

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

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

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



Additional comments /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

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

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

Various pagings.

Pages 526 & 648 are incorrectly numbered pages 625 & 48.

OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA.

THIRD SESSION—FIFTH PARLIAMENT.

48-49 VICTORIÆ, 1885.

VOL. XVII.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-NINTH DAY OF JANUARY TO
THE TWENTY-SIXTH DAY OF MARCH, 1885.



OTTAWA:
PRINTED BY MACLEAN, ROGER & CO., WELLINGTON STREET.
1885.

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RT. HON. SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD, G.C.B.

AT THE OPENING OF THE 3rd SESSION OF THE FIFTH PARLIAMENT,

1885.

President of the Council (Premier)	Right Hon. Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, G. C. B., &c.
Minister of Finance	Sir S. L. TILLEY, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Minister of Justice	Sir ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Public Works	Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, K.C.M.G., C.B.
Minister of Railways and Canals	
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. JOHN HENRY POPE.
Minister of Customs	Hon. MACKENZIE BOWELL.
Minister of Interior	Sir DAVID MACPHERSON.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. J. P. R. ADOLPHE CARON.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. ARCHIBALD W. McLELAN.
Postmaster-General	Hon. JOHN CARLING.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN.
Without Portfolio	Hon. FRANK SMITH.
Secretary of State	Hon. JOSEPH A. CHAPLEAU.

Clerk of the Privy Council JOHN J. MCGEE, Esq.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

HON. GEORGE AIREY KIRKPATRICK	Speaker.
JOHN G. BOURINOT, Esq.	Clerk of the House.
DONALD W. MACDONELL, Esq.	Sergeant-at-Arms.
FRANÇOIS FORTUNAT ROULEAU, Esq.	Clerk Assistant.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

GEORGE B. BRADLEY	Chief Reporter.
STEPHEN A. ABBOTT	} Reporters.
JOSEPH C. DUGGAN	
GEORGE EYVEL	
ALBERT HORTON	
J. O. MARCEAU	
F. R. MARCEAU	
THOS. JNO. RICHARDSON	} Assistant to Chief Reporter.
JNO. CHAS. BOYCE	

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES AND MEMBERS

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THIRD SESSION OF THE FIFTH PARLIAMENT OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA,

1885.

ADDINGTON —John W. Bell.	CORNWALL and STORMONT —Darby Bergin.				
ALBERT —John Wallace.	CUMBERLAND —Charles James Townshend.				
ALGOMA —Simon J. Dawson.	DIGBY —Hon. William B. Vail.				
ANNAPOLIS —William Hallett Ray.	DORCHESTER —Charles Alexander Lesage.				
ANTIGONISH —Angus McIsaac.	DRUMMOND and ARTHABASKA —Désiré Olivier Bourbeau.				
ARGENTEUIL —Hon. J. J. C. Abbott.	DUNDAS —Charles Erastus Hickey.				
BAGOT —Flavien Dupont.	DURHAM, E. Riding —Arthur T. H. Williams.				
BEAUCE —Thomas Linière Taschereau.	DURHAM, W. Riding —Hon. Edward Blake.				
BEAUHARNOIS —Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.	ELGIN, E. Riding —John H. Wilson.				
BELLECHASSE —Guillaume Amyot.	ELGIN, W. Riding —George Elliott Casey.				
BERTHIER —E. Octavian Cuthbert.	ESSEX, N. Riding —James Colebrooke Patterson.				
BONAVENTURE —L. J. Riopel.	ESSEX, S. Riding —Lewis Wigle.				
BOTHWELL —Hon. David Mills.	FRONTENAC —Hon. George Airey Kirkpatrick.				
BRANT, N. Riding —James Somerville.	GASPÉ —Pierre Fortin.				
BRANT, S. Riding —William Paterson.	GLENGARRY —Donald Macmaster.				
BROCKVILLE —John Fisher Wood.	GLOUCESTER —Kennedy F. Burns.				
BROME —Sydney Arthur Fisher.	GRENVILLE, S. Riding — <table><tr><td>{</td><td>William Thomas Benson.*</td></tr><tr><td>{</td><td>Walter Shanly.</td></tr></table>	{	William Thomas Benson.*	{	Walter Shanly.
{	William Thomas Benson.*				
{	Walter Shanly.				
BRUCE, E. Riding —Rupert Mearse Wells.	GREY, E. Riding —Thomas S. Sproule.				
BRUCE, N. Riding —Alexander McNeill.	GREY, N. Riding —Benjamin Allen.				
BRUCE, W. Riding —James Somerville.	GREY, S. Riding —George Landerkin.				
CAPE BRETON — <table><tr><td>{</td><td>Murray Dodd.</td></tr><tr><td>{</td><td>Hector F. McDougall.</td></tr></table>	{	Murray Dodd.	{	Hector F. McDougall.	GUYSBOROUGH —John A. Kirk.
{	Murray Dodd.				
{	Hector F. McDougall.				
CARDWELL —Thomas White.	HALDIMAND —David Thompson.				
CARLETON (N.B.) —David Irvine.	HALIFAX — <table><tr><td>{</td><td>Malachy Bowes Daly.</td></tr><tr><td>{</td><td>John F. Stairs.</td></tr></table>	{	Malachy Bowes Daly.	{	John F. Stairs.
{	Malachy Bowes Daly.				
{	John F. Stairs.				
CARLETON (O.) —Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, G.C.B.	HALTON —William McCraney.				
CARIBOO —James Reid.	HAMILTON — <table><tr><td>{</td><td>Francis Edwin Kilvert.</td></tr><tr><td>{</td><td>Thomas Robertson.</td></tr></table>	{	Francis Edwin Kilvert.	{	Thomas Robertson.
{	Francis Edwin Kilvert.				
{	Thomas Robertson.				
CHAMBLY —Pierre Basile Benoit.	HANTS —W. Henry Allison.				
CHAMPLAIN —Hippolyte Montplaisir.	HASTINGS, E. Riding —John White.				
CHARLEVOIX —Simon Xavier Cimon.	HASTINGS, N. Riding —Hon. Mackenzie Bowell.				
CHARLOTTE —Arthur Hill Gillmor.					
CHATEAUGUAY —Edward Holton.					
CHICOUTIMI and SAGUENAY —Jean Alfred Gagné.					
COLCHESTER —Hon. Archibald Woodbury McLelan.					
COMPTON —Hon. John Henry Pope.					

* Died 8th June. Mr. WALTER SHANLY returned 4th July, took seat 7th July, and sat for the remainder of the Session.

HASTINGS, W. Riding—Alexander Robertson.
 HOCHELAGA—Alphonse Desjardins.
 HUNTINGDON—Julius Scriver.
 HURON, E. Riding—Thomas Farrow.
 HURON, S. Riding—Hon. Sir Richard J. Cartwright, K.C.M.G.
 HURON, W. Riding—Malcolm Colin Cameron.

IBERVILLE—François Bécharé.
 INVERNESS—Hugh Cameron.

JACQUES CARTIER—Désiré Girouard.
 JOLIETTE—Edouard Guilbault.

KAMOURASKA—Charles Bruno Blondeau.
 KENT (N.B.)—Pierre Amand Landry.
 KENT (O.)—Henry Smyth.
 KING'S (N.B.)—George E. Foster.
 KING'S (N.S.)—Douglas B. Woodworth.
 KING'S (P.E.I.)— { Peter Adolphus McIntyre.
 { Augustine Colin Macdonald.
 KINGSTON—Alexander Gunn.

LAMBTON, E. Riding—J. H. Fairbank.
 LAMBTON, W. Riding—James Frederick Lister.
 LANARK, N. Riding—Joseph Jamieson.
 LANARK, S. Riding—John Graham Haggart.
 LAPRAIRIE—Alfred Pinsonneault.
 L'ASSOMPTION—Hilaire Hurteau.
 LAVAL—Joseph Aldéric Ouimet.
 LEEDS and GRENVILLE, N. Riding—Charles Frederick
 Ferguson.
 LEEDS, S. Riding—George Taylor.
 LENNOX—Mathew William Pruyt.
 LÉVIS— { Isidore Noël Belleau.*
 { Pierre Malcolm Guay.
 LINCOLN and NIAGARA—John Charles Rykert.
 LISGAR—Arthur Wellington Ross.
 L'ISLET—Philippe Baby Casgrain.
 LONDON—Hon. John Carling.
 LOTBINIÈRE—Côme Isaïe Rinfret.
 LUNENBURG—Charles Edwin Kaulbach.

MARQUETTE—Robert Watson.
 MASKINONGÉ—Alexis Lesieur Desautniers.
 MÉGANTIC—François Langelier.
 MIDDLESEX, E. Riding—Duncan Macmillan.
 MIDDLESEX, N. Riding—Timothy Coughlin.
 MIDDLESEX, S. Riding—James Armstrong.
 MIDDLESEX, W. Riding—Donald M. Cameron.
 MISSISQUOI—George Barnard Baker.
 MONCK—Lauchlan McCallum.
 MONTCALM—Firmin Dugas.
 MONTMAGNY—Ph. Landry.
 MONTMORENCY—Pierre Vincent Valin.
 MONTREAL, Centre—John Joseph Curran.

MONTREAL, East—Charles Joseph Coursol.
 MONTREAL, West—Matthew Hamilton Gault.
 MUSKOKA—William Edward O'Brien.

NAPIERVILLE—Médéric Catudal.
 NEW WESTMINSTER—Joshua Attwood R. Homer.
 NICOLET—Athanasé Gaudet.
 NORFOLK, N. Riding—John Charlton.
 NORFOLK, S. Riding—Joseph Jackson.
 NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—Hon. Peter Mitchell.
 NORTHUMBERLAND (O.), E. Riding—Edward Cochrane.
 NORTHUMBERLAND (O.), W. Riding—George Guillet.*

ONTARIO, N. Riding—Alexander Peter Cockburn.
 ONTARIO, S. Riding—Francis Wayland Glen.
 ONTARIO, W. Riding—James David Edgar.

OTTAWA (City) — { Charles H. Mackintosh.
 { Joseph Tassé.
 OTTAWA (County)—Alonzo Wright.
 OXFORD, N. Riding—James Sutherland.
 OXFORD, S. Riding—Archibald Harley.

PEEL—James Fleming.
 PERTH, N. Riding—Samuel Rollin Hesson.
 PERTH, S. Riding—James Trow.
 PETERBOROUGH, E. Riding—John Burnham.
 PETERBOROUGH, W. Riding—George Hilliard.

PICTOU— { Charles H. Tupper.
 { John McDougald.
 PONTIAC—John Bryson.
 PORTNEUF—Joseph E. A. De St. Georges.
 PRESCOTT—Simon Labrosse.
 PRINCE (P.E.I.)— { Edward Hackett.
 { James Yeo.
 PRINCE EDWARD—John Milton Platt.
 PROVENCHER—Joseph Royal.

QUEBEC, Centre—Joseph Guillaume Bossé.
 QUEBEC, East—Hon. Wilfred Laurier.
 QUEBEC, West—Hon. Thos. McGreevy.
 QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Jos. Phillippe René Adolphe Caron.
 QUEEN'S (N.B.)—George Gerald King.
 QUEEN'S (N.S.)—James F. Forbes.
 QUEEN'S (P. E. I.)— { Louis Henry Davies.
 { John Theophilus Jenkins.

RENFREW, N. Riding—Peter White.
 RENFREW, S. Riding—Robert Campbell.
 RESTIGOUCHE—George Moffat.
 RICHELIEU—Louis Huet Massue.
 RICHMOND (N.S.)—Henry N. Paint.
 RICHMOND and WOLFE (Q.)—William Bullock Ives.
 RIMOUSKI—Louis Adolphe Billy.
 ROUVILLE—George Aguste Gigault.
 RUSSELL—Moss Kent Dickinson.

* Unseated on judgment of Supreme Court, 16th March, 1885; Mr. GUAY returned 14th April, took seat 27th April, and sat for the remainder of the Session.

* U: seated on judgment of Supreme Court, 16th March, 1885; re-elected 7th April, and took seat 17th April.

ST. HYACINTHE —Michael E. Bernier.	VAUDREUIL —Hugh McMillan.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City —Hon. Sir Leonard Tilley, K.C.M.G.	VERCHÈRES —Hon. Felix Geoffrion.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City and County — { Hon. Isaac Burpee. Charles W. Weldon.	VICTORIA (B.C.) — { Edgar Crow Baker. Noah Shakespeare.
ST. JOHN (Q.) —François Bourassa.	VICTORIA (N.B.) —Hon. John Costigan.
ST. MAURICE —Louis Léon L. Desaulniers.	VICTORIA (N.S.) —Chas. Jas. Campbell.
SELKIRK —Hugh Sutherland.	VICTORIA (O.), N. Riding —Hector Cameron.
SHEFFORD —Michel Auger.	VICTORIA (O.), S. Riding —Joseph R. Dundas.
SHELBURNE —Thomas Robertson.	WATERLOO, N. Riding —Hugo Kranz.
SHEEBROOKE —Robert Newton Hall.	WATERLOO, S. Riding —James Livingston.
SIMCOE, E. Riding —Herman Henry Cook.	WELLAND —John Ferguson.
SIMCOE, N. Riding —Dalton McCarthy.	WELLINGTON, C. Riding —George Turner Orton.
SIMCOE, S. Riding —Richard Tyrwhitt.	WELLINGTON, N. Riding —James McMullen.
SOULANGES —J. W. Bain. *	WELLINGTON, S. Riding —James Innes.
STANSTEAD —Charles C. Colby.	WENTWORTH, N. Riding —Thomas Bain.
SUNBURY —Charles Burpee.	WENTWORTH, S. Riding —Lewis Springer.
TÉMISCOUATA —Paul Etienne Grandbois.	WESTMORELAND —Josiah Wood.
TERREBONNE —Hon. J. A. Chapleau.	WINNIPEG —Thomas Scott.
THREE RIVERS —Hon. Sir Hector Louis Langevin, K.C.M.G.	YALE —Francis Jones Barnard.
TORONTO, Centre —Robert Hay.	YAMASKA —Fabien Vanasse.
TORONTO, East —John Small.	YARMOUTH —Joseph Robbins Kinney.
TORONTO, West —James Beaty, Jr.	YORK (N.B.) —Thomas Temple.
TWO MOUNTAINS —Jean Baptiste Daoust.	YORK (O.), E. Riding —Hon. Alexander Mackenzie.
VANCOUVER ISLAND —David William Gordon.	YORK (O.), N. Riding —William Mulock
	YORK (O.), W. Riding —Nathaniel C. Wallace.

* Returned 5th February, and took seat on the 16th.

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

BÉCHARD , Mr. François (<i>Iberville</i>).	INNES , Mr. James (<i>South Wellington</i>).
BERGIN , Mr. Darby (<i>Cornwall and Stormont</i>).	ROYAL , Mr. Joseph (<i>Provencher</i>).
CHARLTON , Mr. John (<i>North Norfolk</i>).	SCRIVER , Mr. Julius (<i>Huntingdon</i>).
COLBY , Mr. Charles C. (<i>Stanstead</i>).	SOMERVILLE , Mr. James (<i>West Bruce</i>).
DÉSJARDINS , Mr. Alphonse (<i>Hochelaga</i>).	WHITE , Mr. Thomas (<i>Cardwell</i>).
FOSTER , Mr. George E. (<i>King's, N.B.</i>)	WOODWORTH , Mr. Douglas B. (<i>King's, N.S.</i>)

Chairman :—Mr. THOMAS WHITE (*Cardwell*).

LIST OF PAIRS DURING THE SESSION.

On amendment of Mr. McLelan to motion of Mr. Edgar, of 13th Feb., 1885 :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
MR. WOODWORTH.	MR. FORBES.

On motion with reference to Supreme Court, 19th Feb. :—

MR. KILVERT.	MR. THOMPSON.
--------------	---------------

On Mr. Tupper's amendment, 20th Feb. :—

MR. KILVERT.	MR. THOMPSON.
MR. BERGERON.	MR. BÉCHARD.
MR. MASSUE.	MR. SUTHERLAND.

On Sir Hector Langevin's motion to adjourn debate, 23rd Feb. :—

MR. KILVERT.	MR. THOMPSON.
MR. MASSUE.	MR. SUTHERLAND.

On Mr. White's (Renfrew) motion, 26th Feb. :—

MR. WILLIAMS.	MR. TROW.
---------------	-----------

On Mr. Curran's amendment, 27th Feb. :—

MR. TAYLOR.	MR. COCKBURN.
MR. WOOD (Brockville).	MR. ARMSTRONG.
MR. BENSON.	MR. CHARLTON.
MR. PINSONNEAULT.	MR. CAMERON (Middlesex).

On motion of Sir Richard Cartwright, *re* Exchange Bank, 5th March :—

HON. MR. McLELAN.	MR. RAY.
HON. MR. CARLING.	HON. MR. VAIL.
MR. VALIN.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.

On Mr. McCarthy's amendment, 11th March :—

MR. WILLIAMS.	MR. TROW.
---------------	-----------

On Mr. Edgar's 2nd reading of Divorce Bill, 23rd March :—

MR. DAWSON.	MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).
MR. VANASSE.	MR. BINFRET.

On Mr. Blake's amendment, 26th March :—

HON. MR. MITCHELL.	MR. WELLS.
MR. GUILBAULT.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.

On Mr. Blake's amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means, 26th March :—

MR. GUILBAULT.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
HON. MR. MITCHELL.	MR. WELLS.

On Mr. Davies' amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply, 10th April :—

MR. WILLIAMS.	MR. TROW.
MR. COURSOL.	MR. BÉCHARD.
MR. VANASSE.	MR. COCKBURN.
MR. DESJARDINS.	MR. WELLS.
HON. MR. MITCHELL.	MR. CASGRAIN.
MR. CAMERON (Victoria).	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. TAYLOR.	MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).

On 16th April :—

<i>Ministerial.</i>	<i>Opposition.</i>
MR. COURSOL.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. WILLIAMS.	MR. THOMPSON.

On 17th April :—

MR. WRIGHT.	MR. CHARLTON.
MR. WILLIAMS.	MR. ROBERTSON (She burne).
MR. FORTIN.	MR. COOK.
HON. MR. ABBOTT.	HON. MR. MACKENZIE.
MR. CUTHBERT.	MR. LANGELIER.
MR. WHITE (Renfrew).	MR. WELDON.
MR. HURTEAU.	MR. BÉCHARD.
MR. BAIN (Soulanges).	MR. McCRANEY.
MR. TAYLOR.	MR. SCRIVER.

On 22nd April :—

1ST DIVISION.	
MR. MASSUE.	MR. DE St. GEORGES.
MR. WILLIAMS.	MR. THOMPSON.
MR. WOODWORTH.	MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).

2ND DIVISION.	
MR. MASSUE.	MR. DE St. GEORGES.
MR. WILLIAMS.	MR. THOMPSON.
MR. WOODWORTH.	MR. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).
MR. WHITE (Cardwell).	MR. ALLEN.

3RD DIVISION.

Same as second division.

4TH DIVISION.

Same as previous division, also

MR. COLBY.	MR. CHARLTON.
MR. BENSON.	MR. SCRIVER.

On 23rd April :—

1ST DIVISION.

MR. BRYSON.	MR. CAMPBELL (Renfrew).
HON. MR. CHAPLEAU.	MR. LANGELIER.

2ND DIVISION.

Same as first division, also

MR. FORTIN.	MR. THOMPSON.
MR. WRIGHT.	MR. CHARLTON.

3RD DIVISION.

Same as last division.

4TH DIVISION.

Same as last division, also

MR. CAMERON (Victoria).	MR. WELLS.
-------------------------	------------

5TH AND 6TH DIVISIONS.

Same as last division.

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT.—48 VIC.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 29th January, 1885.

THE PARLIAMENT, which had been prorogued from time to time, was now commanded to assemble on the 29th day of January, 1885, for the despatch of business.

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

PRAYERS.

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

Mr. SPEAKER,—

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber. And the House being returned,

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Hon. Mr. Justice Armour, one of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, 1874, a certificate relating to the Controverted Election for the Electoral District of Lennox, declaring the election of the respondent, David Wright Allison, null and void.

Also, from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, a copy of the judgment and decision of the said Court in the election appeal relating to the Controverted Election for the Electoral District of Soulanges, declaring the election of the respondent, James William Bain, null and void.

Also, from the Hon. Mr. Justice Osler, a judgment relating to the Controverted Election for the Electoral District of West Middlesex, declaring the sitting member, Donald M. Cameron, duly elected.

VACANCIES.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that during the Recess he had received communications from several members notifying him that the following vacancies had occurred in the representation :—

Of WILLIAM McDONALD, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Cape Breton, by being summoned to the Senate;

Of the Hon. Sir CHARLES TUPPER, K.C.M.G., Member for the Electoral District of Cumberland, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown;

Of GEORGE WHEELER, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Ontario, by resignation;

Of FREDERICK DE ST. CROIX BROCKEN, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Queen's County District, P.E.I., by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown; and

Of JOSEPH BOLDUO, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Ontario, by being summoned to the Senate.

He also informed the House that he had issued his several Warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to

make out new Writs of Election for the said Electoral Districts, respectively.

He also informed the House that the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, a copy of a Warrant, showing a vacancy which had taken place in the representation of the Electoral District of Maskinongé, by the decease of Frédéric Houde, Esq., and that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery had, by virtue of the Act 41 Victoria, Chapter 5, Section 14, Sub-section 2, issued a new Writ of Election for the said Electoral District.

NEW MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER further informed the House that, during the Recess, the Clerk of the House had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, certificates of the Election and Return of the following Members :—

Of ATHANASE GAUDET, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Nicolet ;
Of FRANÇOIS LANGELIER, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Megantic.
Of CHARLES JAMES TOWNSEND, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Cumberland ;

Of HECTOR F. McDOUGALL, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Cape Breton ;

Of JOHN THEOPHILUS JENKINS, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Queen's County District, P.E.I. ;

Of JAMES DAVID EDGAR, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Ontario ;

Of THOMAS LINIÈRE TASCHEREAU, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Beauce ;

Of ALEXIS LESIEUR DESAULNIERS, Esquire, for the Electoral District of Maskinongé, and

Of MATTHEW WILLIAM PRUYN, Esquire, for the Electoral District of the County of Lennox.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

The following Members, having previously taken the Oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took their seats in the House :—

ATHANASE GAUDET, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Nicolet, introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Hon. Mr. Caron.

CHARLES JAMES TOWNSEND, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Cumberland, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. McLellan.

THOMAS LINIÈRE TASCHEREAU, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Beauce, introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Hon. Mr. Caron.

MATTHEW WILLIAM PRUYN, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the County of Lennox, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Mr. Mackintosh.

ALEXIS LESIEUR DESAULNIERS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Maskinongé, introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Hon. Mr. Caron.

FRANÇOIS LANGELIER, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Megantic, introduced by Hon. Mr. Laurier and Hon. Mr. Blake.

JOHN THEOPHILUS JENKINS, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of Queen's County District, P. E. I., introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Leonard Tilley.

JAMES DAVID EDGAR, Esq., Member for the Electoral District of the West Riding of the County of Ontario, introduced by Hon. Mr. Blake and Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.

REPORT.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the House the Report of the Acting Librarian on the state of the Library of Parliament.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS OF OFFICE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD introduced Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office. Bill read the first time.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform this House, that when the House attended His Excellency the Governor General this day in the Senate Chamber, His Excellency was pleased to make a Speech to both Houses of Parliament, and, to prevent mistakes, I have obtained a copy of the Speech, which is as follows:—

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In again meeting you for the despatch of business I have to congratulate you on the abundant harvest with which Providence has blessed our country and upon the general condition of the Dominion. Its commercial prosperity, although it has to some extent shared in the depression which has prevailed in Great Britain and in the neighboring Republic, rests upon foundations which no temporary or partial disturbance can remove.

I trust that the present year will be one of peace and progress.

The flow of population into Manitoba and the North-West Territories, although impeded by various and unexpected causes, has been substantial, and the testimony of members of the British Association and other visitors of the North-West last summer as to the well-being, contentment, and hopefulness of the settlers, is most gratifying.

A Bill introducing into those Territories a more simple and economical system for the transfer of land will be laid before you.

The Report of the Commission for the consolidation of the Statutes affecting the Dominion has been completed and will be submitted to you for legislative action.

You are again invited to consider a measure relating to the representation of the people in Parliament and for the assimilation of the Electoral Franchises in the several Provinces.

A provisional arrangement of matters for some time under discussion with the Government of Manitoba has been entered into, and a measure confirming the same will be submitted to you so soon as it has been accepted by the Provincial Legislature.

I deemed it expedient to issue during the Recess a Commission to consider and report upon the whole subject of Chinese immigration with reference to its trade relations, as well as to those social and moral objections which have been taken to the influx of the Chinese people into Canada.

The Report of the Commissioners is very nearly completed, and will be laid before you during the present Session.

The necessity of encouraging the speedy construction of lines of railway through the North-West Territories has pressed itself on my Government, and you will be asked to aid railway enterprise by liberal grants of land.

Urgent representations have been made by the Boards of Trade of the chief towns in Canada, as well as by some of the Chambers of Commerce in Great Britain, of the necessity that exists for the adoption of some system of bankruptcy or insolvency giving adequate protection against undue preferences, and your attention to this important subject is earnestly invited.

In pursuance of the vote of last Session I caused a vessel to be fitted out and dispatched to Davis' Straits and Hudson's Bay, in order to obtain more accurate information as to the navigation of those waters, and test the practicability of the route for commercial purposes.

A report of the progress of the expedition during the last season will be laid before you.

An International Exhibition will be opened at Antwerp during the present year, and a Colonial and Indian Exhibition is to be held in London in 1886. Canada should, I think, be represented in her various manufactures and natural productions on both occasions, and I invoke your consideration of the best means of aiding in these important objects.

Several other measures of importance will be submitted to you; among them will be Bills to amend the Insurance Act of 1877, the Civil Service Act, and the law relating to contagious diseases among cattle,

Mr. SPEAKER.

as well as measures for taking, at an early period, a census of the population of the North-West Territories, and one relating to the North-West Mounted Police.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the past fiscal year will be laid before you. You will find that notwithstanding the very considerable reduction in the prices and volume of many of the leading imports, the income has exceeded the expenditure chargeable to Consolidated Revenue.

The estimates for the ensuing year will also be submitted. They will be found, I trust, to have been prepared with due regard to economy.

Honorable Gentlemen of the Senate,

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I am sure that your earnest consideration will be given to the subjects I have mentioned, as well as to every matter which may affect the prosperity and good government of Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General be taken into consideration to-morrow.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock) the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 30th January, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

The following Member, having previously taken the Oath according to law, and subscribed the roll containing the same, took his seat in the House:

HECTOR F. McDUGALL, Esquire, Member for the Electoral District of Cape Breton, introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald and Hon. Mr. McLelan.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. TASCHEREAU. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker: Having been called upon as the youngest member of this House, by virtue of a time-honored tradition, to move the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, I feel that, less than any of my predecessors, would I be justified in leaving aside that other time-honored tradition which makes it my duty to begin by craving the indulgence of this

House. When I consider that, in order to deserve the interest of the House, I must comment on this document in a new and able manner, and when, on the other hand, I am struck with my own want of experience, I feel that the duty which I have undertaken to fulfil is quite out of proportion with my ability. However, in the idea that this invitation has been extended to me out of respect for the people by whom I have been chosen as their representative here, of the fine electoral division for which I am a member, and in my deep sense of gratitude for my constituents, I shall find courage enough to pursue this difficult and honorable task. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, when I throw a glance on this document and when my mind is fixed upon the numerous and important subjects of new legislation which it announces, and when at the same time I consider the general condition of the country, I feel that my task becomes easier as it becomes more agreeable to me. In fact, how could I not feel happy while inviting all members of this hon. House and the country at large to congratulate themselves on the abundant harvest with which Providence has blessed our country, and upon the general condition of the Dominion? Therefore, to Providence we owe our thanksgivings, but we should not forget to offer also to the Government our congratulations on the results of their financial policy. In fact, when we remember the disastrous effects in the country of the commercial crisis which has preceded the actual depression, when we have been in a position to have such a clear insight into the great depression which prevailed last year in Great Britain and in the neighboring Republic, when we consider the intimate and constant commercial intercourse between these countries and our own, if we look at the actual condition of our trade, we cannot certainly refrain from making a comparison between the old financial system and the present one, and this comparison being made, the superiority of the new system is not only made apparent by speeches or by words, but is perfectly established by accomplished facts and by experience. Neither can we help admiring the clever direction given by our legislators to our commerce whose prosperity to-day rests upon foundations which no temporary or partial disturbance can remove. If then, Mr. Speaker, the stability of our institutions, the safety of the present and the prospect of the future which cannot but improve the wealth and welfare of the inhabitants of this country, are as many tokens of peace and prosperity, why should we not feel confident that the year now commencing will open an era of peace and prosperity? Of peace, Mr. Speaker, not only with foreign nations, but of peace also in the union and harmony which ought to exist among citizens of a nation to enable them to make more rapid strides in the high road to progress. Our legitimate aspirations, like those of all new nations, must necessarily tend to lead us in the way of progress, and, indeed, no one can pretend that our advance in that direction has been too slow up to this day. Let us see: the immense wilderness of the North-West whose soil was heretofore untrodden except by savage tribes or by a few bold explorers endeavoring to discover the unknown, and whose echoes had only been awakened by the howling of wild beasts, that wilderness is to-day covered by a network of immense railways. Closely following in the wake of the constructors, thousands of laborers, settlers, and diligent workers have inaugurated a new era in that great country, and to-day the shrill whistle of the locomotive is heard in these new regions and proclaims loudly in all parts of that country that civilization and progress have conquered the great wilderness. But, in spite of all that has been accomplished up to this day, we have only made our first step in that direction. It is true our institutions are well established, but our traffic is daily increasing its scope, new routes of communication are furrowing the country in all directions, and soon, in a few months hence, a line of railway will cross it through and through, from one ocean to

the other. Notwithstanding this, what a great amount of work remains to be done! What a great number of resources remain undeveloped! What an extent of unsettled territory and what an amount of wealth still lies in the bosom of the earth! Even apart from the older provinces, what a great field for work is offered in the development and settlement of Manitoba and the North-West Territories! Our efforts must, therefore, be pushed in that direction, by promoting emigration in these rich and yet unsettled Territories, by aiding their colonization and development, in order that the sacrifices made in the hope of seeing one day that immense region transformed into a vast empire, may not be lost. With this purpose in view the Government have felt the necessity of encouraging the rapid construction of a railway line across these Territories, and have decided to ask the House to help the construction of that line by a liberal grant of lands. We may also congratulate the Government for the impulse which they have, by legitimate means, given to the advancement of the country. For my part I am an admirer of the system which tends to facilitate by grants of land the construction of railways, for this system gives to the immense area of lands still remaining in the hands of the Government a great increase of value, and at the same time makes of every individual interested in those grants a devoted and zealous agent of colonization. The efforts of the Government have, besides, during the course of last year, been admirably seconded by the eulogistic reports on the country made by members of the British Association for the Advancement of Science. A visit on the part of such prominent men, whose reputation for science and general knowledge is so widely spread in Europe, cannot fail to have the most happy results. Therefore, I feel confident that in the near future, the results obtained from such a visit will be made clear to us by the great increase in the number of settlers coming to our Canadian North-West. The Government, on their part, must also contribute as far as they can to promote this immigration, and they can do this by extending to the settlers coming into this country all the legitimate and efficacious protection in their power, and by giving them a simple and economical means of transferring their properties, while giving to their title deeds an indisputable character of authenticity and of validity. It is, therefore, just and right that we should respond to the appeal made by the Government to this House, in order to pass a law which will authorize a safer and more economical mode of transfer of real estate. Before leaving this question aside I beg to be allowed to allude to that part of the Speech from the Throne, which informs us that a provisional arrangement has been entered into with the Government of Manitoba on matters which have been for some time under discussion, and that a measure confirming the same will be submitted to us so soon as it shall have been accepted by the Provincial Legislature. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this information will be greeted with satisfaction by the whole House. Every question which has heretofore arisen between the various Legislatures and Parliament has been amicably settled. This is one of the strongest arguments in favor of our constitution, and it speaks well for the foresight of those who have conceived the plan and have carried it out. Let us hope that such differences will always be settled in the same amicable manner, so that prolonged quarrels and acrimonious contests may not trouble that harmony among the people which is so necessary to the advancement and progress of the provinces. The Speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, after giving us a knowledge of those measures of legislation more especially adapted to that part of the country called the North-West, points out to us measures which are proposed in the general interest of the country. I read with pleasure the paragraph which informs us that the work of the Commission for the consolidation of the Statutes affecting the whole Dominion is completed,

and that the report will be submitted to us for legislation. I attach to it a great deal of importance, not only as a member of the legal profession, but furthermore, and above all, in view of the very great advantages which will be derived from the measure by citizens of this country who are not familiar with the study of our laws. During the eighteen years which have elapsed since the establishment of Confederation, so many amendments to existing laws have been passed that even legal men were obliged to make long and patient enquiries to discover all the bearings of a law. Still more numerous were the difficulties met with by people who were not familiar with our laws. But to-day, thanks to this consolidation, every one will have easy access to the laws passed by Parliament, and more than any others, members of the legal profession will owe a debt of gratefulness to the Government. The next paragraph of the Speech from the Throne tells us that we will be again invited to consider a measure relating to the representation of the people in Parliament, and for the assimilation of the electoral franchises in the several provinces. It would be useless for me, Mr. Speaker, to deal lengthily with this paragraph, for I could only repeat that which was so eloquently said last year by the mover and seconder of the Address. However, I cannot help calling the attention of the House on the importance of defining the class of voters which shall elect its own members. Is it not an anomalous fact that by the system which prevails to-day members of the House of Commons should be elected by voters chosen and pointed out by Local Legislatures? If, in order to act with more freedom in its own sphere, each Local Legislature must be thoroughly independent from the control of the Federal Parliament, for the same reason the House of Commons must be absolutely independent, either directly or indirectly, from the control or action of Local Legislatures, and, above all, not be exposed to fall, sooner or later, into the hands of an electoral division created against their will. We all wish that the relations existing between Local Legislatures and the Federal Parliament should be relations of peace and good-will. Well, Mr. Speaker, the surest means to keep them such is for all parties to entrench themselves behind their rights, to carefully watch over them and to maintain them with all their might. In such a way the positions of each will be beyond attack, and peace and harmony must necessarily prevail. The Government cannot be charged with not having worked constantly to maintain this union, not only among the various institutions, but also among the different races and nationalities coexisting in the country. I find the proof of this in that part of the Speech from the Throne which promises us that the work of the commission named to consider and report upon the whole subject of Chinese immigration with reference to its trade relations, as well as to those social and moral objections which have been taken to the influx of the Chinese people into Canada, will be submitted to the House during this Session. No doubt, Mr. Speaker, that in preparing this report due consideration has been given to existing treaties between Great Britain and China, and that, at all events, the determination to be taken on this point will be taken after that careful study which is the guarantee of sound legislation. Our attention is next called to the following paragraph:—

"Urgent representations have been made by the Boards of Trade of the chief towns in Canada, as well as by some of the Chambers of Commerce in Great Britain, of the necessity that exists for the adoption of some system of bankruptcy or insolvency giving adequate protection against undue preferences, and your attention to this important subject is earnestly invited."

Mr. Speaker, if I remember aright, when the repeal of the Insolvent Act, which existed some few years ago, was moved in this House the great majority of the House of Commons of Canada voted for the repeal. I think that the House then reflected the opinion of the people, and I am

Mr. TASCHEBAU.

not aware that there are to-day any reasons for a change of sentiment. But before deciding on this question it might be well, perhaps, to form a just idea of the wants of the people on this point. As for us, members of the Province of Quebec, we have, by virtue of our civil law, an equitable mode of distributing the estates of insolvent debtors. Perhaps it would be just, perhaps it would be advantageous, for the Dominion at large to accept the mode of legislation now existing in the Province of Quebec. The next paragraph informs us that in pursuance of the vote of last Session a vessel has been fitted out and despatched to Davis' Straits and Hudson's Bay, in order to obtain more accurate information as to the navigation of those waters, and test the practicability of the route for commercial purposes. The progress of science and human faculties have, for a certain number of years, developed the natural resources to such an extent that feats which were considered as impossible even at the beginning of the present century, may now be accomplished with astounding facility. If I remember aright, Mr. Speaker, the general impression has long been entertained that it was impossible to navigate the Strait of Behring; to-day, this problem has long been solved. Why should not we be as justified to think to-day that the Hudson's Bay is navigable as people were a few years ago in believing that the Strait of Behring could be navigated? What great advantages would result for Canadian trade if we could come to the conclusion that Hudson's Bay is navigable for commercial purposes? Another paragraph of the Speech from the Throne tells us that an International Exhibition will be opened at Antwerp during the present year, and a Colonial and Indian Exhibition is to be held in London in 1886. Canada should be represented in her various manufactures and natural productions on both occasions. Mr. Speaker, the success already obtained by Canada at the various exhibitions to which it has been represented during the last few years, is certainly a great encouragement for the future. At the Philadelphia, London and Paris Exhibitions, Canada has been very successful, and I think we should send our productions to the two exhibitions which will soon take place; and increase, if possible, the quantity of articles to be exhibited, the more so as we are pursuing a policy of immigration to our country, in order to cause the richness of our soil and the great variety of our resources to be known abroad. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I beg to conclude as I have commenced, by congratulating our country on the happy condition of affairs, and on its prosperity during the commercial depression which has prevailed of late years. In spite of the numerous expenses necessitated by the administration of such a vast country as ours, a country whose population is disseminated on all points, still, the fact that the receipts exceed the expenses chargeable to the Consolidated Revenue is a proof of the spirit of economy, and of the ability of our rulers who have foreseen all coming emergencies, and have managed to throw the balance on the surplus side. Moreover, I think that I reflect the opinion, if not of the whole population, at least of the greatest part of the population, when I state that the inhabitants of this country are satisfied with their lot; that they live happy under the protection of Great Britain, and that they do not intend to transfer their fealty and homage, but that they wish to continue to live, grow and prosper under the folds of that glorious flag which ensures to them peace and prosperity for a long time to come. I have the honor to move the following Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne:—

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

That we rejoice to know that in again meeting us for the despatch of business, His Excellency is able to congratulate us on the abundant harvest with which Providence has blessed our country, and upon the general condition of the Dominion, and to express his belief that its commercial prosperity, although it has to some extent shared in the depres-

sion which has prevailed in Great Britain and in the neighboring Republic, rests upon foundations which no temporary or partial disturbance can remove; and that we trust with His Excellency that the present year will be one of peace and progress.

That we are glad to learn that the flow of population into Manitoba and the North-West Territories, although impeded by various and unexpected causes, has been substantial, and that the testimony of members of the British Association and other visitors of the North-West last summer as to the well-being, contentment, and hopefulness of the settlers, is most gratifying.

That any Bill introducing into these Territories a more simple and economical system for the transfer of land, laid before us, shall receive our best attention.

That we learn with pleasure that the report of the commission for the consolidation of the Statutes affecting the Dominion has been completed and will be submitted to us for legislative action.

That we shall carefully consider any measure relating to the representation of the people in Parliament and for the assimilation of the electoral franchises in the several provinces, which may be laid before us.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that a provisional arrangement of matters for some time under discussion with the Government of Manitoba has been entered into, and that a measure confirming the same will be submitted us so soon as it has been accepted by the Provincial Legislature.

That we learn with great interest, that His Excellency deemed it expedient to issue during the recess a Commission to consider and report upon the whole subject of Chinese immigration with reference to its trade relations, as well as to those social and moral objections which have been taken to the influx of the Chinese people into Canada, and that the report of the Commissioners is very nearly completed and will be laid before us during the present Session.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that the necessity of encouraging the speedy construction of lines of railway through the North-West Territories has pressed itself on his Government, and that we shall be asked to aid railway enterprise by liberal grants of land.

That we feel with His Excellency that the urgent representations which have been made by the Boards of Trade of the chief towns in Canada, as well as by some of the Chambers of Commerce in Great Britain, of the necessity that exists for the adoption of some system of Bankruptcy or insolvency giving adequate protection against undue preferences, demand the earnest attention to this important subject which His Excellency invites us to give to it.

That we learn with much satisfaction that in pursuance of the vote of last Session His Excellency caused a vessel to be fitted out and dispatched to Davis' Straits and Hudson's Bay, in order to obtain more accurate information as to the navigation of those waters, and test the practicability of the route for commercial purposes, and that a report of the progress of the expedition during the last season will be laid before us.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that an International Exhibition will be opened at New York during the present year, and that a Colonial and Indian Exhibition is to be held in London in 1886; that we agree with His Excellency in thinking that Canada should be represented in her various manufactures and natural productions on both occasions, and that we shall attentively consider the best means of aiding in these important objects.

That any other measures of importance submitted to us, including among them Bills to amend the Insurance Act of 1877, the Civil Service Act, and the law relating to contagious diseases among cattle, as well as measures for taking at an early period a census of the population of the North-West Territories, and one relating to the North-West Mounted Police, will receive our attentive and earnest consideration.

That we thank His Excellency for informing us that the accounts for the past fiscal year will be laid before us; and that we shall be glad to find that notwithstanding the very considerable reduction in the prices and volume of many of the leading imports, the income has exceeded the expenditure chargeable to consolidated revenues.

That we shall respectfully consider the estimates for the ensuing year to be submitted to us, and which will be found, we trust, to have been prepared with due regard to economy.

That His Excellency may rest assured that our earnest consideration will be given to the subjects he has mentioned, as well as to every matter which may affect the prosperity and good government of Canada.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. In rising to second the motion for an Address in reply to His Excellency's Speech, I beg the indulgence of the House while I make a few remarks. There is nothing contained in the Speech from the Throne which is more deserving of the attention of the House and the country than the reference made to the recent visit of the British Association to this Dominion. The presence in Canada of a body of such eminent men would, under any circumstances, be an advantage to the country at large, but coming as they did and meeting here, and afterwards visiting every portion of the Dominion, seeking to inform themselves as to the resources of our country with the same eagerness as they have displayed in prosecuting scientific enquiries in other countries, their visit gave to Canada a double advantage. We find that far from confining themselves merely to the objects of their meeting as an association they traversed

this country from one end to the other acquainting themselves in the most thorough manner with its resources and capabilities; and having obtained that information they have carried it with them to England and to Europe generally, dispersing it in all directions in a manner most advantageous to this country, and in a mode by which, under no other circumstances, could the same advantages have been secured to this Dominion. The utterances of such men as visited this country with the British Association, such men as Sir Richard Temple, Professor Tanner, Professor Sheldon, Professor Gilbert, General Lefroy and others—for I have only mentioned a few of the most prominent—with the fact that they sought this information and gave it to the British public, cannot but be of immense advantage to us, because these men speak with authority. It is with no ordinary pleasure that I have had the opportunity of perusing some of the letters and speeches of those gentlemen since their return to the Mother Country, in which they have spoken in the most glowing terms of this great Dominion of ours, impressed as they were with our great agricultural and mineral resources—in fact, with all the great material resources of this country—to such an extent as thoroughly to surprise them; and I repeat that their views given to the public cannot but be of inestimable advantage to us. Indeed, I consider that nothing which has taken place in the history of Canada during the present century has been of more consequence to the people of this country than this visit, and it is an event which speaks well for the intelligence of Parliament and the Government in affording the association so much assistance in visiting the different parts of this country. There was nothing that struck me more forcibly—and I think it must have struck almost every one—than the contrast between the eloquent and truthful statements of these gentlemen—statements which were made and published by men unbiassed in the slightest degree—and some of the doleful utterances which have been spread broadcast through Canada itself. Sir, the contrast was so striking that it would be hard to pass over it without comment. These statements by members of the association came from men who are utterly without bias, and without any political ends in view. I think, Sir, that this country will ever remain under a debt of deep gratitude to these men who have spoken so well of us and have taken such pains, even at much cost and trouble to themselves, to find out what our resources really are, and what this Canada really contains. Now, Sir, the general condition of this country is spoken of in His Excellency's Speech. The revenue, we are told, will again give us a surplus. I rejoice, and the country must rejoice, that the days of surplusses are not yet gone by, and, Sir, this is the more gratifying when it is remembered that at the last Session of Parliament a considerable reduction was made in the taxation of the country. I refer principally to the tax on tobacco, which was reduced from 20 to 12 cents on the pound. This, with some other reductions, if I remember rightly, was estimated to cause a loss in the revenue of over a million dollars; and yet, Sir, we find, notwithstanding that, and in spite of the large expenditures made in the country, that the Government are able to meet Parliament with the announcement of a surplus. This is the first year that we have felt the effect of this great reduction in the taxation. We might also have expected a considerable diminution in the revenue from other causes. We know from the returns that the duties collected on spirits have been very much reduced, which I attribute to the greatly diminished quantity of spirits consumed throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, owing to the general temperance sentiment which is happily now prevailing. I hope, Sir, it may long continue so. Now, Sir, while on the subject of revenue, I may be permitted to refer to what must be a cause of congratulation to this country—the loan effected in England last summer by the Finance

Minister—effected on terms, I believe, never obtained by any colony before, and at a rate of interest lower than we ever had enjoyed up to this time. As to the details of that loan, whether it might have been for a larger amount, or whether it was the best which could have been obtained I say nothing; but this I do know, that eminent financiers on both sides of the Atlantic have pronounced it an admirable transaction; and I think it speaks well for the credit of this country, and should convince us that we are not going backwards, that such is the opinion of men best able to form a judgment on the matter. Now, Sir, the trade and commerce of the country have been referred to by His Excellency. It is true there has been a certain amount of depression common to this country with the United States and Great Britain; but, Sir, we have the consolation of reflecting that if there is a depression here, it is less trying and less damaging in every respect than in either the United States or England. Any person who reads the terrible accounts of the trade depression in England—of closing factories and unemployed operatives—and the same thing in the United States, and compares that condition of affairs with what exists in Canada, must at once be convinced that the trade of this Dominion, if depressed at the present time, at least rests on sound foundations. The trade of our country consists chiefly in fisheries, coal and other mineral products, agricultural and animal products, lumbering and manufacturing. From these we should find the best index of the condition of the trade of this country. Now, taking the six months ending the 31st December, 1884, I find that the exports of the products of the mines, as compared with the corresponding period in 1883, have increased \$683,000, of animals and their products, \$1,900,000, of agricultural products, \$500,000, and of manufactures, \$45,000; showing a steady increase in the value of our exports in these important branches of industry in which our people are engaged. This is convincing evidence that the tendency of the present fiscal tariff is to broaden and extend the base upon which our commercial prosperity must rest—that instead of having, as was the case when the former depression overtook the country, to depend solely upon our agricultural and mining interests, we have other industries which have been created by the present fiscal policy, to supply the deficiencies that existed. Now, Sir, with regard to our shipping interest. I come from a Maritime Province—a province which, I think, is the largest shipping province in the Dominion; and, notwithstanding the fact that there is a decrease amounting, I think, to some \$20,000,000 in the value of the imports and exports of the Dominion during the past year, yet we find that the tonnage of the sea-going vessels, inwards and outwards, has largely increased. The increase, I find, amounts to 558,291 tons, showing that a larger quantity of goods has been moved during the year than previously; and the increase, compared with 1879, reaches the very large amount of 2,712,214 tons. This I take to be very strong evidence of the soundness of our trade policy; for I believe I am not wrong in saying that, according to eminent statisticians, there is no better evidence of the soundness of a country's trade than the extent of its inward and outward shipping. I find also that the coasting trade, notwithstanding the development of railways and low freights which have prevailed, has steadily and satisfactorily increased, that trade now amounting to 15,473,000 tons. These figures afford strong testimony to the healthy state of trade, particularly in connection with the shipping interest. I had my attention drawn the other day to a very excellent and clear statement made by Mr. Fairweather before the Board of Trade in St. John, N.B., in which he exhaustively discussed the question of inter-provincial trade. He gave figures which, I think, were unknown, or at any rate unappreciated, up to this time. From his statement we find that the trade between the pro-

vinces amounts to the very large sum of \$16,271,332. Six years ago, before the introduction of the present fiscal policy, our inter-provincial trade amounted to only one-eighth of this figure. This is a remarkable and healthy state of affairs, and is clearly the result of the fiscal policy adopted at that time. From these figures we can draw our own conclusions as to what in the near future this trade must grow to. From the steady increases it has shown we may expect, when the great North-West is more fully connected with the Eastern Provinces, that an infinitely larger trade will spring up between them and that portion of the Dominion. Now, Sir, there is one fact in connection with our trade to which I may be permitted briefly to refer, and that is that the exports from the Maritime Provinces during the past year were much larger than the imports. I think the excess for consumption amounts to \$2,137,000; that is the excess of exports over the imports entered for consumption; while on the other hand in the Western Provinces the imports very largely exceed the exports. For those who contend that the excess of exports over imports is evidence of a country's prosperity, these figures, I hope, will make them once and for all appreciate the value of the Maritime Provinces to the Dominion. When you add to that the fact that our vessels, sailing in every sea, manned by the expert and hardy mariners who belong to our provinces—when you reflect that those vessels are returning to this Dominion the freights earned by them, you will see that the Maritime Provinces are a still greater source of wealth to the Dominion. Shipbuilding is said to be on the wane; we were told that that industry would be ruined by the introduction of the present fiscal policy. Now, I am not in a position to speak for the other provinces, but I can say for Nova Scotia that, so far from that being the case, the tonnage is greater; I can say that, although the number of vessels has slightly diminished, the tonnage has actually increased. In 1883 the result of the National Policy was to show that in Nova Scotia we were building a much larger class of vessels. In 1883 we built 202 vessels with a tonnage of 35,765 tons; in 1884, while we only built 175 vessels, the tonnage was 42,000 tons, thus showing that so far from that industry diminishing it is on the increase. The tonnage is also—and that is another fact worthy of note—the largest tonnage since 1878. There are some other facts in connection with this matter to which I will refer further on. I will take now the fisheries, an interest also connected with my province, and I am happy to be able to congratulate the country on the fact that the catch of fish steadily increases. Thus, notwithstanding the decrease of prices, the total value of the catch last year exceeds that of the year previous by a million dollars. Now that is a satisfactory result for us in view of the fishing interest, and it bears testimony to the wisdom of the policy adopted by this House in giving bounties to fishermen. I find on reference to some reports that I hold in my hand that the effect of the bounty was to increase the number of vessels employed in the deep sea and in-shore fishing. Last year we had about 40 fishing vessels built in the county of Lunenburg alone. Another fact, which I also claim as proof of the wisdom of the policy of giving bounties, is that, in 1883, we had 902 vessels against 116 in 1882, an increase of 786 vessels, 26,711 tons, which increase was made up almost entirely from Nova Scotia, principally in the counties of Lunenburg, Shelburne, Yarmouth and Digby. Reference has been made in the Speech to the Hudson's Bay expedition. I have no doubt, from what we have learned on the subject, that even if that expedition does not realize all the happy results anticipated by this country—even if all the objects for which it was sent are not accomplished—and that we cannot know yet—it will, in the matter of fisheries, be a large gain to this country. From reports we have already received we find both in regard to the salmon and cod fisheries that the Hudson's Bay expedition will give us important information. In fact it

Mr. TOWNSEND.

has already shown us that in addition to the great sea pastures which we have, both in the Eastern Provinces and British Columbia, we will have one more very important field added in the north. A great deal has been said with reference to the treaties about to be made between the United States and Spain. While we would regret being excluded from any advantage we might gain by trading with the West India Islands on equal terms with our neighbors, yet we must not forget one fact, that we possess the great fisheries of this continent, and that the United States have not sufficient to supply their own consumption. From some figures I have, I find that, in 1884, the Americans exported \$4,742,000 while they imported \$5,579,000, showing that they actually have not enough for their own consumption, and that, should they make these treaties, they will have to look to us for their supply. In this connection I may be pardoned for referring to the Washington Treaty, and expressing a hope that, if, when the fishery clauses expire in June next, they cannot be renewed on as favorable terms as were obtained by our worthy chief, the Premier of this Dominion, at Washington, formerly, such measures will be taken as will guard and protect this our national heritage. I may be permitted to add one thing more. We have another industry in the Maritime Provinces which we trust may be protected at the same time. I refer to our great coal industries, and I cannot forbear expressing the hope that the United States may remove duties from the coal, thus enabling our great collieries to immensely increase their output. I hope for this, unless, indeed it would have the effect of raising the price of coal in Ontario by enabling the Pennsylvania coal owners to increase their price. I find that the total exports of animals and animal products for this year is some \$24,500,000, making an increase of over \$3,000,000 as compared with 1883, and that for the past six months the increase in this export is \$1,875,000, showing a much larger increase than in the previous year. While on that subject and referring to the immense importance of that industry to the people of this Dominion—becoming, as it must, greater year by year as the North-West is more settled and developed—I cannot help alluding to the vigorous and wise action of my predecessor in the representation of Cumberland, Sir Charles Tupper, who so ably represents this country in England, and whose wise management has done so much to assist and improve this trade. Taking into consideration the large ranches now existing in the North-West and the millions of dollars that have been invested in that industry, we can hardly estimate the immense importance it is going to be to this country. But, Sir, there is one thing that we may anticipate. Perhaps it may be received with an incredulous smile by some persons, but I believe the day is not far distant, when communication is effectually made between the North-West and the Eastern Provinces, when we shall have the cattle bred and fed on those ranches in the North-West brought to the shores of the Bay of Fundy and fattened on the marshes which surround its borders, thus enabling them to be transported to England with the least loss of flesh, which is the great difficulty that now exists in bringing the cattle from so great a distance. The lumbering industry, it is true, is to a certain extent depressed. That is a matter which is beyond the control of any fiscal policy. What the Government could do has been done by enabling the lumbermen to obtain their supplies at the very lowest rates. On examining the returns, however, it will be found that the volume of exports from the forests is actually greater during the past year than in the previous year, while we know the price has been less. This is convincing evidence of the fact that our hardy lumbermen are receiving employment, although those interested in buying from them may not receive such large returns. It is also a matter of congratulation to us that the latest reports show that the market is

rising. I find that the export of manufactures during the past fiscal year is greater than in the previous one, and during the past six months it has been proportionately larger than for the previous twelve months. This, Sir, shows that this important industry, the creation, we may almost say, of the National Policy, is not in such a depressed state as we were led to suppose. I can only refer, in support of this, to the remarks made by the Finance Minister recently in Toronto, as very satisfactory evidence on that point. He showed that the artisans have increased since the introduction of the protective policy 9,500 a year, while during the previous ten years the increase was only 6,500. Take that statement in connection with *Bradstreet's*, where we find that the decrease of artisans and mechanics in the United States was 130 for every 10,000, while in Canada it was only 65 in ten thousand during the same period. In the matter of immigration—although it is true that there is a falling off, owing, as His Excellency says, to various causes to which I need not now allude—we find that a much better class of substantial settlers is coming amongst us, and becoming permanent residents. I find the total number of immigrant settlers is, in round numbers, 100,000 for the past year. I think these few facts which I have been enabled to give to the House will verify the first statement in His Excellency's Speech, when he says that the "commercial prosperity, although it has to some extent shared in the depression which has prevailed in Great Britain and in the neighboring Republic, rests upon foundations which no temporary or partial disturbance can remove." Reference is made to the railways in the North-West. Now, Sir, we can all appreciate the immense value which the North-West is to this country. It is not for me to descant on that subject, but I do believe that, if the North-West is important to the Dominion, it is equally important that everything should be done by Parliament to help and develop that country. It is to be remembered that every extra cent of freight which the farmers have to pay for want of railway communication in that country handicaps them in the English market. The country can congratulate itself upon the near completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that great trunk line which we must regard as a national achievement of which every Canadian may be proud. I regard it as a work, not only of importance to Canada, but to England and to the Empire itself, and we may expect at no distant day that it will form the great highway from England to her Eastern possessions. While we are fully convinced that Parliament has done well to aid railways in the North-West, there are some railway matters in connection with the Maritime Provinces to which I beg leave to refer. Parliament gave large assistance to railway communication throughout the North-West, and at the same time some compensation to the Maritime Provinces was given by subsidising our railways. Respecting the construction of the road from the Intercolonial to Louisburg through the Island of Cape Breton, the House will learn with regret that the company have failed to carry out the object Parliament had in view. I am sorry to have to say that the people are suffering in consequence of the default of that company, but I trust I am fully justified in believing that ere the Session closes, such provision will have been made by the Government, either by negotiation or legislation, as will remove all cause of discontent and lead to the early completion of that road to the Port of Louisburg in Cape Breton. Now there are many other matters in the Speech, but I do not propose to allude to them at any length. The franchise, for instance, is of great importance to this country, and it is time that it should be dealt with. Having, as we now have, different franchises on which members are elected to this House, it is important those franchises should be made uniform, and any measure of that kind, I have no doubt, will have ample consideration. The revision of the Statutes, also, is a matter of great importance to the country. The subject of a bank-

ruptey law, we must all admit, is a difficult one to deal with—a most difficult subject, indeed, to deal with. It has been found so in the United States; it has been found so in England; and I can only trust that any measure that may be brought forward in reference to that subject, will have a just and proper regard to the relations between debtor and creditor. The exhibitions at Antwerp and London are also matters of great importance to this country, and as they will be an excellent advertisement of the country's resources, it is our duty to encourage manufacturers and others to show the world what our country can do. In conclusion, Sir, I cannot forbear referring to the gratification we must all feel at finding still at the head of the Government of this country the distinguished leader of the Liberal-Conservative party, who, with undiminished vigor, is still able to sustain the responsibilities of his office. It was with feelings of gratification that the people of this country, from one end to the other, heard of the honors conferred upon him by Her Majesty; and I think I am safe in saying that throughout this Dominion the hope is indulged that he may long be spared to preside over, and guide, and guard the destinies of this great Dominion of ours.

Mr. BLAKE. I have to congratulate my hon. friends who have just addressed the House on the manner in which they have discharged their somewhat difficult and onerous task. It is true that we observed at some stages slight signs of hesitation, but upon the whole, if I were asked to say in what particular art of oratory they have most shown their abilities to-day, I should say it was in the euphemistic and hyperbolic style. We have heard an account of the country, we have heard an account of its progress and prosperity, we have heard an account of its condition, which we should be only too glad if we could adopt as correct, but which, unfortunately, from the point of view from which we look at that condition, from the facts which are visible to our eyes, from the accounts which reach our ears, we are utterly unable to assent to; and I must repeat my congratulations to my hon. friends, having undertaken the task of seconding and bettering the expressions in the Speech, that they have been able to go through their business with so much gallantry, and, upon the whole, with so little hesitation. I am sorry that we are met so late. I had hoped that after the promise made the Session before last, and which was very measurably kept last Session, we should have adhered to the notion of coming here as soon as our friends and colleagues from the most distant parts of the Dominion could reach Ottawa, after passing their Christmas week at home. I believe that that is the most convenient time for the discharge of the legislative business of the Dominion, and it is a very important thing for us that that business should be discharged at the period at which it can, with the least inconvenience to the country, and to the members who compose the Legislature, be discharged. I trust that we shall not on future occasions go further into the year than to-day, but rather that our future Sessions may commence at the time at which the hon. gentleman brought us together last year, if not a few days earlier. I join in the congratulations which have been addressed to the House in the gracious Speech, and referred to slightly by the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the Answer, as to the abundant harvest which, no doubt, has been a very great blessing. I have not observed upon this occasion a repetition of those further eulogies with reference to harvests which have accompanied some former Ministerial utterances upon that subject. I recollect very well the occasion of a Ministerial demonstration in the western part of this province a few years ago—I think in honor of the Minister of Public Works—when a then member of Parliament representing an Ontario constituency, declared that he had voted for, and intended to support, the Government

Mr. TOWNSEND.

that had raised the price of wheat from 77 cents to \$1.40. He did, I admit, vote for and support that Government, whether upon those or other grounds I know not. He was faithful, and he has received his reward. He no longer adorns these benches, at least during the sitting of the House, but he receives a handsome salary for inspecting the Colonization Companies of the North-West. I dare say, under similar circumstances, some other hon. members, with similar expectations, may be induced to say that the price of wheat is to-day satisfactory; but that stretch of audacity has not yet prevailed in this House. And we are told besides, in effect, that we are enjoying commercial prosperity as well as a good harvest; and the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau), several times felicitated us upon the condition of the country. He opened his speech with felicitating us on our general prosperity, and he said he could not do better than close it with a repetition of the same felicitation. It is admitted, indeed, that we have a share, a slight share, a modest share hardly worth mentioning, to be mentioned only in a whisper at all events, in the depression which is said to prevail in the neighboring Republic and also in Great Britain. But we are told that we are ever so much better off than they are—the great exemplars of Free Trade on the one hand, and of Protection on the other. We have, I presume, reached the happy medium with respect to our fiscal policy. We are, I suppose, just right. They protect too much in the United States, and so their depressions are deeper; they protect too little in England, and so their depressions are deeper; but happy Canada, its financial destinies presided over by the hon. gentleman who smiles so blandly upon me, and who, no doubt, would smile in the same way on a platform in St. John, if he happened to be there to-day,—I say happy Canada has found the medium. She neither indulges in Free Trade nor does she indulge in Protection, and so, by consequence of that the depression is ever so much lighter. But there is a depression. It is now acknowledged. It was faintly denied last year. I remember, two or three years before, the hon. Minister of Finance prophesied—standing as he does on a great eminence, with means and sources of information not available to the general public, responsible as he is, at least to some extent for giving the tone and turn to public opinion, which is important in these respects—ten years of prosperity, and invited those who might trust in him to clap on all sail for that time and then to take it in. Last year he offered us a modified prosperity. Three years had elapsed so he did not offer us the ten years then; but he gave us seven years, to date from last Session. It was not absolute prosperity, it was not an all-sail kind of prosperity; you were to take in a reef or two, and if only you took in a reef or two, and were prudent, you would get seven years of prosperity. Well, we have had one year of the hon. gentleman's half-breed prosperity; we have had one year of going under reduced canvas, and I am afraid in too many instances with masts gone and running under jury masts, and in some other instances with wrecks on divers rocks and reefs, some of which were created by the hon. gentleman himself. I say we have had that little time, and now we are told that there is depression, but that it is only a modified depression. What a contrast that is to the ten years of full-sail prosperity, and even to the seven years of modified prosperity promised last year! What a contrast the condition of the country presents in the light of the promises made by the hon. gentleman just before the General Election of 1882! What do we hear to-day of the increasing industries which were to be established, provided he secured the verdict which the hon. gentleman solicited and which he obtained upon the faith of fallacious promises made in 1882? The hon. the First Minister speaking in Toronto, said:

"I tell you this, and this is not a matter of supposition but of certainty and knowledge on my part, that there are millions of dollars waiting to be invested in Canada, millions in England and large sums in the United States waiting to be invested in every kind of industry, in mines and manufactures of every kind."

And then a little later he said :

"All that is wanted by capitalists in Canada, England, and the United States, aye, in France and Germany, is to learn whether the country is of the fixed, constant opinion that the National Policy shall be continued as settled in 1878."

He promised us, not as a matter of speculation, not as a matter of expectation, not as a matter of belief, not as a matter of calculation as were the hon. Finance Minister's promises of continued prosperity, not as a matter of supposition, but of certainty and knowledge, that if he got the verdict which a few weeks afterwards he did get, we would see not merely a continuance of the existing industrial activity, not merely a continuance of existing industrial investment, but an enormous influx of capital in addition, to be invested in various industries. Where are they? I ask again, where are those millions which the hon. gentleman certified to us as a matter of absolute certainty would be here if he was retained in power? The gracious Speech assures us that our commercial prosperity rests upon foundations which no temporary or partial disturbance can remove. There is a sense in which I agree to that proposition. I am glad to do so, because I do not desire to move an amendment to the Speech. There is a sense, I say, in which I agree to that proposition. Such commercial prosperity as in this country we can enjoy does rest on permanent foundations. It rests on the land and on the sea. It rests upon the fertility of the soil, upon our agricultural products, upon our great timber resources, upon our minerals, upon our ships, upon our fisheries; but important and large as all these interests are, it rests, and will for many generations mainly rest in Canada, upon the land. And it depends, these being the foundations, upon the well-applied energy and industry of our people and the frugality of their expenditure. If those energies and abilities and that frugality are properly applied we shall grow in trade, commerce and manufactures. But the hon. gentleman obviously reads the Speech in another way. It is not upon these great foundations to which I have referred, which the hon. Finance Minister may indeed shape, which he may indeed to some extent interfere with, but it is upon Acts of Parliament that he thinks our trade and commerce and prosperity depend. We should, circumstanced as we are, having gone through a very long period of liquidation, of depression, of economy, during which all the weak houses in business were eliminated, and having made a fresh start a very little while ago, we should, in the natural and ordinary course of things, have had a right to expect, not indeed the Finance Minister's promised duration of prosperity, but we had a right to expect a very considerable number of years of extraordinary prosperity. That is what past events, and the experience of different commercial countries, would have indicated to us. What we have got is a too brief gleam of prosperity. What we obtained by the hon. gentleman's arrangement was not an increased permanence of that prosperity but an abbreviation of it. It has been contracted, its term has been shortened, and difficulties have been created by the system which he lauds as the very foundation of prosperity itself. How has this been done? Disturbances the hon. gentleman speaks of. He talks of temporary and partial disturbances. There have been disturbances not very partial but pretty general—not very temporary, for they have lasted a good while. There have been disturbances which he has created. There has been the disturbance of a high, an excessive taxation. There has been the disturbance of an unequal, an unjust taxation. There has been the disturbance of a sectional taxation. There has been the disturbance of an unnecessary amount of taxation. There has been an

unnecessary withdrawal of the people's earnings from the conduct of the people's business. There has been a diversion and a lock-up of money, causing an entire loss and annihilation of capital as an effect of his policy. There have been great inflation and speculation promoted by the hon. gentleman's policy. There has been an unnatural stimulus administered to certain favored industries, giving to them a brief opportunity of fleecing the public with the higher rates they were enabled to charge while they were practical monopolies, and producing, natural, inevitable, predicted results at a time even earlier than we might have expected them. These disturbances are due not to visitations from on high; they are not due to the natural difficulties of our situation. They are due to the action of this Government and the preceding and present Parliament. It is natural, under the circumstances to which I have alluded, that the hon. gentleman should propose to press upon our attention a bankruptcy or insolvency law. It was the natural out-crop of his policy. He has delayed it as long as he could, but he feels that the situation is so serious that that measure must be brought into the prominence which all measures receive when they are introduced in the Speech from the Throne. We are told that Canadian boards of trade and English chambers of commerce alike have pointed out the necessity of such a measure. We were quite familiar with the views of Canadian boards of trade. They have been pressed upon us for more than one Session past. Strong representations have been made by the principal boards—the Montreal board, the Toronto board—and, I think, one of the hon. gentlemen from Montreal introduced last Session a Bill, based on a report or proposal by the board of trade of his city, and we know the active course which has been pursued by some of our western boards. They did not have much effect; but I observe by the papers that the First Minister has taken a trip to the other side of the water and has seen there some of the English chambers of commerce. The Finance Minister has also seen them, and I am glad to know that their representations have had more effect than the representations of our home-made boards of trade, and that they have given so much attention to the subject as is involved in suggesting its consideration in the Speech. The First Minister, indeed, in that country, in which it seems there is something in the air—I do not know what it may be—which makes our tongues wag a little wildly sometimes, told one of the chambers he addressed, that we were principally a rural population, with the prejudices of a rural population; that we naturally represented those prejudices ourselves, and of course there were difficulties in passing such a law. If we were an urban population, if we had the superior intelligence and knowledge of affairs which belong to urban populations, there would be no difficulty in the matter; but having only poor homespun country people for our constituents and representing them in this House, there were difficulties in carrying out the measure. However, he said he would do what he could with us; he would do his best to open our eyes and remove these scales of prejudice from our vision. And I suppose he has satisfied himself that if his influence is so great, and indeed I observe that the Secretary of State has said *l'état, c'est moi*—that he will do what he will—and I suppose from the utterances of the hon. gentleman that he has decided that he will do what he will in this matter. Now there were glorifications on this subject some time ago when, after a long period of depression, the threat of the removal from the Statute Book of the existing bankruptcy Act had frightened all the weak houses into, in some cases, premature assignments. We had pointed out to us as the effect of the policy of the Administration the short bead roll of the bankruptcies and insolvencies when they were something between six and eight millions for a period of three years. In 1883 they became heavy, though not so heavy as in the

old days, and they became very heavy in 1884. The list of liabilities for 1883 was about \$15,900,000 while for 1884 they were about \$19,000,000, and these figures become still more remarkable when we look at the distribution of the bankruptcies by Provinces. Quebec has fared much better in this regard in 1884 than in 1883. The Province of Manitoba has fared better still, for if I rightly recollect its insolvency liabilities amounted to only about one-fourth of the liabilities for the year before. But the other Provinces, Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, present very different features. The liabilities for Ontario, in 1883, are stated at \$1,700,000; for 1884, \$9,600,000. Nova Scotia, 1883, \$1,075,000; in 1884, \$2,075,000. In New Brunswick, in 1883, the liabilities were \$750,000, and in 1884, \$1,675,000. The liabilities in Prince Edward Island in 1883 were \$40,000, and in 1884, \$150,000. In all cases I have given the round figures, and they make a gross result for 1883 in these four provinces of \$6,550,000, and in 1884, \$14,400,000, an increase of about 140 per cent. As to the numbers, I observe that the hon. First Minister the other day stated that we compared favorably in that respect with the United States. But that was a statement made on very inaccurate information indeed, because the number in proportion to the number of traders in Canada was one in fifty, while in the United States it was only one in eighty-four; and it would be difficult even for my hon. friend from Beauce (Mr. Taschereau) or my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) to make out that that was a sign of comparative prosperity. The bank returns show similar results. The current commercial loans have decreased over eighteen and a-half millions between 1882 and 1884, and the larger portion has taken place in 1883. Overdue debts have more than doubled between 1882 and 1884. They were \$3,190,000 in 1882, and \$4,400,000 in 1883, and \$6,440,000 in the year which has just expired. The circulation has decreased more than four and a-half millions between 1882 and 1884; public deposits have decreased about the same amount in the same period. Government deposits have decreased about one half—in fact we do not know where the money has gone. On the whole I maintain, notwithstanding the smooth phrases of my hon. friend, that the condition of the country in the large is one of dulness and depression; of stagnation, of short hours, of reduced wages, of reduced opportunities for working men, of lost capital, of vanished opportunities, of hard times generally, and hardest chiefly in those industries which were but a while ago the chief and prime glories of the hon. gentleman's fiscal policy. Take the cotton industry. In New York the First Minister was candid enough, I observe, to admit that there was a little trouble in cotton, but when he got to England he almost forgot the existence even of that trouble, and said there was a condition of tolerable general prosperity. Take the iron industry; take the sugar industry; take important branches of the woollen industry. I will give as an example the general production of knitted goods. All these were cases for the application of unbounded praise but a short time ago to the fiscal policy of the Administration, which had, it was said, revived and almost recreated these industries, and put them in a position of stability, permanence, and great prosperity. What is their condition to-day? What has it been for the past year? Does any man doubt that there has been an immense permanent loss of capital in the cotton industry? Does any man doubt that there has been an unproductive diversion of capital in that industry, as well as in the industry of knitted goods? There is another great industry—an industry which if you take the output, may be said to be almost the largest—the milling industry. I do not perceive that the millers are entirely contented with the present tariff. The degree of protection the hon. gentleman has given them does not seem to satisfy them. On the contrary,

Mr. BLAKE.

they seem to be so blind as to suppose that they are discriminated against. They are so foolish as to allege that there is a positive premium placed on the importation of flour in place of wheat from the United States; and I see that they are presenting a petition, whether to the Government or the Parliament I know not, asking that the duty on flour should be raised to a dollar a barrel, and I observe that the Finance Minister has more than once stated lately that serious consideration would have to be given to the difficulties of the milling industry. Having stated so much generally with reference to the condition of the country, I would allude again to the City of St. John. It is the constituency of the Finance Minister, and in its fate and fortune he is no doubt specially interested. I do not believe things have been so bad in the City of St. John for forty years as they have been in the last year, and I do not believe the hon. gentleman would find his old and faithful friends in that city rally around him in support of his policy as they might do in support of himself individually. I believe they have had amongst the saddest and most difficult experiences of the failure of the hon. gentleman's policy to do the great things which he promised it would do. Take the capital city of Nova Scotia, the City of Halifax, and ascertain what its condition is. Ascertain in each case what the condition of the specially-protected industry is. Look at the cotton industry of St. John; look at the cotton industry of Halifax, the sugar industry of Halifax, the West Indian trade of Halifax which this policy was going to do so much to develop. Go to the far West, and look at the City of Winnipeg, and what is its condition this year as compared with the last? Manufactures, of course, have not been developed there; but take the returns of Customs duties, of populations, of assessment, take the general condition of the people, and tell us whether Winnipeg has prospered. And so, whether you go to the far East or to the far West on this side of the Rocky Mountains, can you find prosperity? Take the old City of Quebec, and notwithstanding the statement of the hon. member for Cumberland that the timber and ship-building industries are flourishing in Nova Scotia, I ask what is the condition of these industries in Quebec? There is another view, however, not quite so pleasant, which the hon. gentleman overlooked when he told us of the change that has taken place in the system of construction of ships in Nova Scotia, and that is, that it is found that the ships of the tonnage formerly prevalent can no longer live, that they cannot do a business to keep them afloat, and that vessels of larger tonnage for longer voyages have to be constructed. There has been a change in the system owing to a change in the times. In the long struggle between steam and sail and between wood and iron, it is found that the only chance for wood must be in vessels of large tonnage and built for long voyages, and if so ships constructed before that change took place must be doing an unprofitable business. So, when the hon. member for Cumberland spoke of the large amount of tonnage employed, and said it was in an active condition, I must say he surprised me, because it is the common talk of the world that there has never been a time when tonnage was so unprofitable as it has been in the last year. It is certain that there has been a great over-production in the world's tonnage. It is also certain that freights were never lower and that ships are carrying freights at prices which cannot pay. It happened only the other day that there were tenders for carrying a certain lot of stuff from Liverpool to London, and an Atlantic liner agreed to carry it by way of New York for six shillings. That is the state of the shipping industry of the world when the hon. member for Cumberland finds cause for congratulation in the state of the shipping industry of Nova Scotia. The hon. member having told us that his province was flourishing so greatly, it was natural that out of the abundance of his heart he should have had regard

for the poor Province of Ontario. I thank him for his consideration when, in expressing the hope that the article of coal should be admitted free into the United States, he coupled with it the reservation that he would have regard for the Province of Ontario, and that he should not like to have the price increased there by the removal of the present duty on that article imported from the United States. I do not know whether the hon. member's remark was serious or a joke. If a joke he will allow me to say that it was not a very good one; if serious, I will not waste time upon it. To go a little farther west than Montreal, take the town of Cornwall, one of the glories of the National Policy, a place the hon. Minister of Finance was good enough to visit shortly after the election of 1882, and find what the condition of the main industry in that town is. Go to the City of Kingston, to Cobourg, to Oshawa; go even to Toronto, which has exceptional opportunities of prosperity and growth, and which has fortunately only a few protected industries. It is true we have a couple. We have the bolt works, but they are shut up—yes, they bolted, as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) says; we have also the glucose works, but they were never opened. Other industries we have, and they are in a happier condition. Then take Hamilton, Dundas, London, St. Catharines, Guelph, Chatham—it would be too tedious, Sir, to prolong the list, but with very few exceptions you will find that the story of the cities and towns and industrial centres of Canada is the same everywhere. It varies in degree, but it is the same in kind; it is one of difficulty and depression instead of life and animation. No wonder. The hon. gentleman, as I have said, has done what he could to disarrange the natural progress and growth of these industries, and we have in the lumbering industry, the farming industry and, notwithstanding the statements of the hon. member for Cumberland, the fishing and shipping industries, great sources of difficulty, owing to this process of disarrangement. You could not give that permanent prosperity you talked of, but you could take it away, you could shorten it, and that you have done. The Speech rather regrets than otherwise the diminution in imports, but it announces, I observe, that notwithstanding that circumstance and notwithstanding the lessened prices and volume of imports, the revenue exceeds the expenditure. At the close of the financial year a surplus was announced of about \$1,600,000—\$700,000 from the other sources of the revenue and \$900,000, in round figures, from Dominion lands. The expenditure on Dominion lands was omitted, and I am afraid it was very large, but as the hon. gentleman charges it to capital account, he finds it is of no account at all. We borrow the money to pay for the expenditure on Dominion lands which I am afraid was about \$700,000. This would leave a modest margin of \$200,000 as the net revenue from Dominion lands instead of \$900,000: or if you leave your revenue from Dominion lands intact, it would absorb the surplus from all other sources. Perhaps I am uncharitable, but I suspect the hon. gentleman of having put to capital account some of those railway aids which we have been granting so lavishly out of our revenues, from time to time, until to-day; and I shall look with some anxiety for the production of the Public Accounts to see whether this surplus, small as it is, compared with former surpluses which the hon. gentleman gloried in, is real or in large part fictitious. With reference to the question, adverted to in the Speech, of the lessened price of imports, it is to be remembered that that circumstance is not of such great importance under the present as under the old *ad valorem* tariff, because there is now a very large proportion of the duties specific, and you pay the same duty to that extent, however cheaply the goods may be bought. But this is also to be remembered, that your revenue—although you very nearly produce an equilibrium—is still very large. In 1879 and 1880 the imports were from eighty-two to

eighty-six and a half million dollars, and the hon. Minister said they were too large and ought to be reduced. He said that one of the great sources of evil and difficulty in this country had been the expansion of imports; he congratulated us on their being down to these figures, but he wanted to break them down still further in order to make things safe and tidy and comfortable. Now in this year of reduced imports they are still \$30,000,000 to \$35,000,000 more than they were in the year when the hon. gentleman said they were too large, so that it is not for you, whose policy it was to make the imports smaller than \$85,000,000, to congratulate yourselves, because they are \$35,000,000 more than what you said was too much. If, on the one hand, the imports have decreased and the revenue has diminished, on the other hand the hon. gentleman is getting back slowly to his policy which was to have less than \$85,000,000. But about the same time the hon. gentleman denounced the adverse balance of trade and gloried very much in the circumstance that in one year that adverse balance had been turned the other way, and I recollect well how the Ministerial organs generally crowed over that event. The good time had come and we were going to keep it up. We were going to keep up our exports and to keep down our imports. Well, that has not happened. At the time that the hon. gentleman said he did it, he had succeeded, in pursuance of his policy, in so arranging that he had, I think, one or two millions excess of exports over imports and he was happy. But if his policy is to be measured by his statement at that time, what sort of value must be given to it when there is an adverse balance of \$25,000,000? In 1878 he declared \$13,000,000 was about the sum required for Customs duties to carry on the public service, and in 1881 he gloried in having obtained a revenue of eighteen and a-half millions, which was a very handsome revenue and produced a very large surplus. This year the hon. gentleman has a Customs revenue of more than twenty millions, or more than one and a-half million greater than in the year 1881, when he got this eighteen and a-half millions which produced so large a surplus as the surplus of that year. Yet we learn now that the hon. gentleman almost seems to regret the revenue is reduced, and says that notwithstanding its reduction he is still able to produce a modest surplus. Well, I admit the growth of Canada in one respect; we have grown in many things, in various degrees, but there is one thing alone in which it may be said we have grown enormously—a growth, I think, almost too great to be natural and wholesome, though the hon. gentleman has thought differently. What I refer to is the amount of money we take out of the people in the way of Customs—an amount which has increased 50 per cent. Whether we have grown equally in any other respect, except in our ability to extract from the people their national life, I leave to the most ardent supporters of the Government, not to assert but to establish. Our public debt has increased very largely; we shall get the account very soon. With the engagements of the year preceding, and looking to those engagements which are to be added in the coming year, it is clear that there must be an increase of the public debt to a very large extent. That general result affected our credit. Notwithstanding the great commendation of hon. gentlemen opposite on the great loan, we find it drags; we find that it is a drug in the market; we find it stated in an important London paper the other day that a portion of it was taken by a few persons who hold it still, as they have been unable to unload. And that is the condition of things, arranged by the hon. gentleman, in which we have to effect the important operation of exchanging a very large proportion of our 5 per cent. debt in a very few months. I hope, however, Sir, that whatever else the hon. gentleman may have done with reference to our finances, he has been more careful of his

investments than he was last year. I trust he has not invested any more money in banks like the Exchange Bank, and that no item of that description will reappear in our Public Accounts as an investment. All the circumstances which have since become manifest to the general public with reference to the disgraceful management of that institution throw light upon what ought to have been the conduct and the policy of the Administration, when they lent, under the peculiar circumstances under which they did lend, that sum at the time at which they did lend it; and I cannot but conceive that the hon. gentleman will have a very difficult task, even in this House and to this House, in vindicating, with that added light, his conduct in that transaction. We seem to have stopped a good many gaps. We seem to have filled up many voids. We seem to have handed over to Mr. Craig some \$100,000 I think it was, and I suppose that settled that little gap that was made in that anomalous account which placed a sum of \$6,500, I think it was, to the credit of the Conservative election committee. I forget which division of Montreal it was, but I dare say the hon. member to whom it belongs will rise and say. Now, Sir, it was in this state of things with reference to the country that the First Minister in England in November last declared that at that juncture there were no industries materially suffering and that every industrious man could get a good day's pay for a good day's work. It is indeed quite true that the hon. gentleman has assumed a new rôle. Who does not remember the diatribes that were uttered against my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and those who acted with him when they modestly said that they thought it was of some consequence to Canada that it should be a cheap country to live in? Who does not remember that we were almost told it was a disreputable thing to have a cheap country to live in—cheap and nasty—that what was wanted was a dear country to live in and plenty of money to pay the high prices? That was the argument, and it was said that the argument to the contrary, of its being of some consequence that the prices of commodities should be low and that people should pay as little as possible for what they wanted, was a despicable argument, an argument to be swept away by hon. gentlemen opposite. But it is his argument to-day. He repeats on two occasions the statement that we are suffering to-day from too great plenty. There is too much wheat in the country and so wheat and flour are too cheap; there is too much cotton in the country, enough for three times as many people as there are, and so we are suffering because cotton is too cheap; and so forth and so forth. Well, in part, of course, this is due to that general reduction of values which the hon. gentleman mentions in the Speech itself, which he declares exists, and which applies necessarily to imports and, by reflex action, to a considerable extent to home manufactures. For example, sugar. I read the report the other day of the Connal stores in Glasgow for the close of the year, and I find from it that for the last few weeks of the year a fair quantity of yellow sugar was retailed in Glasgow at a penny a pound, and it was not due to the fiscal policy of Great Britain, in the way of protection at all events, that that was achieved. But I hear hon. gentlemen talking about relatively cheap sugar, not relatively cheap as compared with the price in England, but as compared with the price here a little while ago, and declaring that this is the result of their fiscal policy here. But the effect of these values being reduced, as far as their policy has affected them, is that, instead of there being a slaughter of the foreign goods to the prejudice of the foreign maker, there is a slaughter of the domestic goods to the disadvantage of the domestic maker. We have brought to our own doors, to our own homes, and amongst ourselves an unnecessary and abnormal degree of demoralization of trade, of depression of values,

Mr. BLAKE.

and of difficulty. The consumer is reaping a temporary advantage, it may be, which we know will not be a permanent one, which will very soon be disposed of; but, in the meantime what has happened to the industries the hon. gentlemen were so anxious to protect and secure, and to the workingmen whose wages are reduced, whose numbers are diminished, whose hours of remunerative toil are shortened? What is wanted in some of these industries is a blessing of some kind or another. There are natural blessings which may relieve the hon. gentleman. A flood or a fire would relieve him. If we could sell some of our surplus cotton manufactories to an insurance company, it would relieve him. If we had a violent storm of some kind that would carry them away, that would help the thing a little bit. Short of that, if what we hear is to be believed, we want a ring or a combination by which half the machinery can be kept idle and the other half worked; by which the operatives may be cut off to the extent of one half in numbers, the rest worked, and the general consumer may be obliged, by the effect of the high tariff, to pay such a price as will remunerate the capitalist in respect, first, of the mill he is working, and, secondly, of the mill he is keeping idle. These are the things we want, and in regard to cotton and knitted goods I observe that there is some hope of something of the kind being accomplished. It is a difficult matter to accomplish, it takes time to arrange, and afterwards very often it is broken. Still, it is getting along, and by means of these natural or these artificial blessings it is possible that the hon. gentleman may be able to report some improvement in some of these industries on some other and happier day. While this is the condition of matters, we hear nothing now about the foreign trade. Oh, I beg the hon. member for Cumberland's pardon—we did hear a little of it from him—we heard that the export of manufactures had increased by \$43,000 over the previous year. Has the hon. gentleman taken the average of the years before the present fiscal tariff and compared it with the average of the years under the present tariff, which was to develop our manufactures, and promote our trade? If he does so, he will find the comparison gives a very different result. I know not the figures for the last six months. No doubt he has stated them correctly, but the excess which he gives, not an excess over the figures of the old days, but an excess over those of 1883, is no indication of the improvement of trade. We heard in the past a great deal of the efforts made to encourage trade with foreign nations. We have appointed High Commissioners, first one and then another, specially to accomplish that object. We have had missions to France, Spain and elsewhere with the same view. As yet, however, there has been no result that we can ascertain, and I am entitled to assume, in the absence of any statement to-day in the Speech from the Throne, that there is no result—that there is nothing to be communicated to us. So with reference to that which is of course also foreign trade, but which naturally assumes an exceptional prominence in our eyes—reciprocity with the United States—we hear nothing except the statement that we are not to move, that we are to do nothing, that we are not to approach them, that we must wait until they approach us. It was our view, and we emphasised it last Session by a vote, that the expiry of the articles of the Washington Treaty rendered it prudent to enter into negotiations with the United States upon the subject of the fishery arrangements between the two countries, and in connection with that the subject of reciprocal trade between the two countries. The hon. gentleman caused that resolution to be amended; he declared it was inopportune, and the policy of masterly inactivity seems to have been pursued until now. We drifted along without effort, that we know of, that we are told of, to secure better relations than are likely to occur from the policy of drifting. Now the hon. gentlemen who have spoken, having found grounds for con-

gratulation as to the past, and as to the present, found it very easy to be congratulatory as to the future. I am not surprised that when they were able to felicitate us upon our present condition they should come to that conclusion with reference to our more immediate future; and I hope that the early apprehension by the public of Canada of the fallacy of the views of the hon. Finance Minister, their early reaching the conclusion that he was not a trustworthy guide, the determination which they evinced—not, indeed, until after there had been, under his advice, an unhealthy expansion, a diversion of capital from which we are suffering to-day, but still much earlier than we would have expected them to do—their reaching, I say, the conclusion that they must retrench and draw in, will enable us to pass through what one hon. gentleman called the present crisis, and pass through the present period of depression, at any rate, within a period of not very protracted length nor of very great severity. But I do not believe that there are indications which would render it justifiable in the Legislature of this country, in members of Parliament, or in Ministers, to invite the commercial and the general community to launch out at this time. I believe that we have before us a year of considerable difficulty; I believe we have before us a year in which it will be requisite to exercise the virtues of prudence, of frugality, and of retrenchment in public and in private affairs, and that the true advice to give to the people is what I have just now suggested—not to befool them with statements as to their immediately returning into the state from which they have recently gone, but rather to point out the true method by which it is alone possible to hope for a recurrence of good times. I am quite aware that the hon. gentlemen opposite, many of them, denounce statements of this description, that they declare that they are unpatriotic, that they declare that it is wrong to deal with facts as they present themselves to the mind of the speaker, if those facts are not grateful to their ears; but I believe that it is our duty not to exaggerate but to state facts, and the conclusions from them, as we really understand them, and that honest advice of that description is what we owe to our country; and, therefore, notwithstanding these denunciations, I am determined, for my part, to “tell the truth and shame—the Tories.” Now, Sir, the second paragraph of the Speech deals particularly with Manitoba and the North-West; and some later paragraphs with railways there and with the financial status of the Province. I am very glad to hear the account of the well-being, the hopefulness and content of the settlers there, which are said to have been manifested to the visitors from the British Association. We all cheerfully voted the supplies which were asked from this Parliament in order to carry out the projected visit of the British Association; we were all very glad that it took place; we all expected considerable benefit from it, and there was no dissenting voice as to the pecuniary arrangements that the Government proposed upon that occasion; but it did strike me as one of the most cogent proofs of the excellence of the hon. member for Cumberland, in that particular part of oratory to which I referred, namely, hyperbole, that he should have declared that no event in the history of Canada during the present century has been so important, or redounded so much to its advantage, as the visit of the British Association. I remember in my own experience a good many things, and I have read of many more which I conceive to have been of infinitely greater importance to our country, which have conduced more to its credit and prosperity than the visit of some two hundred, or whatever the number may have been, of eminent British gentlemen, could by any possibility do. Now, Sir, the expectations of immigration, it is said, have been disappointing but by the hon. gentleman's account, not so very much so. He says about 100,000 came in. I shall not enter into the controversy which is going on from Session to

Session as to the accuracy of these figures. We will get them, and they will be analysed in due time. But extravagant expectations of immigration were, no doubt, entertained. At one time we hoped great things from the railway company and we were told when the contract was let that one of the burdens from which the country would be relieved was that of getting immigration into the North-West, because the railway company would do that for us. I have not observed, in any accounts that I have received, any large expenditures, as yet, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company upon immigration, but I do observe *per contra* that our own expenditures have been very largely increased, and this year they will be found considerably to have exceeded half a million of money. Notwithstanding that glowing picture which the Speech gives of hopefulness, well-being and content in Manitoba and the North-West, I am obliged to reiterate the view that there have been great blunders and errors in the policy of the Administration, with reference to that country; that the railway monopoly, the policy as to other lines in Manitoba in the earlier years after the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, the locking up of large blocks of lands, the speculative sales which were made, and the operation of the tariff, have all been extremely adverse to the creation and permanent existence of that condition of hopefulness, well-being and content which we all agree is so essential to the growth of that country and the prosperity of Canada at large, dependent, as it is, for its prosperity upon the prosperity of the North-West, so great is the stake it has taken in that country. The hon. member for Cumberland pointed out in a sentence that fact. He says one cent on a bushel of wheat to the farmer of the North-West is of the greatest importance; we must not handicap him in his effort to get his wheat to the markets of Europe. That is the great difficulty. That is the difficulty which we have got to combat, a difficulty largely of our own creation, in view of the policy of the Government with respect to the whole Canadian Pacific Railway. The anxiety of the people of that country to obtain some other mode of communication, their anxiety to reach Europe by some other means, cutting off us of the East by a short run to Hudson's Bay, their proposals with respect to the expenditure, the zeal which they display in pressing the construction of that railway, are to my mind the strongest evidences of the feeling that must exist there, as to the vital importance of procuring some other means of communication or some competition with respect to moving their produce. I was very sorry to hear—I suppose it was a half inspired utterance—from the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend), when, in referring to the expedition to Hudson's Bay he told us that whatever difficulties it might have evidenced as to its primary object, the establishing of the possibility of a route between the North-West and Europe, we had at all events to congratulate ourselves more than to console ourselves with the reflection that we had found a new salmon fishery. That will, indeed, be balm to the people of the North-West. I am very glad under these circumstances to hear, and I hope it is not now too late, that a liberal land policy with respect to railways in the North-West is about to be adopted. When the Pacific Railway Company was chartered we were told that it would supply us with branch lines; that a very large proportion of the land grant was to be taken in districts off the main line, and that interest and policy would necessitate their building the branches; and in the earlier days, after the execution of that contract, they adopted that view themselves and they projected very lengthy lines—I cannot now give you the mileage, but in one year the projects transmitted to the Minister covered more than one thousand miles of branch lines. But a change took place in their policy and in the policy of the Administration, and it was determined to make it the primary object, to the exclusion and sacrifice of the branch lines, in

the meantime, to finish the ends of the main line; and so, although something has been done by the company in that direction, something where it was necessary perhaps to meet competition, something where it was necessary to push to one side rival enterprises, something where it was necessary to provide another means of connection with the second line of the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba Railway, yet what has been done in that direction has been trifling compared with the expectations which were held out to us, trifling compared with their own projects as laid before us years ago. I cannot blame them,—this policy having been adopted—because if all the resources they possessed, if all the money they could borrow and raise, were to be devoted to the construction of the ends of the line, it was clear there could be nothing left for the branches. One observation only I will make. Long ago, in the last Session, I think, of the Parliament of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), a proposal was made to grant liberal aid to local railways. That proposal has been the subject of much animadversion and criticism on the other side. Hon. gentlemen were going to do the thing a great deal better; they were going to help the railway companies and at the same time make money out of it; they would not give the land away, not they; they would sell it at \$1 per acre and the company would make \$1 or \$1.50, and so both the railways would be benefited and the Public Treasury replenished. But now we find free grants are to be given to railways. I will add this caution to hon. gentlemen opposite. I hope, whatever arrangement is made with any railway for a free grant of land, it will be coupled with such restrictions as will secure those lands being open for settlement at fixed moderate prices. I maintain that that is of vital importance. We have suffered enough in the North-West from not keeping that before us as a leading, cardinal principle in the land and railway policy of the country. To repeat that policy now would be more than a blunder; it would be a crime. I hope that the golden dream has not altogether vanished, and that it is not too late for the Government to have awakened to the necessities of the situation, because I have always believed that the rapid settlement of that country demanded numerous railways through it, and I stated in my place here years ago, that you might as well talk about rapidly settling the North-West with one cart road as with one railway. The hon. First Minister has not upon this occasion said anything in the Speech about the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—and for this much thanks. We were a little afraid there might be an announcement made to us. We were reassured by a statement made that the company had, during a certain period, made \$800,000 or \$900,000 of net profits. We were reassured by a statement that out of those profits the company would be able to pay its February dividend in excess of the guarantee dividend, \$625,000, making a profit to investors in that enterprise of from 11 to 12½ per cent., according to the rate at which they acquired their security. We are glad to know by this fortunate omission in the Speech that we will not be called upon to put our hands into our pockets again. We are glad to know that no demand for further help will be made; we are glad to know that the second final settlement is final, at all events for this Session, and that we have therefore nothing to apprehend in that direction with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway. But while that is so, I had expected that the circumstances of the road, its approaching completion and the great through trade that is about to be developed, would have been the subject of a glorifying paragraph. I had really expected that when the hon. gentleman could extract so much sunshine from cucumbers as he has done with respect to those matters which he has put into the Speech, he would have certainly found, particularly when we regard the floods of oratory which we have heard within the last few weeks on

Mr. BLAKE.

this subject, something in regard to the completion, before we next met, of the great Canadian Pacific Railway and its through trade, and the new impetus which is to be given to Canada. And the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) felt there was an omission there, and he bettered the Speech by himself introducing the subject, and pointing out to us that the road was going to do great things for us, of which the Speech does not tell but of which orators tell us. I hope it may be so. I hope the trade will be quite as large as the hon. gentleman depicted, and quite as profitable; but still I would have had a stronger assurance had I found it certified by Ministers whose every prediction has hitherto been verified to the letter. There is one point on which I should like to have heard something, and that is with respect to the grades in the Rockies and the Selkirk Range. The time has now arrived when Ministers must have settled and approved the route of the road. I have more than once called their attention to the fact that the reports of engineers indicated that grades could not be obtained within the contract, and that there was no power to approve grades heavier than those specified in the contract. I trust no violation of the law has taken place, and that no grades have been approved or sought to be approved in excess of those which Parliament sanctioned, because it seems to me that a grave breach of the duty of the Administration to Parliament will have been committed, as well as a course taken which may be, in the future, extremely prejudicial to the permanent interests of the railway, if that result has taken place. Nor do we hear anything this time about the colonization companies. I am sorry for that. I had hoped to hear they had paid their instalments and that the Treasury was getting filled from their resources. Instead of that, a rumor is in circulation that they are calling for relief. It is actually said that they talk about a change; that they require some modification in their position, and that they make the change in the policy of the Government with regard to branch railways a basis for their application. They say, if you are going to give branch railways lands free along their roads, the companies will sell them at prices at which people who have free lands can sell them and make a handsome profit; and how shall we make a profit when we have to pay for our lands which will come into competition with these free lands at the disposal of railway companies, and therefore as you have conceded it for the others, so you should for the colonization companies. Under these circumstances it is to me a great pleasure and satisfaction to refer to solemn estimates, to ascertain and carefully calculated results, to feel that whatever difficulties may sometimes oppress my mind and make me rather gloomy as to the financial results of the lands in the North-West, we know that the Government, on an occasion when they were calling upon Parliament to take an important step, when they were demonstrating the consequences of that step, took their officers into their confidence, and obtained from them statements which reassured my sinking spirits. On the 4th of May, 1883, the late hon. Minister of Railways was about to address the House on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and on that day, doubtless with a view of confirming his own statements—as if those statements should need confirmation—read a letter from the first officer of the hon. First Minister, which letter the late Minister of Railways read in the House, and which I have read several times in the last few months, whenever I felt low spirited about the financial results of the sales of our lands in the North-West. That letter is as follows:—

“OTTAWA, 4th May, 1883.

“SIR,—Having given the subjects my best and fullest consideration”—

You see how careful he was, Mr. Speaker—

“I estimate that the receipts of this department from the sale of agricultural and coal lands, timber dues, rents of grazing lands, and sales

of mineral lands other than coal, with the royalties from the minerals, between the 1st January 1883, and the 31st December, 1891, both inclusive,"—

Mark you the precision of detail. The 1st of January and the 31st December, were both included in the calculation—

"will amount to not less than \$58,000,000.

"A. M. BURGESS."

That, Sir, is testimony which makes me feel happy under the most desperate circumstances. We are sorry to observe that the receipts from Dominion lands this year do not quite come up to the proportion. In fact, I am not aware of any particular year in which they may be said to have reached those figures. But doubtless the hon. gentleman was just stooping to conquer. He was withdrawing only to make the better leap, and what little has been done in the way of permitting arrears to accumulate in the North-West lands will be made good; the assurance given to Parliament by the Ministry will be implemented, and our debts will not only be paid but we will have a handsome revenue from the sale of North-West lands—between the 1st of January, 1883, and the 31st December, 1891, "both inclusive." But while I feel thus assured as to the West, while I stick to my text and insist on its accuracy in spite of all difficulties, I am not so certain about the Eastern part of our expenditure. One of the hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House—in fact both of them—alluded to the East. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Taschereau) said something about one East and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) said something about another farther East, and it seems we have not received any assurance or statement as yet as to the effects of the policy of last Session in the East. What of the Short Line route? What of the Bill of last Session for reaching the city of Quebec? As to the arrangement for reaching that city, one alternative of that arrangement was to take effect, if at all, within six months after the passing of the Act; the other within twelve months. I do not know whether the fatal hour has struck, but at any rate it approaches very nearly, and we begin to be anxious about the arrangement in that regard. As to the route of the Short Line we really thought last Session that we had something to say about it. Some of us were audacious enough to suggest that the people's representatives should have an opportunity of deciding whether the view of the Government, after receiving the report of a competent engineer, was good or not, and that the route should not be finally fixed by executive action. We were pooh-poohed. My hon. friend who sits close to me tested the sense of the House on that view, but his motion was denied, the Government resisting it, and we were refused the opportunity. But I see something in the newspapers, which always are accurate, that seems to indicate that after all my hon. friend was not so far wrong. I see that something was said by the First Minister, and corroborated by the Minister of Public Works—as if the statement required corroboration—in the city of Three Rivers, in the county which he so ably represents, indicating that we were to see the surveys, that we were to have some opportunity of dealing with the selection of the route. Clearly then the decision which was reached last Session was a wrong decision under the circumstances. To what do we owe this new light on the part of the hon. gentleman? Was it to reconcile his supporters, or what, that, having us completely in his hands, having procured from this confiding Parliament the consent that he asked for, he should now say that he will be gracious enough to permit us to do our duty in the matter? From the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) we learned that nothing has been done in the far East, and that the counties of Cumberland and Fictou are in a sad condition by reason of that failure. Now that surprises me. I begin to lose faith in assurances, however plausible. I had

myself doubts about this matter; I expressed them frankly as I always do. I questioned the hon. gentleman's predecessor, the late hon. Minister of Railways, as to whether he had satisfied himself that the companies were all right, that they were solvent, that the matter was *bonâ fide*, and the Minister of Railways assured me, with every positiveness, that it was all right, that he had satisfied himself as to the *bonâ fides* and good standing of the corporations, and that everything was going through. Now, the hon. gentleman from Cumberland says that his predecessor was all wrong. He assures me that nothing—no, that some small work has been done, which has not been paid for, and that the poor laborers lack, and the store keepers lack, and they call on the Government whom they have faithfully supported in two elections, notwithstanding the offer held out to them of a railway through the country—they call on the faithful Government to pay these debts and procure the construction of this railway. And has it not gone to Cape Breton either? We had a positive assurance on that point, too. My hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail) declared that he thought that the amount was too small, and I was obliged to say to him that the Minister of Railways had told us it was enough and that the work was going to be done; that if we wanted more money to spend on railways we should spend it where it was wanted, but not to ask us to take more money out of the Treasury than was needed to secure the railway. Is the hon. gentleman serious in saying that no arrangement has been made for the building of that railway? Whom shall I believe? As to the Manitoba settlement, I am glad to hear that there has been another final settlement in that Province. But I want to know if it is final for this year, or really finally final. There are some things which it is utterly impossible to settle finally. You cannot provide finally with reference to that Province on the population basis. And with regard to that question, I suggested, two or three years ago, that there should be more frequent censuses to regulate the adjustment of the population subsidy to that Province. But, apart from that, there was no reason why these matters should not have been settled once for all. I see, however, that the hon. gentleman declares that we shall have a Bill to confirm the settlement as soon as the Local Legislature has accepted it. Therefore, I presume that the Province will be called upon to deal with the matter in the first place, and I am not called upon to pronounce upon the merits of this settlement until the details shall be laid before us. But I am very glad to see that the hon. gentleman has succeeded again in conciliating his stern opponent, the Premier of that Province, and actually capturing his confidence. We are treated with the statement, for the third time repeated, that we are to have a Representation Bill, and I suppose the third time is the charm, because twice before we have had it up to a certain point, but no farther. I trust, however, that as the story goes that this is to be a very short Session, the hon. gentleman will have reconsidered the provisions of that measure as introduced on two former occasions, and that he will have taken heed to the objections rather suggested than elaborated; because it was not proper that the measure should have been fully discussed until the hon. gentleman opened that discussion by an expository speech in introducing the measure, which he has never yet made, and that the measure introduced will be more satisfactory than the former one was. For my part, I declare my unswerving adhesion to the view, notwithstanding the statements of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this occasion, that simplicity, economy, convenience and the public welfare are to be served most by our adopting, until there is some good reason given to the contrary, the franchises of the Local Legislatures. I shall not anticipate that question, but I maintain further that a measure which proposes, as the former measures of the hon. gentlemen

proposed, that persons to be appointed by the executive of the day shall practically control the revision of the voters' lists, is a measure that should not be accepted by a free and independent Parliament.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member, Mr. Speaker, was very much pleased with the paragraph in the Speech with reference to the question of Chinese immigration, and thought it evinced great care and great diligence on the part of the Administration in the prosecution of their duty. I am not surprised that the hon. member for Cumberland, who is new to this House, should have apprehended the state of the case somewhat differently from the way in which some of us are disposed to look at it; because I find in the Commission to which reference is made in the Speech that a most inaccurate recital has been made of the facts of the case. That Commission, speaking from memory, as it was published in the papers, was issued upon a report of the First Minister to the effect that a motion which had been made in this House on the subject of Chinese immigration had been withdrawn upon a pledge made by the Government that they would issue such a commission. Now, this is wholly incorrect, and I am astonished that the hon. gentleman should have so soon forgotten the events of the Session, or that he should have trusted to his memory, and not have referred to the record. It is quite true the hon. gentleman used his most persuasive tones to induce the withdrawal of the motion. It is quite true he asked my hon. friend, who is a supporter of his, and who was pressing on the motion very earnestly, to withdraw it, but he was not successful on that occasion. The hon. gentleman insisted, and the First Minister then proposed some slight modification of the terms of the motion, or of the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Allen), and with that amendment the motion passed. So far then, from this Commission issuing upon a pledge of the Government, the fact is that we unanimously resolved "that in the opinion of this House it is expedient to enact a law restricting or regulating the incoming of Chinese into the Dominion of Canada." That was the state of the case at the close of the Session; that motion was carried with the assent of the Government; and now we are informed that a Commission has been issued, that the report is nearly ready, and that it will be presented to us during the Session, which I suppose is intended to convey to those interested in this subject that they shall see the report, but that the measure which the House agreed should be brought down, and which it was understood should be brought down this Session, will not make its appearance. I do not think, Sir, the report ought to be delayed. There is one member of the Government at any rate—the hon. Secretary of State, who also fills the position of Commissioner—who cannot admit the necessity of delay. Therefore, I hope, the report will come, not during the Session merely, but at once, so that we shall be in a position to grapple with the question in accordance with the resolution of the House to which I refer. The hon. member for Cumberland paid a very natural and graceful compliment to his predecessor—whom he will permit me to say we miss from his place this Session. His disappearance from that place is the practical result of the view taken by this side of the House last Session. We insisted that the holding of the two positions which that gentleman then held was inconsistent, inconvenient and improper. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) moved a resolution indicating that it should not be continued; the hon. gentleman resisted it, and his usual majority sustained him; but immediately, at the close of the Session, the position we took prevailed, and the holding of the double office ceased. The office of Minister of

Mr. BLAKE.

Railways has not since been filled for now a long time—for more than two years, if we except the actual period of the Session, during a considerable portion of which it was the opinion of a large number of the members of this House that the office was not filled either—at any rate by a member of Parliament—there has been no Minister of Railways practically. It is of some consequence to us, particularly when important transactions are taking place with reference to the Pacific Railway route and other matters, that there should be a Minister of Railways. It is of some importance to us to know who should be the successor of the late Minister of Railways. It is of little consequence when a Robitaille succeeds a Robitaille, but it is of some consequence who should be the successor of the late member for Cumberland. Now, we are promised some measures, mostly of an amendatory character—measures to amend the insurance law, the Civil Service Act, a contagious diseases measure, a North-West census measure, and a measure in relation to the North-West Mounted Police. These are indicated to us as some of the principal subjects of legislation of the Session. But we find on both sides of the House—the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont has shown that he found it too—that certain measures which were promised once or twice before are not mentioned. There is no factory Bill promised, though, like the franchise Bill, it adorned former Speeches from the Throne. The franchise Bill survives, but we cannot say, in this instance, that it is the survival of the fittest. The factory Bill seems to have disappeared, obviously, as the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont thinks, for good. It is not among the *alia*, the other things which it was not thought worth while to mention in the Speech from the Throne, but which are to be brought forward as special plums in the pudding. Nor do we find anything more promised to the North-West than the census. I had hoped some measure would have been promised for the representation of the North-West Territories. That question was discussed in both branches of the Legislature last Session. My hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) brought in a Bill to provide for representation in the Territories, but the hon. gentleman does not see fit to offer them representation, and tells them instead he will count their numbers. Nor is anything said with reference to the grand schemes of which the hon. Minister lately declared himself a supporter. We had some reason to expect that when a gentleman in his position had announced, in his view, the importance of these schemes, they would, at any rate, have been brought forward in that Speech. But upon them nothing is said. I shall not, under these circumstances, discuss them, but I cannot pass by the occasion on which the hon. gentleman made statements on these subjects without protest, for my part, with reference to certain names he used. When in England, as the First Minister of Canada, the hon. gentleman ought to have been particularly careful, if he chose to make allusions, to make them with regard to accuracy and fact, and not to have used his position unfairly, as I conceive he did, to discredit those who are opposed to him in this country. As reported in the English papers, he said in one of his speeches:

"The Canadian Liberal-Conservatives are those who draw their inspirations from England, who believe in the English constitution, and would loyally follow English precedents. Opposed to them we have the Liberal party, but they are not the true Liberals. The majority are, I believe, as loyal as any Conservatives. They have an earnest desire to continue the union which happily exists between Canada and the Mother Country, but they do not draw their inspirations from England. We have contiguity to a great nation, to a people who speak the same language, deal with us and trade with us, and it is therefore very natural that their institutions should offer some attraction to a considerable body of our people."

I maintain that was an inaccurate statement of the opinions of the Liberal party. I maintain that the Liberal party has a well settled and reasonable preference for that system, as more flexible, as giving earlier and apter opportunities for

the triumph of the popular will, which we have here according to the British system, than it has for the presidential system which prevails on the other side of the line. I have never heard any gentleman who represented in any shape any section of the Liberal party or any constituency in the interest of the Liberal party, express a preference for the presidential as opposed to our parliamentary system, and I maintain it was an unfair use to make of the position the hon. gentleman occupied in England, that he should make a statement eminently calculated to discredit his political opponents and without any foundation in fact. At the same time, the hon. gentleman was good enough to say that :

"Any Englishman, in coming to Canada, if he was a man of education, invariably joined the Canadian Conservative party, no matter what his home politics may have been."

I do not know, I am sure, under what circumstances the hon. gentleman made such a statement, but I say he inflicted a gross insult on a very large portion of the most intelligent part of this community, who have come from England, are educated men, and are warm adherents of the Liberal party. The hon. gentleman made another statement on the same occasion. In giving what he thought was a historical *résumé* of past history, he declared, with some very violent language which I will not read, for we are accustomed to it from the hon. gentleman, that the conduct of the Liberal party had been that of demagogues in Canada, and then he went on to say :

"And they charged Sir George Cartier with being little better than a French speaking Englishman."

That was the climax of the hon. gentleman's attack upon us that we had charged Sir George Cartier with being no better than a French speaking Englishman. Why, I fancy, if the hon. gentleman's audience had been present when Sir George Cartier was in England on a former occasion, they would have heard him making the same statement. That was Sir George Cartier's public statement with reference to his position. But the hon. gentleman turns this speech, which came from the lips of his own colleague, into a dreadful accusation hurled at him by political opponents. I hope the hon. gentleman, on future occasions, when in England, will be a little more accurate when he attempts to describe the actions and conduct of his political opponents. The hon. gentleman ought to have remembered, when he gave that account, which I have read, of the principles and views of the Liberal party, that the only man of the quondam annexationists of 1849 now prominent in public life, Sir David Macpherson, is a colleague of his own. He ought to remember that the most prominent advocate of independence in Canada was a former colleague of his own, his Minister of Finance for many years, who declined to receive the honor of knighthood except upon the distinct understanding that he held views on independence which he would be at perfect liberty to uphold; and who denounced the hon. gentleman in 1875, but, as a repentant sinner, was afterwards received by the hon. gentleman into his service. Under these circumstances, it little becomes the hon. gentleman to make such attacks as he has made in the absence of those whom he was aspersing. Besides the absence of those subjects in the Speech, there are some other little omissions. The hon. gentleman had found place in the Speech from the Throne last year for the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in *Russell* and the *Queen*. There has been a greater decision since then. There has been a decision on the boundary question. The *Russell* case settled a point of law with reference to what the hon. gentleman thought were the relative jurisdictions of the Dominion and the Provinces. The decision of the boundary question decided the fate, as the hon. gentleman described it, of a kingdom, and yet we find no statement of it. There is much said upon this subject, which I am a little compelled to disagree with. People seem to think that the issue is very different from what I

have always thought the issue to have been. A great question has been settled; a question between Canada and one of the Provinces; a question promoted by this Administration, in one point of view, which it afterwards thrust upon one of the Provinces, and which has ultimately been decided adversely to that Administration. I say adversely to that Administration. The issue was, as to what the boundary of Ontario was, and upon that subject, as long ago as March, 1872, the Government presided over by the hon. gentleman made this declaration with reference to that boundary :

"The boundary in question is clearly identical with the limits of the Province of Quebec, according to 14 George III, chap. 83, the Quebec Act, and described as follows * * * Extending along the river Ohio westward to the banks of the Mississippi (that is the junction of the two rivers) and northward to the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory. The southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory is well understood to be the height of land dividing the waters which flow into Hudson's Bay from those entering the valley of the Great Lakes, and forming the northern boundary of Ontario."

Therefore, the position the hon. gentleman took at that time was that the boundary of Ontario was the due north line from the junction of the Ohio and the Mississippi on the one part, and the height of land upon the other part. The Government of Ontario stated its position in the course of that correspondence, which was practically the boundary of the Lake of the Woods to the westward and on the north a line to the northward of the height of land. Then the hon. gentleman, on the 17th November, 1872, reported, stating this :

"The northern boundary of Ontario the Government believe to be the line of the watershed separating the waters that run towards Lake Superior from those which run towards Hudson's Bay, and the western boundary a line drawn in accordance with the provisions of 14 Geo. III, chap. 83, from the conflux of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers northward, that is, by the shortest northward course to the southern boundary of the Hudson's Bay territory."

There, Sir, were the two statements of the Administration on that subject. Then there came an attempt to ascertain what the boundary was, and the arbitration was arranged, and the award took place, and the hon. gentleman, in opposition to the contention from this side of the House, that the award ought to be accepted, declared that it should not be accepted. Why? Because he said it was all wrong, that we ought to have an entirely different boundary from that which was found by the award. He said this :

"They"—that is the Dominion Parliament or Government—"say it is not a true boundary—that the Dominion wants simply what by law is their right. The Ontario Government and Legislature have no right to ask more, but they say no. They passed a law accepting the award, because they saw it added an additional kingdom to Ontario, as was the remark of its Premier, and they will not do anything else."

Once again :

"The effect of settling the boundary between these Provinces will compel, I do not say the Province of Ontario, but the present Government of Ontario, to be reasonable, and not to insist upon a boundary which cannot be supported in any court or tribunal in the world. They will come to terms quick enough when they find that they must do so. To use an expression which is common in Scotland, it is land hungry they are for that country, and they are resolved to get it rightly or wrongly."

Then again :

"Nor is it the duty of the Dominion Government to accept their idea of the facts; because, according to my idea, the whole case was given away before the arbitrators. Anybody reading the case would see that it was most wretchedly managed on the part of the Dominion. An inferior man, though a respectable man in his way, Mr. McMahon, was chosen to conduct the whole case, instead of employing the first legal ability in the country—in the Minister of Justice himself conducting the case before the arbitrators. The whole case was thrown away—it looks almost as if it was deliberately thrown away. Never was such a case so given away as the case of the Dominion was on the very face of it."

Now we find that this subject is once more discussed; but, before it was discussed, and at the very time at which this debate took place from which I have been reading these extracts, the hon. gentleman was arranging to thrust the issue upon a sister Province and to hand over to Manitoba

the controversy which he had been, up to that time, himself engaged in, between the Dominion and Ontario, and the Province of Manitoba endeavored to take possession of a portion of that which had been awarded to be, and is now found to be, territory of Ontario. And hon. gentlemen opposite said it was all right for the Province of Manitoba to do it; and the Province of Ontario resisted the attempt of Manitoba to take possession of what is determined to have been Ontario's territory. And hon. gentlemen opposite said it was all wrong for Ontario to attempt to resist such a taking of possession—they ought, like good Christians, to have allowed the Manitobans to take possession of the territory which it is now established was all along their own. The question has been practically settled according to the award, as far as the committee have decided. They have decided, it seems, not that the award was wrong, not that it was a conventional boundary, but that it was the real boundary. As far as the committee have decided, the case was not given away before the arbitrators, deliberately or otherwise, and the issue which the hon. gentleman, in the year 1872, joined, as I have shown from these extracts, between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario, in which he contended for a due north line from the conflux of the Ohio and Mississippi as the western boundary and for the height of land as the northern boundary, as far as it is decided, so far is decided entirely against the contention of the hon. gentleman and in favor of the contention of the Province; and those oceans of learning and erudition which we heard poured out in the debates upon the subject in this House from supporters of the Administration seem to have been all wasted and thrown away, inasmuch as the decision has been altogether opposed to them. Yet the whole question is not settled. The hon. gentleman, for some reason or other, although it was agreed in this House that the reference should take place between the Dominion as well as Manitoba and the Province of Ontario, although it is said that there was an assent on the part of the Dominion to such a reference, at the end it seems withdrew, and so the decision only formally and effectually settles the question as far as the boundary of Manitoba and Ontario is concerned. Still one is led to the hope that, inasmuch as what has been declared by the arbitrators settles the principles upon which the rest of the boundary ought to be determined, there will be no further controversy and the award will be accepted, in reference to the rest of it, on the principle which appears to have guided the Judicial Committee so far as it has gone. Nor is anything said as to the hon. gentleman's attitude in regard to the lands. He has arranged another controversy with the Province; he is at issue as to the ownership of the lands in this territory. He has declared that, even if the territory be within the boundary of the Province of Ontario, still the lands are the property of the Dominion. It will be important for us to know, if that contention is to be maintained, whether there is still to be a controversy, or whether this question is not to be, as I say it ought to be, at once settled in all its parts. There is yet another omission which is proper to be remarked upon—nay, two. The first is with reference to the Streams Bill. Since we last met here, there has been a decision of the Judicial Committee on that subject also. It was alleged by the hon. gentleman that the legislation in the Local Legislature, declaring what the law was, was not legislation; that it was robbery. He used language which, coming from anybody else, I should have said was strong. He said these things:

The Ontario Government, "dressed in a little brief authority, Jack-in-the-box, trampling on the man, as they said they would do, pleased Mr. Caldwell and robbed Mr. McLaren. An hon. member has stated that the Streams Bill was not intended for Mr. McLaren, but for general application. But it is meant for the sneak who creeps down the back stairs and steals the kitchen utensils, or the fellow who comes behind you and picks your pockets—they are men more to be despised than the highway robber. It would have been more manly if the Ontario Govern-

Mr. BLAKE.

ment had introduced a Bill to hand over Peter McLaren's property to Wm Caldwell; they dare not do so, and therefore they passed a Bill respecting rivers and streams. It was a wretched, flimsy and transparent device; it deceived nobody, but it was only by being a public bully that the Government could introduce and carry it; otherwise there must be a petition. It had the effect of depriving Mr. McLaren of his property, under the pretence that it was in the public interest. Nothing more contemptible or sinister could be done by a Government or Legislature. It was a Bill to take from Mr. McLaren his property and hand it over to Mr. Caldwell. True, Mr. McLaren had spent, some say \$250,000, and hon. gentlemen opposite say from \$100,000 to \$150,000. I do not know how much it was—but it was Mr. McLaren's property. The river at that spot was not a navigable river, and the judge who heard the evidence and viewed the facts stated that it was clear that at the place where the improvements were made it was not only not navigable but not floatable. It would scarcely allow a plank or a slab to go down any more than upon a ditch. Caldwell's timber and logs could not go through there until the improvements were made. Mr. McLaren, with his usual industry and perseverance, in order to carry on his extensive business, made a dam and a slide out of his own timber, for his own purposes and on his own soil. Mr. Caldwell had no right to use it without his consent and without paying for it. It was absolutely the property of Mr. McLaren."

And again he says:

"Supposing an honest old farmer's wife should expropriate her neighbor's hen and say: 'I shall keep this hen, and you shall feed it right and see that it lays at the proper time, and I will pay you by giving you a share of the eggs.'"

Now that was the attitude of the hon. gentleman. But the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have decided to the contrary; they have decided that it was not Mr. McLaren's right to interfere with Mr. Caldwell's coming down this stream; they have decided the law was correctly declared by those who advised the local legislation; they have decided, in fact, that the Bill which was said to be a means of taking away Mr. McLaren's property with an illusory compensation, was the only Bill that could protect him at all, or give him any reasonable compensation for the use of his improvements over property in respect of which there was a public easement under the existing law of the land. So the infallible disallowers who disallowed this measure on the ground that it was an unjust interference with Mr. McLaren's property, turned out to be all wrong, and the reason upon which they acted, insufficient as I conceive that reason to have been, turns out to have been no valid reason at all. I say insufficient, as I conceive that reason to be, because I am convinced that upon the true reading of our constitution the mere circumstance that in the opinion of these gentlemen a different kind of compensation ought to be given, that it was interference with private rights, was no ground whatever for exercise of the power of disallowance. But it turns out that the very basis of their action was an error. And yet, Sir, we do not find any reference to Caldwell and McLaren in the Speech from the Throne. Then, Sir, there was the very case in which the hon. gentleman introduced this custom of giving an account to us of the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—the case of the license question. The license question was raised last Session on several occasions, but it was last raised on the floor of this House on the motion of our lamented friend, Frederic Houde; and I may say that all of us who watched his course here must receive the mention of his name with sadness. He has since passed from amongst us. He was a man of marked independence of character, of frankness, of honor, of indomitable spirit and energy; and no man who has seen him here for these many years past but must have been touched with the exhibition of that spirit and energy which he made when he struggled against weakness and disease in the discharge of his duties in Parliament. We know that he exhibited that independence of character to which I refer in a very marked way, outside this House, with reference to the journalistic career to which he was attached. We have observed in this House, with what emotion he, on one or two occasions, separated himself from his friends, feeling that it was a painful thing to do, knowing that it was a painful thing to do, but rising superior to his emotions at the call of duty. And he was a

man of great kindness of spirit as well. He was kind to all of us, opponents as well as friends; and I cannot omit mentioning here the marked kindness and generosity of feeling with which, during many years, he treated myself who am now addressing you. More than once it has happened to me to receive from him, sitting on these opposite benches, before he came to sit near my hon. friend from Montreal East (Mr. Coursol)—I have received from him a little note, after I had said something that pleased him, expressing satisfaction with the way it was said, though not always concurring in the sentiments I uttered. Such was the spirit in which he treated his opponents, and the manliness he exhibited towards them I am sure was exhibited in a redoubled spirit towards his friends. How would he, who has gone from amongst us, have rejoiced at the late decision in this case, the last of his efforts; how would he have rejoiced to see that by the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court the view which he took as to the law was sustained in this case. Now we have no reference to that, and yet it was an important transaction. Parliament, by a Bill, decided that there should be a reference of this subject to the Supreme Court. It was thought important enough to do so, and a reference was made. The Provinces were called upon to take part in the proceedings, and five, I think, did take part—the Province of Ontario, the Province of Quebec, the Province of Nova Scotia, the Province of New Brunswick and the Province of British Columbia. From the Province of Manitoba, as we are aware by public documents, there had proceeded a protest against this license measure of the Government, although I do not observe that they took part in the case. I am not aware what was the attitude of the Province of Prince Edward Island. But we find most of the Provinces taking part in this transaction on one side, and the Dominion on the other; yet a transaction of that description, taking place under authority of that Act of Parliament, resulting, as it has resulted, is not thought worthy of being admitted into the Speech from the Throne. Why? Because the result is unpleasant to the hon. gentlemen, I suppose. Now, I ask the House, is it too late to retrace our steps? Remember that we meddled in this matter for one reason, and for one reason only, because it was said by the hon. gentleman that the local laws were waste paper, and that it was absolutely necessary that we should intervene. Remember that was the ground upon which he invited his supporters to sustain him in passing his Bill. Remember that that alleged necessity was wholly disproved by the decision in the case of the *Queen vs. Hodge*; that since that time the insistence of the hon. gentleman that the local license laws were waste paper, has been by him withdrawn; that it was admitted they were valid, and therefore the pretence upon which Parliament was induced to interfere has disappeared and disappeared forever. Remember that from that time out it was only as an expedient and not as a necessity that we were told we should interfere; that it was admitted to be true that the local laws, which had been in force for seventeen years, were good and valid laws, and it was only because it was thought better in the interests of the whole Dominion that we should interfere, and if we could supersede them, invalidate them—submerge them, as the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), I think, said—by federal legislation, we should interfere. Remember that in this policy of interference, of abstraction from the Provinces of that which it was decided by the Committee of the Privy Council is their right, we, in this Parliament, are engaged in a conflict with each one of six out of seven Provinces; and I have no reason to suppose that the attitude of the Province of Prince Edward Island differs from the attitude of the other Provinces. Now, remember that we are engaged in an effort to take away, against the will of the Provinces of Canada, a right which they have been exercising—validly,

as decided by the court of last resort—ever since Confederation. Remember, again, that since last Session, the Supreme Court has decided unanimously, not that the local laws are waste paper, as the hon. gentleman alleged, but that his Act is waste paper, that the Act which he passed because the local laws were waste paper is itself waste paper; and consider for yourselves whether it is useful, in the interests of this Confederation, to continue this struggle; whether it is calculated to strengthen the bonds of union, to strengthen our confidence in the federal system, to proceed into this Parliament further in a controversy in order to take away from the several Provinces a right which is theirs under the laws of those Provinces, that you may be able, by legislation of your own, to do the same things which they are doing, according to your fashion, and by that means, as the hon. gentleman stated, submerge their legislation. I do think we ought to retrace our steps, that we ought not to prolong this controversy, that we ought to repeal the objectionable parts of the Act which the hon. gentleman passed, and leave the Local Legislatures, according to the wants and wishes and the condition of public sentiment and opinion in each locality, to deal with the license question. I do trust that wiser counsels will prevail. I know full well that it would be a humiliating act for the First Minister. He made great pretensions. On the stump and elsewhere he declared himself infallible. He declared he had never been mistaken, but had always been sustained. It was a foolish action. It was not necessary to have done it, and he should have allowed his followers to have sounded his praises in that regard rather than have sounded them himself, because just so soon as he began to do so defeat after defeat took place. Once he began boasting of his infallibility, day after day the hon. gentleman found that he was mortal and fallible like the rest of us. Is it not much better that we should acknowledge that we are all fallible, even if some are immortal, and decide that we will not continue this struggle to save the hon. gentleman's *amour propre*, but we will leave the matter where it was for seventeen years, whence the hon. gentleman himself said he would never have dragged it, except under the belief that it was necessary in the public good, because the local laws were only waste paper? Let the local laws remain. If I could hope that my words have any weight I would pray the House to recognise, though it may be late, our true position; to apprehend the fact that we are, by our general policy, and have been for some time, rather weakening than strengthening the true bonds of union; that our centralising policy, our tariff policy, our policy of high and sectional taxation, our policy of extravagant expenditure, has been and is alienating important elements in Canada from sympathy with the union itself; that it is our duty to recall the promises that were made to the various Provinces which were induced to enter into this union, the promises of economical government and of low taxation, the promises with respect to trade, the promises with respect to a fiscal policy, the promises with respect to expenditure, which were made, particularly by the leaders in the Maritime Provinces, at the time the union measure was brought before them; and that we ought to set about the initiation, I might almost call it so, of a true federal policy, including that of a reduction of expenditure and such a reduction of taxation as the past extravagance permits—a policy suitable to our actual circumstances, instead of one based on hollow dreams already proved untrue, and which will, too late, if persisted in, end in a disastrous awakening.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I can join, in the first place, most cordially in the commendation passed by the hon. gentleman opposite upon the mover and seconder of these resolutions in their maiden efforts. The hon. gentleman could not well do otherwise, and he has shown the sincerity of his belief in the ability with which those hon. members addressed the House by making as the basis

and text of his remarks the speech of the seconder of the resolution. I do not know what the hon. gentleman would have done if the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Townshend) had not furnished him with the text on which he preached such an eloquent, and at the same time, a rather discursive, amusing and instructive address. All three speeches were eloquent; but there was a difference in the style of their eloquence. The hon. gentleman stated, while paying a compliment to my hon. friend behind me, that all his language was euphemistic and hyperbolic. It cannot be said, in regard to any remarks made by the hon. gentleman opposite, with respect to the development of Canada, that his remarks were either euphemistic or hyperbolic. He is pessimistic—and I was going to say maledicent. The hon. gentleman said with a very grave face—he had to admit it, though he did so with some reluctance—that we had had a very good crop, an abundant harvest. He said that gloomily, but his countenance lighted up when he added that the prices are very low; and he alluded to a remark made by my old friend Rufus Stephenson, some years ago, that \$1 was the normal value of that important cereal, wheat. The hon. gentleman was quite cheery at the idea that this country was not so prosperous—at all events that the Speech did not announce universal prosperity, as previous Speeches from the Throne had done. Well, we had to tell the truth; we did tell the truth: that Canada was suffering, but in no very great degree, from the depression which existed alike in the protectionist country of the United States and the free trade country of Great Britain and Ireland. The hon. gentleman stated that the chief cause of the depression in this country was the high, unjust taxation which oppressed the people. I would ask him, I would ask this House and the country, if there is any evidence of the people objecting to the present system of taxation. In 1879 the tariff was introduced with the general assent of the people and of their representatives. The tariff has in no great degree been altered since that time. The oppression, if it took place, took place in and from 1879. Since that time there has been an appeal to the people. Has there been laid on this Table any petition from any body, large or small, important or insignificant, showing that the country is suffering from excessive, unjust, sectional, exorbitant or oppressive taxation? No. We hear throughout the country that the millers and some other interests are asking an increase of taxation; but no body, party or individual is complaining of the policy of the Government in establishing this protective tariff. The hon. gentleman should not set up his own opinion, for it represents but a small minority in the country who are free traders. The hon. gentleman knows, if he will admit it, that a very large body of those acting with him, and called Reformers, those having general confidence in him and want of confidence in the present Administration, aye, those hon. gentlemen who sit behind and cheer him, would not allow him, if he occupied my position, to carry out the extreme views of free trade which he has enunciated to-night here, and has enunciated elsewhere. They would not allow him to do it, and he knows this right well. The hon. gentleman made, however, one very important admission in his speech. He admitted for the first time in his life that there had been a brief gleam of prosperity—a too brief gleam of prosperity; and it was, I repeat, the first occasion on which he, as the leader of the party which he leads so ably, admitted that there was any prosperity. Let us look back to the faithful *Hansard*; let us read the speeches made by him in the years 1879-80-81-82-83-84, and we will find that during the period of this brief prosperity, in every Session and in every speech, without one single admission of there being even a gleam of prosperity, the same pessimistic cry was raised that the country was ruined and oppressed; that this enormous taxation was ruinous to the country's best interests; and now the hon. gentleman

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

is obliged to admit that there has been a gleam of prosperity. And it has passed; it was too brief; it only lasted a short time. Mr. Speaker, it exists at this moment.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the hon. gentlemen will laugh and sneer and regret it, as they do regret it, but I say that this country at this moment is substantially prosperous. It is a prosperous country, and when the hon. gentleman or any other hon. gentleman says there is anything like real poverty, in the European sense—aye, or in the American sense of poverty—by which a man cannot get bread for himself and family, I deny it. I say he is libelling this country; he is making an untruthful statement regarding the condition of the people of this country. I say that, looking at the country as a whole, from one end to the other, any industrious man can earn a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. To be sure, the hon. gentleman says, "Look at the factories; look at Cornwall and Kingston, and several other places where the cotton trade was suffering, where there was depression." Well, we all know, and we said at the time the tariff was introduced—my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said it, and I in my place said, when we were told that the consequence of introducing the National Policy would be that there would be a great number of cotton lords having a monopoly of the trade, that they would build up enormous fortunes at the expense of oppressing the people, that there was an absence of free competition—we said no, there will be home competition; the natural competition which will arise when our manufacturers find that when they are protected from the free influx of foreign goods, the struggle, the competition between man and man, between capitalist and capitalist, will bring down the price. Is not that so? Are not prices lower than ever before? Is not the price of cotton lower than it ever has been? Is not nearly every article which is produced by industries introduced into Canada, at less than the normal price? The consequence of that competition has been that in the cotton industry, for instance, there was an undue rush into it; there was a speculative spirit arose, and more money was invested in that particular industry than the restricted market required. That was prophesied. But it is all for the benefit of the consumer; the bloated aristocrats are the sufferers, and the people of the country are the gainers. This condition of things will remedy itself, and we see how it is being remedied. The manufacturers meet; they say, we make too many grey cottons, for instance; we will diminish the quantity so as to suit our market; we hope the Government and Parliament will get us foreign markets, but in the meantime we will diversify our industries; we will go into prints or other cottons; we will use our machinery for other purposes than those for which it was originally established. That kind of thing regulates the supply until there is such a diminution of the supply as to bring it to an equality with the demand; and meantime the country has been the gainer. Then the hon. gentleman says that we see the miserable operatives' sufferings. The operatives are not suffering. There may be, in places, a diminution of wages, but there is enough wage left to enable an industrious man to support himself and his family in comfort. There may be workmen on short time in some places, but that only exists until the balance between the demand and supply is adjusted. In the meantime what would the condition of things have been but for the National Policy? The hon. gentleman will not deny that the sufferings among the operatives in the United States are greater than in Canada; that their sufferings in England are greater than in Canada. He cannot truthfully deny it. Then the hon. gentleman says that the exodus of our population, over which he used to gloat, is going on. Our people were seeking among the manufacturers of the United States for the employment which they could not get in Canada. But

if they had gone to the United States factories which are suffering from the depression which exists there, and the starvation which exists there—away from their Canadian homes, without any money to bring them back—in that case there would have been real suffering amongst them. But instead of that we have kept them in our own country. They are here; on the whole, well-doing fellow subjects of ours and furnishing a home market for the great industry of all, our agricultural industry. The hon. gentleman contemplates a return of that happy state of affairs when our factories shall be closed, when all the vigor and energy and constructive skill and enterprise of those who are not fitted or inclined to follow agricultural pursuits must go to the United States. The hon. gentleman would be glad to return to that state of things, but he does not express the opinion of the country; he does not express the opinion of the representatives of the people in this House. And I tell the hon. gentleman if he goes to the country as the leader of his party, as the exponent of free trade, and I go to the country as the exponent and supporter of the National Policy, we will beat him at almost every poll.

Mr. COCKBURN. Try it to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We have been trying it, and of the nine members who were introduced to you, Mr. Speaker, seven went to the polls as advocates and supporters of the National Policy—as advocates and supporters of the Government which introduced and maintained the National Policy, and two, I believe, occupy seats on the opposite benches. We are quite satisfied with the opinion of the country. We have the declaration of the majority of the country, and I believe that as seven is to two, so is the majority in the whole country in favor of the National Policy. My hon. friend was merry over all this kind of thing. He is not usually playful, but to-day he was excessively merry, and, like Mark Tapley, he wished to show that he was jolly under adverse circumstances, and certainly the portentous sight of seven gentlemen walking in one after the other, declaring continued confidence in the Government and their policy, was enough to arouse all his energies and make him as happy and as smiling as Mark Tapley himself, even at the Garden of Eden. The hon. gentleman says he knows that he and his party have been charged with belittling the country and undervaluing its position, but, he says, I must tell the truth and shame the—Tories. Well, I do not know that the Tories will accept the comparison drawn by the hon. gentleman, but certainly it will occur to him in that case that the Tories have played the very devil with him and his party. The hon. gentleman alluded to my speeches in England. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was in England, and I made some speeches. I am not ashamed of those speeches, and I adhere to what I said. I believe what I said was true, in substance and in spirit; I intended to speak the truth, and I am not ashamed of what I said. The hon. gentleman spoke of my speech as to a Bankruptcy Act, and he said I sneered at the prejudices of the rural population. I simply told the truth. I stated that the boards of trade in Canada, representing the commercial interest, were, as a whole, in favor of the introduction of a bankruptcy or insolvent law; I said that the rural population were opposed to a bankruptcy or insolvent law—that they had strong prejudices against it. Is that not so? Is it not so, in this House and out of this House, that while the commercial men desire an insolvent system with protection against undue preferences, the representatives of the rural constituencies as a whole are opposed to a bankruptcy law? That is what I stated, and I stated the truth. The hon. gentleman said that I stated that I was going to do the best I could for them. The hon. gentleman has not read my speech carefully, or he has forgotten it. I carefully guarded myself from expressing any opinion upon the question. When the represen-

tatives of the chambers of commerce, some of the most important chambers in England, asked what course they should take to express their views, I said I really did not know that they could do anything better than to pursue the course which they had already commenced—to keep up their communications with the various boards in Canada, and through them to use the powers and arguments they wished to use for the purpose of showing that a bankruptcy law was a necessity. Now, Mr. Speaker, it was my duty and my pleasure to receive with all courtesy these important bodies. The trade of England with Canada is of great importance, and I believe is going to be of still more importance; and it was of the utmost moment that I should receive such great representative bodies as the chambers of commerce when they wished to state that they believed sincerely that the commercial intercourse between England and Canada, and the development of that intercourse, were greatly prejudiced in consequence of the absence of a bankruptcy or insolvent law. I believe they have taken my advice. They are communicating now, or have communicated, with the various boards of trade in Canada; and, Mr. Speaker, the Speech did not say that there was not going to be any measure introduced. I may give the hon. gentleman this information in advance, that it is the intention of the Government to ask this House to strike a special committee, carefully formed, for the purpose of examining into the whole subject. They will have before them the petitions, the memorials and the remonstrances of these various commercial bodies, and we shall get a report upon the whole subject, and especially upon one point of the greatest importance, which dwells most particularly in the minds of the members of the English chambers of commerce, that is to say, the possibility of there being undue or fraudulent preferences. Those who have read my remarks may, perhaps, remember that I explained to those bodies, that unless the measure amounted, in the fullest sense, to a bankruptcy or insolvent law, the jurisdiction did not rest with us, but with the Provincial Legislatures. In order, therefore, that this whole subject may be reviewed in its commercial and constitutional aspects, it is the intention of the Government to ask this House to strike a committee of competent men to deal with this subject. The hon. gentleman has spoken about a reciprocity treaty, and treaties in general, and if I understood his remarks, he desired that we should go again to the United States and renew our efforts to secure a reciprocity treaty. Mr. Speaker, the public men of the United States, from the President down, know that Canada has always been ready to enter into negotiations for a reciprocity treaty. They know that upon our Statute Book there is a provision that in case the Americans at any time choose to enter into negotiations with us, the Government are empowered by the Parliament of Canada, without a new Act, without any legislation whatever, to reduce the tariff, or wipe away the duties altogether, on condition that the Americans reciprocate. And, Sir, what more do they want? It is not by going down on our knees that we shall get reciprocity, or by doing what those people at St. John did the other day. Because there has been a treaty entered into between the United States and Spain, giving the United States exclusively the trade with the Spanish Antilles, they said. We must have annexation with the United States—anything in order to get this trade as well.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not many said that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very glad to hear from the Minister of Finance that very few said that. Yet they were men who held out to the United States the supposition that we must have annexation if we do not trade with the Spanish Antilles. Why, Mr. Speaker, the consequence was, as happened before, and as has happened again and

again with United States statesmen. They desire to enlarge the boundaries of the country; they would like to add Canada to the United States; they said, let us hold off a little longer; let us refuse them reciprocity, and Canada will fall like a ripe plum into our mouths. What was the result? It turns out now during the present sitting of Congress that there is not the slightest chance of this same Spanish treaty being ratified at Washington. The hon. gentleman has stated that he has heard a great deal about our attempt to develop the trade of Canada—that we had two commissioners appointed to England, and yet we have not heard of any results. The United States has had ambassadors appointed to France and Spain, and you do not hear of any results yet. Believe me, Mr. Speaker, and the majority of this House and of this country will believe me when I say that the Government keep their attention constantly, earnestly and most actively directed to the development of the trade of Canada, and the obtaining of commercial treaties with the various civilized countries of the world. And I say this, that we have, I am happy to say, from Her Majesty's Government, every assistance in doing so. They have, for instance, taken the step which the hon. gentleman may perhaps consider insufficient, but which I consider all sufficient. They have joined our High Commissioner, Sir Charles Tupper, with the Spanish Ambassador at Madrid as joint envoys in order to attempt to negotiate a treaty between Canada, as part of England, and not only the Spanish Antilles but the mother country—Spain. So with respect to France. The attention of the Government has been steadily given in that direction. The continual changes in government in France and the various circumstances connected with their own government are such that we have never been able to induce them to approach this subject with an earnest desire to come to a conclusion, but by and bye we may have successful negotiations. At all events we will keep "pegging away," to use the homely phrase of Abraham Lincoln; we will lose no opportunity of extending and developing the foreign trade of Canada. The hon. gentleman congratulates the House on there being no mention of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Well, that is all very well. There is no necessity for mentioning it, inasmuch as there is no legislation that we are going to lay before the House—that we propose to lay before the House just now. What we may do in the immense future, and with the immense future of that railway, we must leave to the future. At present we do not mention the Canadian Pacific Railway, as we do not propose to lay a measure before the House on this subject. But the hon. gentleman asks a great many questions about the progress of the work, the grades, and other cognate questions. I will take it that the report of the hon. Minister of Railways will settle that question, and therefore there was no necessity for encumbering the hon. gentleman's speech with any remarks about them. I do not think that it will answer any good purpose to follow the hon. gentleman in his discursive remarks on the various subjects of public interest. It was rather a waste of time, when the facts and papers are not before the House, to discuss the question. Therefore, I will say not a word more about the railway policy or about the land policy, or about the receipts for land sales, and so on. By the way, however, I will call the attention of the House to the rather unfair—I was going to say uncandid—remarks of the hon. gentleman, in which he pooh-poohed the receipts for the sales of land. He says that the receipts were so much and the expenditure was so much, and that there is a very small balance left. The hon. gentleman ought to have told the House that the receipts for the sales of land were for a particular year, while the expenditure, on the other side, was for the surveys, which will last for all time to come. The Government have been going on surveying township after township—we have surveyed a kingdom, almost, in area, and we have paid

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the expense of those surveys. Those surveys will last for all time; the receipts were merely the receipts for one year. The hon. gentleman would like to know very much whether there is going to be a Factory Bill introduced or not. The hon. member for Cornwall (Mr. Bergin), has rushed to the rescue at once for fear there should be a dereliction of duty. We will see, by and by, when we have my hon. friend's measure before the House, how that will be dealt with. With respect to the factory law, the case stands thus: Already in two of the Provinces there is factory legislation. If at any time it is found requisite for the protection of life or property that offensive breaches of the factory law should be made a crime, a misdemeanor, of course we must act here. The Provincial Legislatures have no power to declare any breach of the law a misdemeanor; they can of course fix certain penalties in civil law to any breach of their law. The constitutional Act provides that they may by decision imposing a fine, protect their legislation, but they cannot interfere with any portion of the criminal law. Now, the hon. gentleman says that we ought to have mentioned an Act to give representation to the people of the North-West. I think before we can do that we must know what people are there, how they are divided, where their settlements are, what divisions are to be made, how the electoral franchise is to be exercised, what the electoral franchise is. We can have no satisfactory adjustment of that question until we know the number of people that are there, where they are situated, how they are scattered, in order that we may, hereafter, if Parliament thinks proper, give them representation in Parliament. The time must come ere long when these districts will be made Provinces, and if made Provinces they will, as a matter of course, be represented in this Parliament like any other Province. In the meantime, the first and necessary step must be taken of having a census. The hon. gentleman objects very much to some remarks I made in England, to the effect that the Liberal-Conservatives are the true Liberals. Well, I have said so in the House and in the country; I have not the slightest reason for not repeating the same thing in England. I believe the Liberal-Conservative party is the progressive party, the party that is going to develop this country. I believe that if hon. gentlemen opposite succeeded in taking our place, a restrictive policy would be introduced, and the prosperity of this country retarded and obstructed. I said so there and I say so here. The hon. gentleman said I spoke unfairly of their party when I said the Conservative party drew its inspiration from England and the other from the neighboring Republic. I thought I was doing them full justice when I said I believed they were as loyal a party and as true to British interests as were the Conservatives. I could not go further than that. I did not state in my speech, though I might have done so, that they were anxious for any constitutional changes. I simply stated that in their legislation, their general legislation, they drew their inspiration from the United States, from the neighboring Republic, and I believe, if you look at the Statute Book, from 1874 to 1878, you will find the proof of my assertion.

Mr. MILLS. Fiscal policy, for instance.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, the hon. member for Bothwell has really mentioned the exception which proves the rule. That is the only case in which we have adopted the policy of the United States. The hon. gentlemen laugh over there. I wonder if the members do not think we were right in adopting, in that instance only, the policy of the United States. I know many of them do. Then the hon. gentleman, in order to wind up his speech, although it had not anything to do with the Address from the Throne, brought up, in the first place—

Mr. LANDERKIN. The License Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, he brought up the License Bill.

An hon. MEMBER. Streams Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will come to the Streams Bill just now. He brought up the License Bill. Mr. Speaker, we have the decision of *Russell vs. the Queen*; we have the decision of the Queen and Hodge. Unfortunately, in the reference to the Supreme Court here, it was presented to them in such a way that we have not the reasons given by the judges for their decision. They have not decided according to *Russell and the Queen*—that is quite clear. They have not decided according to the case of the Queen *vs. Hodge*—that is quite clear. The only way in which we can judge of the reasons which induced the Supreme Court to decide or give an opinion as they have done is from the remarks of the judges during the course of the argument. During the course of that argument it was said by more than one of the judges that the two decisions in the Queen and *Russell*, and the Queen and *Hodge*, were antagonistic; that they were contradictory; that one opposed the other, and so apparently the court has split the difference; it has declared that all the wholesale licenses belong to the Dominion, and all the retail and tavern licenses belong to the Provincial Legislatures. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is of very great importance that we should get such questions settled. After that decision, not one of the Provincial Governments can issue licenses or receive a dollar for any wholesale licenses or for licenses on any vessel; and it is strange that the words "wholesale" and "retail" have different significations in the different Provinces. In one of the Provinces, a wholesale license covers five gallons and upwards; in another it covers one pint and upwards. We must get these questions settled, and it is, I consider, of the very greatest importance that, so early in the history of Confederation, while we are yet just laying the basis of the Dominion under our present constitution, all possible questions of conflict of jurisdiction should be settled. You see what the consequences of allowing the contrary practice to obtain were in the United States. They culminated in a great war. Now we are, one after the other, settling these questions, and I hope this question will be settled in the same way, finally and for ever. The hon. gentleman says we should have no more legislation about it. How can we help ourselves, Mr. Speaker? Who is to decide what "wholesale" means and what "retail" means? If the Provincial Governments, for a matter of revenue, wish to tax all sellers of spirits and wines, they are cut off from a great branch of the trade. They cannot charge a license fee to any wholesale dealer in wines or spirituous liquors. That must be settled in some way, and can only be settled by the final tribunal. The hon. gentleman then spoke about the boundary question. Mr. Speaker, if the proffer, the repeated proffer, the solemn proffer of the Dominion Government had been accepted, the boundary question would have been settled ten long years ago. He has quoted remarks of mine, and state papers issued by the Government, alleging that the boundary line was due north from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi. The Government were obliged to take that ground, and why? Because there had been a solemn decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, the Queen's Bench, in the then Province of Lower Canada, which was a court of competent jurisdiction specially charged to deal with the subjects before it. In the Queen and *Reinhart*, it was a question of the greatest importance, on which the life of a man depended. The man was tried for murder, and the question whether that man could be tried or could be executed depended upon the decision of that court, and it decided that the line was a line drawn due north from the confluence of the two rivers. Until that decision was reversed it was the law of the land, and the hon. gentleman knows that Judge Armour, who

before he was a judge, was selected specially by the Government of which that hon. gentleman was a member, to manage the case for the Dominion in respect to this boundary, in his evidence before the committee, declared that he would feel himself bound by the decision in the Queen against *Reinhart*. It was the law of the land until it was reversed by a superior tribunal. So the Dominion Government were bound to hold to that decision as a decision of a court of competent jurisdiction, until it was reversed. But the Government had no disinclination to have it reversed if the Supreme Court decided it was erroneous. They offered, in 1872, and repeated the offer again and again, but it was too valuable a political plaything to give up. It was kept to be used at the polls and on the stump, and therefore the plain, straightforward offer of the Dominion Government to go at once with the question and leave it to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council was set aside and was only at last forced and dragged out of the Provincial Government. The hon. gentleman says: "But that boundary question was handed over to the Province of Manitoba, so that that Province might intervene in the matter." The Parliament of Canada was enlarging the boundaries of that Province, and it was necessary that there should be no interval between the Province of Manitoba and the Province of Ontario. The piece of land there would be too small to form a Province or to form a territory, and therefore the Government proposed, and Parliament adopted it, and it was declared that the western boundary of Ontario should be the eastern boundary of Manitoba. The reason and common sense were obvious. There was no use in having a small piece of land which was not fit to make into a Province or into a territory, and therefore the Government and Parliament adopted the suggestion made by the Government of which the hon. gentleman was a member, or at least by Mr. Mackenzie's Government, when they formed the Territory of Keewatin. In the statute forming that territory it is provided that the western boundary of Ontario shall be the eastern boundary of the District of Keewatin. And we did exactly the same thing. We copied the Act of the late Administration, when we made the boundary of the one the boundary of the other. Why the hon. gentleman brought in the Streams Bill I cannot well understand. Why did he bring that in? In order, he said, that he might show that I was not infallible. Well, Mr. Speaker, I had pretty good authority for my opinion on that subject. I know, of course, I had the authority of Mr. Mowat, the Attorney-General of the Province of Ontario, because he was so satisfied that according to law Mr. McLaren could hold those rights and exclusive privileges that he thought it necessary to introduce an Act to take them away. He believed that the law of the land would not take them away, so he introduced that Bill for the purpose of taking them away. It was on account of that course, it was because the Dominion Government held that it was a question of law then in litigation that should be left to the courts, and if the courts decided that Mr. McLaren was right it would be wrong to pass an Act to take that right away; and if the courts decided that Mr. Caldwell was right, then there was no necessity for the legislation at all, and therefore the Government disallowed it, in order that the case might go before the proper tribunals and be settled according to law and not according to the political exigencies of the Ontario Government. But not only was it the opinion of Mr. Mowat, but I believe I am not wrong when I say that the hon. gentleman himself, in his professional capacity as counsel for Mr. McLaren, gave his opinion that Mr. McLaren's contention was right.

Mr. BLAKE. No, you are not right.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then if I am not right I am informed very erroneously, and when another member

of Parliament is in his place perhaps I shall bring up this question again in order that we may have this point settled. At all events, it was asserted in this House and not denied.

Mr. BLAKE. Not that I know of.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether there is to be an amendment moved to the Address or not. I thought I gathered from the hon. gentleman's remarks that he did not intend to move an amendment. The Speech I believe and consider to be a plain, straightforward, business-like document. The subjects to be submitted to Parliament are important, and we invite the earnest consideration of Parliament to those measures. We believe the time of the House will be usefully employed in the discussion of those measures. We have not put into the Speech, inserted into the mouth of the representative of Her Majesty, long essays upon constitutional law or upon the question whether myself was right or wrong, fallible or infallible. We have called the attention of the House to important subjects, and if it carries, as I believe it will, the measures that we are going to submit, the members of this House will have the pleasure of knowing and feeling, when they go home, that they have passed a useful Session and done great service to the country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I think it may be fairly left to the impartial judgment of this House, and also of the country, when they read the report of the two speeches, whether my hon. friend for West Durham (Mr. Blake) or the First Minister is the more obnoxious to the charge of having unduly wasted the time of the House on the present occasion. I partly agree with the First Minister, that it would not be expedient to enter on a discussion in detail, particularly as I propose at the earliest opportunity to discuss a good many questions to which the First Minister has alluded. I think I may also fairly congratulate the First Minister and the House on the fact that on the present occasion the First Minister has observed a moderation of tone and statement which it might have been well had he observed on other occasions. The First Minister, Mr. Speaker, is no bad type, on the whole, of that Spanish hero immortalized by *Punch*, who was awfully determined when he had twenty men to one, but who, when the odds were less enormously in his favor, usually found it convenient to remember that discretion was an important part of a general's duty. The First Minister, in old time, in fact, in very recent times, as some of us know to our cost, has found it much more convenient to gerrymander his political opponents out of existence than to face them on the floor of Parliament. Now, Sir, as I have said, having this propensity and this habit of mind, it might have been as well had he been less valiant, less pot-valiant, I might say, on the occasion of some recent demonstration in his honor when that hon. gentleman made certain statements to which I propose to call the attention of the House to-night—not solely on account of the personal elements they contain, but because there are certain important questions greatly affecting the welfare of this country underlying that hon. gentleman's utterances. He has had the opportunity to-night, if he had chosen to use it, to retract or to modify some of those statements, but he tells us that he adheres, if I understand him aright, to every word he has uttered. Sir, I propose to edify and amuse—perhaps to instruct—the House, by giving them a specimen of the statements to which the hon. Minister adheres, and which he is not disposed to modify or alter. I must apologise to the House if my own unworthy name appears a little too prominently in some of the statements I am about to read. It was not I who introduced it. I find that by reports in his organs, the First Minister is represented, on a very recent occasion to have delivered himself as follows:—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

“He was an old Tory, the son and grandson of old Tories—and if it be true, as we believe, that grandfathers and fathers can look down upon what is going on among their descendants, how they would shudder, they who have sacrificed everything to their country and their Conservative principles, when they could see the honor conferred upon him because he had sold his party. (Loud cheers.) Ah, yes, gentlemen, he was a knightly man, was Sir Richard Cartwright. We know that knighthood is an order of chivalry, and that a knight should be a chivalrous man, and the first duty of every man is to be true to his allegiance, to be loyal to his party. (Cheers.) The duty of the knighthood, when occasion calls for it, is to surround the Sovereign and the Crown, and if necessary to fight in defence of that Crown. But Sir Richard Cartwright has set himself up as the champion of independence; he is set up to see how such a thing will be received by the people of this country. Mr. Blake will not commit himself to the policy yet; he will wait to see how the cat will jump—(laughter and cheers); and so they tried it the other day, and gentlemen, only think of it, the man who is a Privy Councillor of Canada, who has sworn allegiance to Her Majesty, Her heirs and successors—only think of it, the man who has accepted the order of knighthood at Her hands, who is supposed to have knelt at her feet, kissed Her hand and received the accolade on both shoulders—”

Now, Mr. Speaker, a question has arisen here of very great practical moment. I recollect, Sir, on the occasion that I received the honor of knighthood, I only received and the hon. Finance Minister only received the accolade on one shoulder. Now, I want to know, in my own interests and in the interest of the Finance Minister, in the interest of several of his own colleagues, has there been a mistake? Looking at the subsequent language of the hon. gentleman it may become an important question to the hon. Finance Minister and all the rest of us, who only got the accolade on one shoulder. Are we only half knights? I refer the question to the hon. gentleman, because knights of high degree, like the First Minister, are expected to be well up in the science of heraldry as well as of constitutional law. I refer to him—do knights of his high degree get the accolade on both shoulders, and do knights of the inferior order—Knights Commander—only get it on one? I only mention the question because, really, it seems to me that if it be otherwise then, Mr. Speaker (and I only venture the suggestion as a possible explanation of an otherwise inexplicable difficulty), is it possible that when the First Minister says he received the accolade on both shoulders, I say, is it possible he may have seen double? However that important question may be decided, and I commit it with all confidence to the Minister of Finance, who is interested with myself. It appears that the hon. gentleman continues:

“saying, ‘Rise, Sir Richard Cartwright, true, faithful and loyal’—fancy him preaching independence; fancy him casting aside the loyalty he has sworn to maintain and still flaunting the title of K.C.M.G.”

Up to this point the hon. gentleman had confined himself to simple prose, but here his feelings become too much for him and so he finally dropped into poetry, in the following remarkable fashion:—

“Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, when reading of this I think of the language put into the mouth of Lady Constance by Shakespeare, when he addresses the Archduke of Austria, after he had caused Prince Arthur to be killed—

‘Now, cold-blooded slave,
Didst thou not speak like thunder on my side,
Being sworn my soldier, bidding me depend
Upon thy star, thy fortune and thy strength,
And dost thou now pass over to my foe?
Thou wear’st a lion’s hide—doff it for shame,
And hang a calfskin on thy recreant limbs.’”

Mr. Speaker, it is only fair to the First Minister to say that that great rhetorical effort from which I have quoted, and of which I make no doubt the hon. gentleman and his friends are justly proud, abounds with passages like these, passages of equal stateliness of diction, of equal loftiness of thought, of equally exquisite good taste. These little outpourings, as one may say, of a thankful heart and mind, tinged probably with a little glow of after-dinner enthusiasm, do infinite credit to the First Minister. I know from old recollection that the First Minister was

always more conversant with Hudibras than with Shakespeare, and with Rabelais than either; but I really did not think that the First Minister's memory, in former times at all events, would have led him to make such an inapt quotation as that with which he wound up. If I remember anything of the play of King John, the identical language he quotes is uttered by a certain Sir Richard to a certain craven Grand Duke or Grand Cross, as the case might be, who came to condign punishment afterwards at the hands of the aforesaid Sir Richard. And if I recollect anything of my Shakespeare, and I knew something of his works in former days, it was not the Grand Duke who killed the unfortunate Prince Arthur, but his own uncle, King John. I do not want to criticise too severely these utterances of the hon. gentleman, but I advise him when he next drops into poetry to take the trouble to read the whole play, and then he will be able to quote it a little more correctly. But not content with poetry, the hon. gentleman went on, as he has not infrequently done before, to invoke the spirits of my ancestors, in order that they may inflict on me such punishment as he would like to inflict if his power were equal to his will. I recollect that about seven or eight years ago the hon. gentleman could hardly make a speech in which my name figured in which the ghosts of my ancestors did not appear, until at last, in pure self-defence, I had to do a little spirit raising on my own account, and on one occasion, before a large audience at Aylmer I invoked the spirit of my esteemed grandfather. I enquired of him how he would deal with the hon. gentleman under certain circumstances, and the reply, I remember, satisfied me and the large audience I referred to, that if the First Minister had lived in my grandfather's days and indulged his predatory and other instincts then as he has done in later times, the First Minister would undoubtedly have had infinitely more cause to shudder at the doom which my ancestor would inevitably have inflicted on him than ever my ancestor would have had to shudder at me. I may further tell him that, even if it should turn out, which is not so clear, that my grandfather's opinions and my own might differ on other matters, from all I know of the character of that worthy gentleman, I feel most positively certain that in the opinion he and I would have formed as to the hon. gentleman there would have been perfect unison between grandfather and grandson. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman undertook to speak of the sentiments which actuated the United Empire Loyalists of former times. I have to tell that right hon. gentleman that I do not admit that a man who never struck one honest stroke, who never spilled one drop of blood, who never lost a dollar, who never risked a foot of land in proof of his loyalty, is quite capable of understanding the feelings and sentiments of men who sacrificed everything that men hold dear for the sake of allegiance to their country. Sir, I do not mean to say that the hon. gentleman's loyalty is not very sincere. He says it is, and he ought to know. But this I do say, that that hon. gentleman's loyalty, ever since I have known him, has proved a most lucrative investment, politically and otherwise; that his is the sort of loyalty that pays; and if he wants a further certificate of character, I am prepared to assure Her Majesty that so long as it continues to pay, She will have no more ardent and devoted servant than the present First Minister of Canada. But these are minor matters; there are other and much more important ones to which I desire to call the attention of this House. I do not at all agree, I do not at all approve of the idea or the conception of the duties, and obligations of Canadian statesmen which underlies, not merely the passage I have quoted, but almost every word of the first half of the speech delivered by the hon. gentleman to his friends and admirers at Montreal—I say that his words and the ideas they imply are of the most mischievous character, and that it is in the

interests of all of us that they should be repudiated by some person, at all events, on the floor of this House. We can gather from the language used by the hon. gentleman what his ideas are of the duties and obligations which Canadian statesmen owe to their country. For myself, I have to tell him that I stand here as the representative of a Canadian constituency, and as a Privy Councillor of Canada I am bound to give to Her Majesty or Her Majesty's representative that advice which in my heart I believe is best in the interest of the people of Canada. That is my plain duty, and that I propose to do at any cost. I can tell the hon. gentleman this, that the Canadian who does anything else, who fails to state what he believes to be for the interest of Canada, who allows himself to be silenced for any consideration whatever, is a traitor to his country. I say he is a traitor to his country. I am prepared to maintain here or elsewhere, against the hon. gentleman or against his friends, that the advice, or more correctly speaking, the warning I gave once or twice to the people of Canada, contained advice which is good for the people of the Dominion, and good also, when rightly understood, in the interests of the whole empire. But that is too large a subject to enter upon just now. What I mean to say is this, that if the view put forward by the right hon. gentleman, or implied by the right hon. gentleman, with reference to the duties and obligations which are assumed by Canadians who accept Imperial decoration be correct, if by receiving an Imperial decoration a Canadian statesman is bound to be silent when the interests of Canada require that he should speak, then, Sir, those decorations are not honors, but bribes. I wish the hon. gentleman to understand that, and it is well that the people of Canada should understand it too. Sir, the idea which the hon. gentleman has given utterance to are ideas which may suit political adventurers who have no drop of Canadian blood in their veins, no spark of honest regard for the true interests of Canada in their hearts. For myself I utterly repudiate those ideas, and I know this, that British statesmen of the highest rank, were they asked if the granting of Imperial honors to Canadian statesmen bound them to be silent when the interests of their country called upon them to speak, would repudiate the idea with the same disdain with which I repudiate it now. The truth is, that the whole tenor of the First Minister's speech is only one of a good many proofs of how far he is in reality, with all his pretence, behind the age—a proof that he is retrograde and reactionary in the highest degree. He goes to the middle ages for his fiscal policy; he takes as his guide, in the method of conducting a Government, the teachings of Sir Robert Walpole, and his ideas of free discussion are based on the times of the Stuarts and on those disgraceful periods of English history when it was ruled from the bench that the greater the truth the greater the libel, a doctrine which would suit the First Minister most admirably. Sir, I tell the First Minister that he knows very little—and perhaps it is unfortunate that he does know so little—of questions which are now seething in the public mind, questions which are not to be ignored, questions which he will soon discover, and perhaps some of his colleagues could tell him, will have to be faced before we are many years older. The hon. gentleman claims to be ultra-loyal, but I can recollect the time when the First Minister was not so ultra-loyal. It is true that at that period the First Minister was in Opposition, and it is possible that the fervent loyalty that he now professes does, sometimes, I do not say fall to zero, but experience a great cooling in the shades of Opposition. At any rate, I recollect when the First Minister was, if not the instigator of, at least the ardent sympathizer with that mob of disloyal partisans who burned the Parliament House of Canada, and pelted the Governor General, the representative of royalty, through the streets of Montreal. Sir, I recollect perfectly well the discussion which

took place in this House with respect to the appointment of a certain Mr. J. M. Ferris to an important post under the Crown, and I remember that it was publicly stated here by many members of this House, several of them supporters of the First Minister, that one of his claims to recognition was the fact that he was a very old friend of the First Minister and a very active promoter of the burning of the Parliament House in the City of Montreal. My hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Blake) called attention to the fact that a certain well-known annexation manifesto is ornamented with the signature of an important member of the present Cabinet. My hon. friend might have added that if you choose to go back through the old *Gazettes* you will find the name of a certain Lieut. David Lewis Macpherson, who was turned out of the militia for rank disloyalty, and I would ask if this is the same David Lewis Macpherson who is now the friend and the associate of the First Minister. Upon the same manifesto is the name of no less a person than Sir John Rose, ex-Finance Minister of Canada. A little further down you will find the name of one Alexander Tilloch Galt, of whom it may be remembered, that before accepting the decoration which I now wear, he addressed a formal communication to Lord Carnarvon, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, in which he wished that it should be known before accepting that decoration that he was an advocate of the independence of Canada, and to whom Lord Carnarvon, than whom no more honorable nobleman exists, replied that he saw no reason in that fact why that gentleman should not accept that decoration. Must I recall the language of the *Mail*, which, if not the hon. gentleman's organ, is the next thing to it, in which, when it was pointed out that the fiscal policy which he inaugurated was likely to prove injurious to British connection, we were told that if that were the case it was so much the worse for British connection. Lastly, must I recall the conduct of the First Minister to Lord Lorne. Sir, this House remembers how Lord Lorne was exposed to unmeasured obloquy, how he was assailed by the right hon. gentleman's supporters and the press which supports those supporters, and we recollect the reason why. We recollect that at the earnest request of the First Minister, in order to extricate himself from a grievous political difficulty, Lord Lorne consented to refer a certain matter to England, and therefore he was assailed in a most virulent manner by a good many members of this House and a good many of the newspapers of this country. I have here the express and positive declaration of Lord Lorne that "on Wednesday, the second day of April, Sir John A. Macdonald again came to me and informed me that as an alternative to his (Lord Lorne's) refusal to dismiss Mr. Letellier, he suggested that the question involved in the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec should be referred to Her Majesty's Government. I referred to this, and Sir John produced a note of the statement he proposed to make to the House on the subject." In another place he says that "on Wednesday Sir John again came to me, and informed me that, as an alternative, he suggested that the question involved in the dismissal of the Lieutenant-Governor should be referred to Her Majesty's Government." The man who gave the advice that Lord Lorne acted upon, that loyal and chivalrous person, sat mute, did not raise his hand, did not open his mouth, but allowed the representative of royalty, the Queen's son-in-law, to be assailed and traduced by his supporters, when one word from him would have closed their mouths. And having done so, he is the man who now lectures hon. gentlemen on this side of the House on their imagined disloyalty to the British Crown. I would advise the hon. gentleman to caution; I would remind him that persons who live in glass houses should be careful of throwing stones. Although I do not at the moment see the hon. Secretary of State in the House, it strikes

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

me that on the occasion to which I have referred that hon. gentleman, to his credit be it said, took occasion to separate himself from his leader, and declare that he was not altogether averse to discussing the future of Canada. I say that the First Minister, not content with the assaults to which I have alluded, must needs make insinuations of a somewhat offensive character regarding certain Liberal leaders. They were to the effect that they had sought and supplicated for these honors. I do not know whether he meant to insinuate that I was one who had done so, but I can tell the First Minister that not only was that insinuation not a fact, at any rate as regards myself, and I believe as regards the other members of the late Cabinet, but it was the exact reverse of the fact. Not one of us, that I know of, ever sought or asked for any honor. Honors were tendered to us, and under circumstances which made the tendering of them peculiarly gratifying, because they were tendered after we had ceased in any way to control the destinies of the country. But, Sir, it is perfectly well known that so far from the Liberal leaders suing or supplicating for honors, my hon. friend here (Mr. Blake), my hon. friend who usually sits beside me (Mr. Mackenzie), and my hon. friend the late lamented Mr. George Brown, were all severally tendered honors, and all, for reasons which did them honor, saw fit to decline them. Can the First Minister say as much for his own colleagues? Will he rise in his place and say that his own colleagues did not sue and supplicate for honors? Sir, we know better. We know that members of his own Cabinet did sue and supplicate for honors. I think that Canadian statesmen, when they are freely and spontaneously tendered to them, may freely accept Imperial decorations tendered in the way I have described; but I can tell the hon. gentleman this, that no Canadian statesman worthy of the name, or worthy to hold such an important place, will ever stoop to sue or supplicate for honors in any quarter; and if, besides suing and supplicating, it is understood that men who accept them are bound to silence when the interests of their country demand that they should speak out, the case is ten-fold worse than that to which I have alluded. I fear that on the occasion I have referred to the First Minister's head was a little turned, and I am sorry for it, because, with all his faults—and they are neither few nor far between—I confess I had a better opinion of the First Minister. I thought there was enough self-respect and manliness left in him to prevent his using the language I was sorry to see he used with respect to the honor recently conferred upon him. That honor, Sir, was one of considerable importance. It was intended, no doubt, as a graceful recognition by Her Majesty of the growing importance of this great Dominion, and it is fitting that it should have been acknowledged, but acknowledged in a respectful and manly fashion. It was not a fitting thing that the First Minister of this Dominion should talk of a thing of that kind as an overwhelming honor conferred on him. Does the First Minister not know that within the last few years, again and again, honors of that kind, and of a much superior kind, have been conferred upon English statesmen, of Cabinet rank, it is true, but of no very high grade in their respective parties? Sir, I object on my part altogether to the use of such language, and I tell the First Minister that he ought to learn that the First Minister of Canada occupies such a position that he should not speak of overwhelming honors conferred upon him by any parties whatever. I tell the First Minister that the use of such servile and debasing language has only shown how unfit he is to be trusted in any matter affecting the honor of Canada. And if the hon. gentleman imagines that we are awe-struck on this side of the House because he is entitled to wear across his breast a red ribbon six inches wide instead of a red ribbon three inches wide around his neck, and to write after his name G.C.B. in-

stead of K.C.B., all I can tell him is that long before this Session closes his mind will be wholly disabused of any such idea. Now, I am not going to allow the First Minister or his followers or press to allege that I in any way oppose or depreciate the honors which Her Majesty has conferred upon him. I may tell him that when I heard that the honor had been conferred upon him, the first feeling that filled my mind was one of lively gratitude, sympathy, and admiration, and I will tell him why;—in the first place, lively gratitude, because, when She saw fit to do this thing, Her Majesty had been graciously pleased to select the Order of the Bath, and not the Order of St. Michael and St. George; in the second place, I have the honor myself of knowing a reasonable number of Knights of the noble and honorable order of the Bath, and I know them to be gallant, truthful and upright gentlemen, and, therefore, for reasons which I will not go into at this moment, I feel they deserve the sincere sympathy of everybody who is acquainted with the antecedents of the hon. gentleman; and in the last place, if it be true, as asserted by the First Minister's press, that there are certain purifying and cleansing influences inherent in the ceremonial of the investiture of the Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, then, Sir, I am filled with the profoundest admiration for the great wisdom of Her Majesty's advisers, inasmuch as I am perfectly satisfied that of all Her Majesty's three hundred million subjects, black, brown, white, yellow and copper coloured, there is no one who stands more desperately in need of every cleansing and purifying influence it is possible to bestow upon him than the last recipient of that distinguished honor. Moreover, I am bound to tell the House that there is precedent for it. I am not disposed myself to hunt up musty old precedents, but you know precedents are dear to every rightly constituted British mind, and I have a very recent precedent for the hon. gentleman's case which goes with it almost on all fours. About twenty-five years ago, under peculiar circumstances, Her Majesty was advised to bestow, and did bestow, the honor of the Grand Cross of the Bath upon another Prime Minister—the Prime Minister of the Principality of Nepal, Jung Bahadur. Now, Nepal, I may mention for the special information of the Finance Minister, is a Chinese Principality, paying tribute to Peking, and inhabited by a race of Chinese extraction; and from what I have heard, from the writings of Mr. Lawrence Oliphant, and from information that came to my knowledge while in London, I am inclined to believe, in point of scrupulousness, in point of regard for his word, and in point of dexterity in getting rid of his political opponents—although the oriental method had the merit of being considerably simpler and more effectual than the occidental one—and in what one may call his common walk and conversation, I believe there was not a pin's point of difference in the way of practical morality between the Prime Minister of Nepal and the present Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada; and, therefore, I conceive that there was a good precedent for the bestowal of the distinguished honor of the Grand Cross of the Bath upon our Prime Minister. I mention that, because I know there are many who felt that it was rather to be regretted, taking all things into account, that Her Majesty's advisers should have been moved to take this particular action; and I wish here to say that I hold that it is not fair to throw any blame upon Her Majesty's advisers for their action in the matter. Let us be just. I think that the thing for certain reasons may have been regrettable, but not that Her Majesty's advisers are to blame. The parties who are to blame, to say the truth, are the majority of the electors of Canada—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—who were ill-advised enough, knowing the antecedents of the First Minister, to elect him to the important office which he now holds, and

to confirm him again in 1882. That these unfortunate people are likely to pay a most heavy penalty for their folly, will, I am afraid, be only too clearly shown when we have had an opportunity of perusing the Public Accounts, and of holding some further discussion on the results of the folly they then allowed themselves to commit. But if we are to blush for anybody, it is not for Her Majesty's advisers, but for that portion of the people of Canada who had so little sense of public honor and self-respect as, after what the hon. gentleman had done, to again entrust him with further powers of injuring his country. And I say that under these circumstances a decoration, more or less, is a very little matter. What is to be regretted is that being such as he is, having made such a use as he has made of the talents with which Providence has endowed him, the hon. gentleman should be to-day the First Minister of the country. Now, I have a warning to give the hon. gentleman. I can tell him this, that the next time he prates or vapors about his loyalty in this House, he will do well to wait until those gentlemen who, like myself, are acquainted with his previous career and antecedents, have ceased to have seats in the House. I can tell him that the next time he talks of the greed of Liberal leaders for honors he had better do so in the absence of two, at any rate, of his hon. colleagues who sit beside him and have recently received decorations. I can tell him that the next time he chooses to interdict free discussion in this House or elsewhere he had better do it in the absence of the hon. the Secretary of State. I can tell him that the next time he chooses to quote Shakespeare he would do well to read the drama from which he quotes before he introduces another quotation. I have further to say to the hon. gentleman, that I am perfectly aware of the extent of his patriotism and have tested the quality of his valor. I know what his loyalty is worth, and of one thing he may rest assured, that anything I choose to say elsewhere or here he will find me, fully prepared to maintain and to justify, and neither threats nor bribes from him or from any other party will prevent me, on any occasion I see fit, from advocating that course or from making any statements or tendering any advice which I believe to be on the whole for the interests of my native country.

Resolution agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That the said resolution be referred to a Select Committee, composed of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Hector Langevin, the Hon. Mr. McLellan, Messrs. Taschereau and Townshend.

Motion agreed to.

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

SUPPLY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved :

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

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD gave notice that he would move, on Monday next :

That a special committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, list of members to compose the

Select Standing Committees ordered by the House on Thursday, the 29th inst., and that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright, Messrs. McLellan, Blake, and Vale do compose the said committee.

Mr. BLAKE. I should be very glad if the hon. gentleman would move that at once. Then we could meet on Monday. He might move instead of giving notice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I cannot do that, I think.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. BOWELL. With the consent of the House, I will make the usual motion to appoint a committee to supervise the Debates of the House. It has been usual, on previous occasions, to make this motion without giving notice. I therefore move :

That a select committee be appointed to supervise the official report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, with power to report from time to time, said committee to be composed of Messrs. Béchar, Bergin, Colby, Charlton, Desjardins, Foster, Innes, Royal, Scriver, Somerville (Brant), White (Cardwell) and Woodworth.

It is the same committee as was appointed last year, with the exception of Mr. Woodworth, who is substituted for Mr. McDonald, called to the Senate.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual report of the Department of the Interior, for 1884.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10:25 o'clock p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 2nd February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Trade and Navigation Returns for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1884.—(Mr. Bowell.)

Report of the Minister of Public Works for the year ending 30th June, 1884; also, Report of the Minister of Justice on the Penitentiaries of the Dominion of Canada for the same year.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Public Accounts of Canada for the year ending 30th June, 1884; also, Report of the Auditor General for the same year. (Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ending 30th June, 1884.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

Report of the Inland Revenue Department for the year ending 30th June, 1884.—(Mr. Costigan.)

COST OF PRINTING, AND ADVERTISING.

Mr. McMULLEN. I desire to enquire of the Government when they will bring down the Return ordered on the 14th of February last, showing :

The amounts paid by the Government to the *Gazette* Publishing Company, of Montreal, for printing, advertising, or any work done or material furnished during the years 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, in detail.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

The hon. gentleman suggested that the words "and other newspapers of the Dominion" should be added, and the years 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1877 be also included, so that we might have a Return for the last ten years. The hon. gentleman at that time promised he would give this Return prompt attention. Eleven months have passed since and no return has yet come down. I would like to know what the probability is of that Return being laid before the House at an early day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not remember exactly the circumstances and have no doubt the Return was not ready at the end of the Session, but it will be brought down immediately.

Mr. McMULLEN. How soon?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. There was a discussion on the subject, and I took occasion to point out to the hon. gentleman that the addition he proposed would probably entail six months labor for a dozen clerks, involving an expenditure unnecessarily of some thousands of dollars. He declared that all pains would be taken and all possible despatch used to give us the Return. It should be ready, therefore, by this.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No doubt all those pains and this despatch were used, and the Return was not ready at the end of the Session. That was the reason it was not brought down, but it will be brought down immediately.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY STOCKHOLDERS.

Mr. MITCHELL. At this stage I would like to ask the Government, and I take the earliest opportunity of doing so that there may be no excuse with regard to time, whether they are yet prepared to lay before the House, in accordance with the Order of the House last Session, a list of the stockholders of the Grand Trunk and their residences.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On account of the absence of the Secretary of State I cannot say whether that Return has yet been received or not. Of course it would be sent to him.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like the hon. gentleman not to let it drift over for more than a week or two.

CIVIL SERVICE BILL.

Mr. CASEY. Seeing that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has been so prompt in giving notice of a couple of measures mentioned rather among the addenda in the Speech from the Throne, I would like to ask the Premier when the Civil Service Bill, also mentioned, will be brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That measure is under the charge of the Secretary of State. I believe it will be introduced in a few days.

SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Explain.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) The explanations which are asked from me, Mr. Speaker, are very simple, and the Bill itself will give them in full at the second reading. As the title indicates, it is intended to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as regards matters relating to civil law in the various Provinces. The object of the law is to withdraw those cases from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. If the Government intend to introduce a measure which would be better than mine, and which would be calculated to meet our views, I will not object to having it

substituted for my Bill, but if they do not introduce a measure of that kind, I intend to ask the vote of this House.

Bill read the first time.

DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS OF INSOLVENT DEBTORS.

Mr. CURRAN, moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) for the distribution of assets of insolvent debtors. He said: This Bill has been prepared under the direction of the Boards of Trade of Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton and Winnipeg, and embodies the views of the commercial community of the Dominion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like to ask the hon. the mover of the Bill whether it contains any provision for the discharge of the debtors when their property is taken away. Without such a clause the Bill will be incomplete.

Mr. CURRAN. The promoters of the Bill have not thought proper to include a clause for the discharge of insolvent debtors. This Bill merely aims at an equitable distribution of the assets. However, as the matter is to be referred to a committee later on, any additions thought necessary will be made there.

Mr. MITCHELL. I understand that the Bill simply provides to take away the property of unfortunate debtors, but does not admit of the discharge of the debtors; I think it is a very one-sided affair.

Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 2) to regulate the employment of children and young persons and women in the Workshops, Mills and Factories of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 5) respecting the liability of carriers by land.—(Mr. Coughlin.)

Bill (No. 6) to further amend the law of evidence in criminal cases.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

THE FACTORY BILL.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce the Factory Bill?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is under consideration.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a measure this Session restricting the immigration of Chinese into the Dominion of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Until the report of the Commission is received and considered, the Government have not come to any resolution on the subject.

PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA.

Mr. CHARLTON enquired, The net amount of the public debt of Canada on January 1st, 1885?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The net debt of Canada on the 30th June, 1884, was \$181,719,931.30; the increase of the debt from the 1st July, 1884, to the 31st December, 1884, was \$7,194,953.75; total, \$188,914,885.05.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman the gross amount besides?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No. The question is not as to the gross amount.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LOAN.

Mr. CHARLTON enquired, Of the loan of \$22,500,000 which Parliament at its last Session authorized the Government to make to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, what amount has been paid over to that company up to January 29th, 1885?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount paid to the company up to the 29th January, 1885, is \$18,591,600.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

Mr. DESJARDINS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to accept as final the judgment rendered by the Supreme Court as to the competency of the Dominion Parliament to pass the Liquor License Act, 1883?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A report is being obtained as to the effect the decision of the Supreme Court will have on the laws of the different Provinces. Until that is received—and it will be received in a few days—the Government cannot express any intention on the matter.

RESIGNATION OF CAPT. LUDGER BOLDUC.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved for:

Return of all papers relating to the resignation of Capt. Ludger Bolduc, after the collision which occurred on the 20th May, 1884, between *La Canadienne* and the brig *Alliance*, of Jersey; covering complaint, enquiry, report, &c., and all correspondence relating to the matter.

Mr. LANGELIER. (Translation.) If the hon. member has no objection, I shall ask him to add to his motion a demand for papers concerning the appointment of that same Capt. Bolduc. The reason why I make the demand is this: Capt. Bolduc superseded Capt. Auguste Dupré, who commanded that steamer for several years without meeting with any accident whatever. For one reason or another means have been found to dismiss him and to appoint in his place Capt. Bolduc, to which the accident mentioned in the hon. member's motion has happened. Therefore, I shall ask him to add to his motion a demand for papers relating to the appointment of Capt. Bolduc.

Mr. LANDRY. I believe the hon. member wishes to mix up two questions which are altogether distinct and separate. If he wishes to get information he is at liberty to do what I am doing, by making a motion to that effect.

Mr. LANGELIER. I believe it is useless to make two motions for the same object.

Mr. LANDRY. It is not altogether the same object.

Mr. LANGELIER. Nothing is more natural than to ask for the circumstances of the appointment while asking for the circumstances of the resignation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. member ought to give a notice of motion. I do not think there would be any objection, but at all events the Deputy Minister will be notified of the motion and he will be enabled to see whether the motion may be granted or not.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN BANKS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Statement showing the amount of money on deposit to the credit of the Government of Canada on the 1st day of January, 1885, whether in Canada or elsewhere, together with the names of the banks wherein the said moneys are deposited, with the amount in each bank respectively; also the amount at interest and the rate of interest, if any, allowed on the said deposits in each case.

He said: If the Finance Minister thinks that it would make

no special delay I would make that the 1st of February, and save another motion.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

GOODS IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for :

Summary statement, similar to No. 2, in the Trade and Navigation Returns, of the goods imported for consumption, dutiable and free, in the Dominion of Canada, the amount of duty collected, and the rates of duty levied thereon, during the six months ending 31st December, 1884. Also, a similar statement to No. 5, in the Trade and Navigation Returns, of the goods, the produce and manufacture of Canada, exported from the Dominion of Canada for the six months ending 31st December, 1884.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no objection to the motion ; but the hon. gentleman must understand that it will be some time before the motion can be brought down as it involves a very large amount of labor and work.

Motion agreed to.

TIMBER LICENSES.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for :

1st. The total number of timber licenses or permits to cut timber granted since February 1st, 1883, and the total area covered by such licenses or permits ;

2nd. The total amount of bonuses or premiums paid on such licenses or permits ;

3rd. The name and residence of each grantee of a timber license or permit ; the number of the license or permit ; the area covered by each ; the date of application for the same ; the bonus or premium per square mile paid upon each : whether the survey of each berth or area covered by license or permit was made by the Government previous to granting the same, for the purpose of obtaining information as to its value ; and the information, if any, in the possession of the Government as to the quantity, quality and kind of timber upon each ; also, the location of each berth or limit ;

4th. The Crown dues or stumpage charged or chargeable on each license or permit ;

5th. Whether in each case where a license or permit was granted the berth was first put up at public auction after public notice inviting tenders was given, and was sold to the highest bidder, or whether granted upon application from the grantee without public competition being invited ;

6th. Copies of all petitions, remonstrances, claims, or communications sent or made to the Government respecting such timber licenses or permits ; and copies of all correspondence had with the Government respecting such lands, licenses or timber, and the action of the Government thereon.

He said : I notice in a Return laid upon the Table of the House very late last Session, in a statement showing the number of timber licenses and leases granted, area, bonuses, total amount of dues, etc., that the names of the grantees are omitted in each case ; in no instance are we able to say who were the parties to whom these leases were granted. I think this motion called for that information, and I consider it essential that the information should be given. I hope the Return to this motion will be made very soon, as there is nothing asked for here except the licenses actually granted, and I hope when that Return is made we may have the names of the parties to whom the licenses were given.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think it is desirable to add, "assignees of Government licenses and the consideration expressed in the assignment of licenses."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That a Special Committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees, ordered by the House on Thursday, the 29th ultimo, and that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Hector Langevin, Sir Richard Cartwright, and Messrs. McLellan, Blake and Vail do compose the said committee.

Motion agreed to.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement showing : 1st. The Christian and surnames of the present employes of the Immigration Office at Quebec, and the nature of their employment ;

2nd. The amount of the yearly salary paid to each such employé on 31st December, 1884 ;

3rd. The amount of the yearly salary attached to the said office on 31st December, 1877.

Also, all correspondence respecting the increase or non-increase of the salary of any employé of the said office, between the two dates above named.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)

Return of the receipts and expenditure in detail, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, from the 1st day of July, 1883, to the 31st day of January, 1884, and from the 1st day of July, 1884, to the 31st day of January, 1885.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return in the form used in the statements usually published in the *Gazette*, of the exports and imports from the 1st day of July, 1883, to the 1st day of January, 1884, and from the 1st day of July, 1884, to the 1st day of January, 1885, distinguishing the products of Canada and those of other counties.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copies of the complaint, correspondence, documents and reports, relating to the enquiry respecting Captain Alphonse Miville DeChene, about the year 1879, at St. Roch des Aulnets.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Copies of all documents, correspondence and contracts between the Government or its officers and the several parties tendering for the supplying of wood to the lightship at the Lower Traverse, for the years 1883 and 1884.—(Mr. Casgrain.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 3rd February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, from the Special Committee appointed to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees, ordered by the House on the 29th ult., reported lists as follows:—

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs

Abbott,	Davies,	Mills,
Amyot,	Desjardins,	Quimet,
Belleau,	Girouard,	Patterson (Essex),
Blake,	Hall,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bossé,	Laurier,	Royal,
Cameron (Huron),	Lister,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Victoria),	Macdonald (Sir John),	Temple,
Casgrain,	Mackenzie,	Weldon,
Colby,	Macmaster,	Wells,
Costigan,	McCarthy,	White (Cardwell) and
Curran,	McIntyre,	Woodworth.—35.
Daly,	McIsaac,	

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Daoust,	McIntyre,
Benson,	De St. Georges,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Billy,	Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Paint,
Cameron (Inverness),	Dodd,	Pruyn,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Guillet,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hackett,	Robertson (Hastings),
Casey,	Harley,	Tyrwhitt,
Cochrane,	Hesson,	Valin and
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Yeo.—27.

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

No. 3.—ON RAILWAYS, CANALS, AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs		
Abbott,	Ferguson (Welland),	Ouimet,
Allen,	Fisher,	Paint,
Amyot,	Forber,	Patterson (Essex),
Bain,	Fortin,	Pope,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Foster,	Ray,
Barnard,	Gault,	Riopel,
Beaty,	Geoffrion,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Béchar, d,	Girouard,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bell,	Glen,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Belleau,	Gordon,	Ross,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Royal,
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Rykert,
Bergin,	Hall,	Scott,
Bernier,	Hay,	Scriver,
Blake,	Hickey,	Small,
Blondeau,	Hilliard,	Smyth,
Bossé,	Holton,	Sproule,
Bourassa,	Irvine,	Stairs,
Bowell,	Ives,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Bryson,	Kilvert,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Burns,	King,	Taschereau,
Burpee (St. John),	Kinney,	Tassé,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Landerkin,	Temple,
Cameron (Huron),	Landry (Kent),	Thompson,
Cameron (Inverness),	Landry (Montmagny),	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Cameron (Victoria),	Languevin (Sir Hector),	Townshend,
Carling,	Laurier,	Trow,
Caron,	Livingstone,	Tupper,
Casey,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Vail,
Casgrain,	Mackenzie,	Valin,
Chapleau,	Mackintosh,	Vanasse,
Charlton,	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Cockburn,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wallace (York),
Colby,	McCallum,	Watson,
Cook,	McCarthy,	Weldon,
Costigan,	McCraney,	Wells,
Coursol,	McDougald (Pictou),	White (Cardwell),
Curran,	McGreevy,	White (Hastings),
Davies,	McIntyre,	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	McIsaac,	Wigle,
De St. Georges,	McLellan,	Williams,
Desjardins,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wilson,
Dickinson,	McMullen,	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	Mills,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dundas,	Mitchell,	Woodworth and
Edgar,	Mulock,	Wright.—140.
Fairbank,	Orton,	

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs		
Allen,	Gillmor,	Massue,
Amyot,	Girouard,	Montplaisir,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Glen,	Mulock,
Bell,	Guilbault,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Hay,	Pinsonneault,
Bourassa,	Hickey,	Ray,
Burns,	Holton,	Reid,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Homer,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Victoria),	Ives,	Scriver,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Small,
Casey,	Jenkins,	Smyth,
Catudal,	Kinney,	Springer,
Cockburn,	Kranz,	Sproule,
Cuthbert,	Labrosse,	Stairs,
Daoust,	Langelier,	Taschereau,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Landry (Kent),	Tassé,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Landry (Montmagny),	Taylor,
Edgar,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Farrow,	Lesage,	Tupper,
Fleming,	Lister,	Vanasse,
Foster,	Macmaster,	Wallace (Albert),
Gagné,	McDougall (G. Breton),	Weldon,
Geoffrion,	McIsaac,	Wells, and
	McMullen,	Wright.—71.

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

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs		
Auger,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Landerkin,
Bain,	Ferguson (Welland),	Livingstone,
Baker (Victoria),	Gaudet,	Macdonald (King's),
Beaty,	Gault,	McDougall (G. Breton),
Bergeron,	Géault,	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Bourbeau,	Gillmor,	Massue,
Burnham,	Gordon,	Moffat,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,

Casgrain,	Gunn,	O'Brien,
Coughlin,	Hackett,	Paterson (Brant),
Dawson,	Hurteau,	Patterson (Essex),
De St. Georges,	Innes,	Rinfret,
Dodd,	Irvine,	Sutherland (Oxford) and
Dundas,	Jackson,	Wood (Brockville).—44.
Dupont,	Kaulbach,	

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

No. 6.—ON PRINTING.

Messieurs		
Allison,	Bowell,	Somerville (Brant),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Desjardins,	Tassé,
Belleau,	Foster,	Thompson,
Bergin,	Innes,	Trow and
Bourassa,	Landry (Montmagny),	White (Cardwell).—15.

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs		
Baker (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Rykert,
Béchar, d,	Holton,	Scriver,
Bergeron,	Ives,	Somerville (Brant),
Bergin,	Kilvert,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Blake,	King,	Taschereau,
Bowell,	Langelier,	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Townshend,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Mackenzie,	Tupper,
Charlton,	McDougald (Pictou),	Vail,
Colby,	McLellan,	White (Cardwell),
Costigan,	Massue,	White (Hastings),
Coursol,	Mulock,	White (Renfrew),
Davies,	Pope,	Wood (Brockville) and
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Rinfret,	Wood (Westmoreland).—46.
Farrow,	Riopel,	
Ferguson (Welland),	Robertson (Shelburne),	

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

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs		
Abbott,	Dupont,	McCallum,
Allison,	Fairbank,	McCarthy,
Baker (Victoria),	Fleming,	McDougald (Pictou),
Béchar, d,	Forbes,	McGreevy,
Bernier,	Fortin,	McMullen,
Blake,	Gagné,	McNeill,
Bossé,	Gault,	Massue,
Bourbeau,	Gigault,	Mitchell,
Bowell,	Girouard,	Moffat,
Bryson,	Guillet,	O'Brien,
Burnham,	Gunn,	Orton,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hackett,	Ouimet,
Cameron (Huron),	Haggart,	Paterson (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Hall,	Platt,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hesson,	Reid,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Carling,	Innes,	Rykert,
Cartwright (Sir Rich.),	Ives,	Scott,
Casgrain,	Jackson,	Scriver,
Catudal,	Jamieson,	Shakespeare,
Charlton,	Kaulbach,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Cook,	Kirk,	Vail,
Coursol,	Kranz,	Vanasse,
Curran,	Landerkin,	Wallace (York),
Cuthbert,	Langelier,	Weldon,
Daly,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),
Davies,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Renfrew),
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Williams,
Desjardins,	Mackenzie,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	Mackintosh,	Wright, and
Dugas,	Macmaster,	Yeo.—100.
Dundas,		

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

No. 9.—ON IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs		
Allen,	Dugas,	Mitchell,
Allison,	Edgar,	Montplaisir,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	Orton,
Auger,	Farrow,	Paterson (Brant),
Bain,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	Patterson (Essex),
Barnard,	Fisher,	Pinsonneault,
Béchar, d,	Fortin,	Platt,
Bell,	Gagné,	Pope,

Benoit,	Gaudet,	Pruyn,
Billy,	Grandbois,	Ray,
Blondeau,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourassa,	Harley,	Ross,
Bryson,	Hay,	Royal,
Burnham,	Hesson,	Scott,
Burns,	Hickey,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Homer,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Catudal,	Jenkins,	Sutherland (Selkirk),
Chapleau,	King,	Taylor,
Cimon,	Kirk,	Trow,
Cochrane,	Kranz,	Tyrwhitt,
Cockburn,	Labrosse,	Watson,
Colby,	Landry (Kent),	White (Hastings),
Coughlin,	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Daly,	McCallum,	Wigle,
Dawson,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Desautniers (Mask'ngé),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wright and
Dickinson,	McNeill,	Yeo.—84.

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

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that the said report be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons a copy of a despatch which he has received from the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in reply to a Joint Address to the Queen, expressing sympathy with Her Most Gracious Majesty, on the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Albany.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 30th January, 1885.

(Copy—No. 57.)

The Earl of Derby to the Governor General, Canada.

DOWNING STREET, 1st May, 1884.

MY LORD.—I have received and laid before the Queen your Despatch (No. 65,) of the 9th ultimo, enclosing a Joint Address to Her Majesty from the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, expressing sympathy with Her Most Gracious Majesty on the death of His Royal Highness the Duke of Albany.

I am commanded by the Queen to request that you will convey Her Majesty's thanks to the Dominion Senate and House of Commons for this expression of their sympathy, which Her Majesty has received very gratefully.

I have, etc.,

DERBY.

Governor General
The Most Honorable
The Marquis of LANSDOWNE, G.O.M.G.
&c, &c, &c.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) presented first report of the Committee appointed to supervise the official reporting of the Debates.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be convenient if the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) would state when he proposes to ask the House to concur in the report of the Debates Committee which he has laid on the Table.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I should like to do it to day. I have given the usual notice, but I will do it to-morrow if the House will consent.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE STATUTES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD laid on the Table reports of the Commissioners appointed to consolidate and revise the Statutes of Canada. He said: There are two parts, and some tables are wanting to the second part. The whole of
Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the revised Statutes are here, and the tables will be finished by the printers to-day or to-morrow. Then the whole will be distributed, with the tables. The French copies are not yet ready, but will be laid on the Table as soon as they are printed.

Mr. BLAKE. I think that, with a reasonable notice of that kind, the hon. gentleman might move it, because it obviously involves a double impression being made in the meantime.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose the report will be printed in the Votes and Proceedings?

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, I suppose so.

ADVANCES TO PROVINCES.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act 37 Vic., cap. 17. He said: This is for the purpose of amending an Act which provides that the Dominion Government may, on application made by a Local Government, by Order in Council, advance to the Province or Provinces such sums of money as they may require for public works, out of the debt account. The amendment of the Bill requires that that application shall have the assent of the Legislature.

Mr. BLAKE. Of both Legislatures?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; but, for instance, if an application should come from the Province of New Brunswick, the assent of the Legislature of that Province must be obtained to the proposal that the amount should be withdrawn from the debt account.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose that this Government should have full power to refuse such application, or is the power to be given to the Provinces, as of course, to draw at any moment?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The law at the present moment is that this Government shall have the power to refuse any such application, but circumstances have occurred which have led the Government to believe that it is in the interest of all parties that the assent of the Legislature should be had to any such application.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is the only alteration?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, that is the only alteration.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is quite competent for the Government, as an administrative act, to refuse to assent to the application of any Province unless it is backed by the assent of the Legislature. The Government is not under any compulsion to assent to any such application. It has power to say yea or nay; and, if at any time it thinks that the opinion of the Local Legislature, as well as that of the Local Executive should be given in regard to such an application, it has the power to say so.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is true, but the Government think it is well that no such responsibility should be thrown upon the Dominion Government, as, in refusing the application of a Provincial Government, it is at once brought into collision with that Government. We think that a vote of the Local Legislature should be obtained before any sum of money is withdrawn. Of course, no Government—either Dominion or Provincial—ought to use money without consent of Parliament. Hitherto, under the law which was introduced for a very good purpose by my hon. friend for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the Provincial Government is enabled to apply for an advance out of the money at its credit for local purposes, but it does not appear on the face of the application whether there has been a vote of the Local Legislature or not; and this

amendment is proposed in order to avoid all question in regard to the matter, and to avoid all possible collision between the Provincial and Dominion Governments in regard to it.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose even Ontario will participate?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Even Ontario will participate.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LETTER POSTAGE.

Mr. HESSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to reduce the rate of postage on letters to two cents per $\frac{1}{2}$ oz.?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention of the Government during the present Session to reduce the postage on letters to two cents.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, instructions given, reports of engineers, and all documents whatsoever, in relation to the selection of the shortest and best line for a railway between the present terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway and one of the seaports of the Maritime Provinces.

He said (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to deal lengthily with this question, at this stage of the Session, for I understand that the papers, on which any debate ought to be based, to be of advantage to public interest generally, and to the Province of Quebec in particular, have not yet been brought down. But I take this opportunity of calling the attention of the Government to a certain rumor, now in circulation, and of which it is expedient to inform the Government. It has been recently stated that an exploration had been made from St. Charles station on the Intercolonial towards the Seven Island through the fifth or sixth range of the township of Montmagny. By taking this line we reach a certain knoll, a certain hill, whose summit is about 400 feet above the ordinary level in those parts. It seems a report on this question has been made to the Government who gave instruction to the explorer, Mr. Light, to discontinue the exploration. In spite of that, according to the rumor, the engineer took upon himself to make an exploration by going round the mountain, and discovered a route just as short, and even shorter, than the proposed line, if the grade is taken into consideration. Nevertheless, rumor has it—I do not wish to affirm anything, but rumors are always allowed to be repeated—that the Government have not yet given, or does not wish to give, instructions to this engineer to the effect that what is called an instrumental survey should be made on this new line. I wish to call the attention of the Government to these facts, at this stage of the Session, so that they may not, at a more advanced stage, come to us and say: We have encountered insuperable difficulties. Indeed, these difficulties are not unconquerable, as the Government may see for themselves, by referring to the last reports fyled by Mr. Light, the engineer. These are the only remarks I shall make to-day, and I have deemed it my duty to make them, so that I may not be charged, later on, with having failed to make them in proper time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the hon. Minister who is in charge of the Railway Department, is not present, but I shall not fail to repeat to him the remarks just made by the hon. member. I am convinced that he will be most happy to receive the information just given, and that he will not fail to give the necessary instructions.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence between the Federal and Ontario Governments and the Imperial Government, on the subject of the Imperial Act, 21-22 Victoria, Chapter 90, known as the British Medical Act, 1858; the Imperial Act 31-32 Victoria, Chapter 29, known as the British Medical Amendment Act, 1868; the Imperial Act 41-42 Victoria, Chapter 33, known as the Dentists' Act, 1878; and the amendments proposed to be made thereto, during the present Session of the Imperial Parliament.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). It was understood yesterday that I should to-day move the adoption of the report of the Committee on the Debates of this House. I may say that information has reached me since the report was presented, which will lead me to propose to refer the first part of it back to the Committee for further consideration—that is, the part having reference to the resignation of the head of the French translators' staff, the appointment of another in his place, and the appointment of another translator to fill the vacancy. I propose only to move, therefore, the other part of the report, which it is important to pass upon at once, because it involves a change in the distribution of the reports, and we ought to know the result as soon as possible. I beg, therefore, to move:

That so much of the first report of the Select Committee appointed to supervise the report of the Debates of this House during the present Session, as refers to the daily issue and the distribution of the bound copies of the said report, be adopted.

I may say that the effect of this, so far as the cost is concerned—and I have got the figures made up by the Printing Department—will be an annual saving of about \$1,072. Last year we agreed to give to each member of the House five copies of the bound Report; this year some members of the Committee have had communication during the Recess with a number of members of the press, who have complained that the unrevised copies that are sent to the newspapers throughout the Dominion, are of practically little use, because they are not revised or corrected; that they may in fact be led into serious error by the Report—and none but serious errors are permitted to be corrected—and it may thus through the newspapers become the permanent record of that serious error in respect to the member of any particular constituency. Journalists would greatly prefer to have the perfected copies sent to them at the end of the Session, and give up altogether the daily distribution. With the view of accomplishing that end without adding to the cost, it is thought that the members will agree to give up three of their copies. Last year it was agreed to give five bound copies of *The Debates* to each member, so that they might be able to distribute some of them among their constituents; but I think experience has shown that the three or four extra copies for each member is not enough to make a satisfactory distribution, but just enough to make it really embarrassing. It is desirable to give bound copies to libraries, mechanics' in-

stitutes and institutions of that kind, and the proposal of the Committee is to have such a reserve of copies by means of this change that they will be able to give a bound copy of *The Debates* to each institution, so that they may be accessible to any person in the locality who may desire to consult them. In that case the members will receive only two bound copies instead of five, as heretofore. The number to be bound will be exactly the same as last year. The number of newspapers on the distribution list is about 500 English and 60 French. We will have 100 more English copies bound and 100 less French copies, so that in the aggregate the number of bound copies will be exactly the same. There will be a saving of 560 copies for daily distribution, which would, I have said, amount to a saving, according to a statement made in the Printing Department, of \$1,072 on the whole.

Mr. BLAKE. Would the hon. gentleman state what is the saving effected on the daily distribution by itself—the diminution of the press daily copies?

Mr. WHITE. About 560 copies a day.

Mr. BLAKE. And how much is it in money?

Mr. WHITE. \$1,072. Outside that saving the condition is precisely the same as before. We print and bind the same number of completed copies, but instead of giving five copies to each member we give him two copies, and the other three will go to supply the press with bound copies.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very glad the hon. gentleman proposes to refer back the first part of the report—not that I have any information as to the individual who has been named, but because I think it will be a good thing, unless special circumstances require otherwise, that in all cases of vacancy on this staff an opportunity should be given, after knowledge of the vacancy has become public, for applications to be made to the Committee in order that they may have a large range of applicants from whom to choose. I say I know nothing of the individual, but I think that will be a wholesome rule to follow, and I hope that the Committee will adopt it with reference to this appointment. As to that part of the report before us, I must confess that I view with great regret the proposal of the Committee to discontinue the daily distribution to the press of the country. We have a system, whether it be for good or ill, of publishing an Official Report of *The Debates*, and the system necessarily impairs the fullness of the publication by the other media of communication to which the public has been accustomed to look. The great newspapers of the country do not publish as full reports as they otherwise would of the debates. Now, it is very important that the only medium practically superseding all other media the only medium by which the public can attain a knowledge of what goes on here, and as it goes on here, which is through the circulation, directly or indirectly, of their official reports—I say I think it of great consequence that the press of the country should have an opportunity, while the debates are going on, while Parliament is sitting and as soon as possible after the utterances of members have taken place here, of knowing what the views are of the public men of the country, the representatives of the people, what the current of discussion has been in respect of the matters which are in agitation. Full use is not made—I regret to be obliged to express the opinion that sufficient use is not made—of this daily issue. That we cannot help, but I think it is our business to give an opportunity to the daily press—I do not say of publishing our long speeches at all—but of having that information which is to be derived from a perusal of the debates and to express their views and frame their articles upon questions of public policy. I am not at all opposed, as long as the system of *Hansard* goes on, to arrangements being made by which the press of the country should receive a record in a permanent form of the debates, as well as the

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

daily issue. That is another question. If we are so variable as to decide that what we solemnly determined last Session was a mistake, that it was an error to give five copies to members, as the Committee proposed last Session, well and good; if it is decided that some other use of these extra copies, which is a better use, can be made, well and good; but it does seem to me an important thing, as long as we preserve an official debate, that we should not cut off the supply to the press from day to day of the means of obtaining early and authentic information of what goes on here.

Mr. CHARLTON. I believe the conclusion arrived at by the Committee to send bound volumes of *The Debates* to the newspaper press in place of the daily issue, was in consequence of an application by the newspaper press of the country. Representations were made by those gentlemen that the daily issue was practically useless to them, that in point of fact it was not an authentic copy, not a revised copy, and that in being guided by it they were likely to make serious mistakes, and that, therefore, the bound copy would be much more valuable to them. It was to meet their views that the Committee took action with reference to substituting bound copies for the daily issue. The Committee sought to make an arrangement by which the expense of *The Debates* would not be increased by this change, and they have done so. It was thought the members of the House would give up the privilege of having five copies and taking two instead, in order that the expense might not be increased. I presume that the great mass of the newspapers in the country would prefer the bound volumes to the daily issue, and in that belief this change is proposed by the Committee.

Mr. CASEY. I do not know how thoroughly the members of the Committee have been able to consult the press in reference to this matter, but I am quite sure that the members of the press are not the only parties who should be considered in this matter. If they are under the impression for the time being that a bound volume at the end of the Session would be of more use than the daily issue, I do not know that we are obliged to accept that conclusion as final. I quite agree with the opinion expressed by my leader that the press ought to have both—I think I understood him to that effect. I quite agree that the unrevised reports of the speeches here are sometimes erroneous; but I must pay this tribute to the *Hansard* staff, that the reports are on the whole and in the average, remarkably good; that they are infinitely better, in my opinion, than any reports that could be secured by any newspaper sending reporters here at its own expense; that they, therefore, form an infinitely more correct representation of what passes in this House than any newspaper in the country could secure if the daily issue of unrevised reports were cut off. I am, therefore, strongly of the opinion that the daily issue should be continued as the only means whereby the press can comment intelligently, and at the time when comment is needed, on what passes in this House. We all know that the bound volumes do not come out until the middle of summer, and by that time newspaper comment on what passes this week or during the next few succeeding weeks would fall very flat. It is of the highest importance that the newspapers should possess for the purposes of comment the best obtainable report of the speeches here immediately after they are delivered. As regards the proposal to deduct three copies from each member of the House in order to provide bound copies for the press, I am not quite inclined to agree with the Committee. I have not found that the five copies which I have received this year were too many for the demands I had for them. I do not think any hon. member will say that he had any difficulty in disposing of his four spare copies. We nearly all have not only institutions that should possess a record of this kind, but in nearly every constituency there are leaders

of opinion who likewise ought to possess the record to enable them to form their own conclusions and assist in forming opinion in the neighborhood as regards political matters. If it is necessary to retrace somewhere in order to provide bound copies for the press, I believe it can be effected in regard to the publication of other documents with which we are deluged, many of which are of very little general interest. Many of these documents, which are published at a large public expenditure, possess very little interest, and in many cases they possess interest only to members from one part of the Dominion. Retrenchment might be made in this direction, not only sufficient to give the press bound volumes of *Hansard*, but to provide us with a larger number of reports of general interest, in regard to which I shall take another opportunity of speaking.

Mr. HESSON. I am very glad to approve, for once, of the opinion expressed by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey). No doubt the report expresses the feeling of newspapers which have representatives here; but there is a large number of papers which have no representatives here, and they are equally important in the different counties in which they are published. The work of the reporting staff has certainly improved very much as compared with that done during the first few years I had any experience of it in this House. I think their reports are very fairly correct, and where there are any errors worth noticing they can be corrected by members for the bound volume. As regards the distribution of the five copies allotted to members last year, I quite agree with the hon. member for West Elgin, that there was not much difficulty experienced in distributing them, and we could have distributed many more. I was able to supply the reading room of the Mechanics Institute and the reading room of the Grand Trunk Railway, and also two leading papers of my county, leaving myself one copy. I cannot conceive why the Committee propose to give us two bound volumes instead of five. I should prefer that one volume be given rather than two volumes. If we receive five copies I can distribute four to the institutions and newspapers of the county, but I should not know what to do with a single extra copy. It would be better to leave the matter as it is at present.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant). The change in regard to the distribution of *Hansard* was made in the Committee at my suggestion. I took occasion during last summer to consult with a number of the newspaper men of Ontario, and from the views they expressed to me I am satisfied that the change proposed will meet with their approbation. The copies of *Hansard* supposed to be distributed daily from the House are not distributed daily, but they are often received at the newspaper offices in bundles of five or six issues. The newspapers throughout Ontario, to my knowledge, depend more especially on the reports which appear in the leading dailies for their reading with respect to the proceedings of Parliament. In sending to the press the advance sheets, the newspapers not only get incorrect reports which cannot be referred to with authority afterwards, but they do not receive an index, and consequently, if they desire to bind the *Hansard* at the close of the Session, they find they have not correct copies of the reports of the House as authorized, and have not an index by which they can refer to any particular speech that may be contained therein. I think in the interest of the newspapers the change which has been suggested is a good one, and I am satisfied it will meet with the approbation of nine-tenths of the newspaper publishers of the Dominion. The advance sheets are practically of no use to them at the present time, whereas the bound volumes would be of great service, especially during the progress of elections in the coming years. The change, I repeat, is a desirable one in the interests of the newspaper men. If it is the wish of the House to furnish the advance sheets as

well as bound copies, the newspaper men will not object; but if it is to be a choice between the daily issue and bound volume, nine-tenths of the press will prefer to obtain bound volumes at the close of the Session.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened to this discussion, and I must say I entirely agree with the hon. member who opposed the report submitted by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). I have heard no other ground for the change advanced than this: That when the daily reports are sent to the newspapers, they fail to obtain an index with them, and at the end of the Session they have the loose copies which are not of the same service as a bound volume with an index would be. The difficulty can be surmounted very easily. I understand from a member of the Committee that it will take 500 bound volumes to supply the press with the complete report, index included, ready for the library. In the meantime the points presented by the hon. member for Elgin strike me as having a great deal of sound, common sense. The bound volumes do not get out till well on in the summer. The questions discussed are live questions only during the sitting of Parliament and for a very short time afterwards—at all events a very large majority of them are so. It is of the greatest importance that the press should have access to the debates at length, presented to them in an official character as the discussions go on. What difficulty is there in securing this? It is said that some of the debates so printed are issued in an incorrect form. I must say this for the gentlemen who occupy the position of official reporters in this House, that whenever I have had occasion to look carefully over the speeches I have delivered I have found that they have been reported generally very accurately, and I have heard from others no very serious complaints in that respect; and I think it would be depriving the public—the *clientèle* of the newspapers of the country—of an amount of information which they should not be deprived of, if they were prevented from having access to the daily official reports as printed by this House, and, therefore, I should oppose the portion of the report which makes a recommendation to that effect. I know that gentlemen who occupy positions on the Committee and have before them the reasons *pro* and *con* as to any particular change or amendment, should have every consideration given to any conclusions at which they arrive, but I have heard no sufficient reason to satisfy me that we should deprive the papers of these daily reports. If it is necessary to give them additional advantages let us add to the cost—I am told it will only cost something about \$1,000 to furnish the bound copies of these reports—and give them to the newspapers, bound and indexed complete.

Mr. MILLS. I cannot say that I concur in the report of the Committee. I think the system which was followed last year is of more service than the one the Committee have proposed. It is my impression that it would be a great advantage to the press to have the bound copy, but if they are obliged to choose between the bound copy and the current publication from day to day, if the press does its duty, it appears to me that the current publication is of far more consequence than the bound volume. It is no doubt very useful during an election campaign to have these official reports to refer to, and newspaper men during an election find it very convenient to have a volume of the Debates at hand from which they can see what has been said upon questions which are made the issue in an election contest. But the members of this House have opportunities of acquiring information upon questions of public importance and public interest which are not open to the press, and unless the press have those daily official reports of *The Debates* of this House they have not the necessary means for criticising and discussing the views which are enunciated in Parliament by the representatives of the people.

Whether it be advantageous to issue a smaller number of copies to the members, each member is able to judge best for himself. If the Committee feel that it is necessary in the public interest, and with a view to the present condition of the public revenue, to economise in this particular, I do not make any objection, but I think it would be very unfortunate if the press of the country were deprived of the current numbers of *The Debates* as they are issued from day to day. I think it is well that they should have the bound copy, but I think it is of still more consequence that they should have the daily issue. If what the hon. member for Brant says (Mr. Somerville) is true it only shows that some person in the Post Office Department or the Distribution Office is not doing his duty, because members of the press should receive these publications from day to day precisely as members do. They should not be mailed in large bundles at long intervals, but should be issued to the press promptly as they are published.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The question of the daily distribution to the press seems to be the point upon which there is great difference of opinion. If that distribution is to be continued and members will give up three of their five copies—

An hon. MEMBER. Make it four.

Mr. WHITE. No, three is the number mentioned in the report—I say in that case we go on just as we did last year in the matter of cost; that is to say, we can continue the daily distribution to the press without adding to the cost, and give them a volume at the end of the Session. I may say, however, that the suggestion to abandon the daily distribution came from the press itself. I think, as one knowing something about the matter, that there is no hon. gentleman in this House who is better acquainted with the sentiments of the press of Ontario, at all events, than the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Somerville), and the suggestion came from him as representing largely the feelings of the journalists of Ontario themselves. If it is desirable to give the journalists both the daily edition and the bound volume I would suggest that the better plan would be for some member who takes that view simply to move an amendment that the daily distribution to the press be continued, and then the part of the report providing that two copies be given each member and the other copies to the press might be adopted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has been suggested, after hearing the discussion, that the motion stand over until to-morrow, when we shall have had an opportunity of considering it.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest for the consideration of the House that if it is desired to produce the same result of economy which is proposed by the report, it would be better done by our giving up one of our three daily copies, and letting that go towards the economical view of the question.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Perhaps the First Minister would let the report go back to the Committee and we will reconsider the whole matter in view of the discussion which has taken place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move in amendment that the report be not now received but that it be referred back to the Committee for further consideration.

Amendment agreed to.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that a Select Committee composed of Messrs. Blake, Cameron (Huron), Caron, Colby, Daly, Davies, Desjardins, Fortin, Laurier, Macmillan (Middlesex), Ouimet, Scriver, Tassé, Weldon, Mr. MILLS.

Wells, and Wright, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library, and that a message be sent to the Senate acquainting their Honors therewith.

Motion agreed to.

PENSIONS TO WIDOWS OF VETERANS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings) enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to extend to the widows of pensioners of 1812-14, payment of the pension?

Mr. CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to extend the pensions of 1812-14 to widows.

McISAAC'S POND, INVERNESS.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant any money during the present Session of Parliament to make McIsaac's Pond, Inverness, a harbor of refuge for vessels engaged in coasting and fishing on the north-west coast of the Island of Cape Breton?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In 1879 this matter was brought before my Department, and was reported upon by the Chief Engineer, who disapproved of the plan. In 1882 a thorough survey of the locality was made by an officer of the Department, and the matter was considered by the Chief Engineer and an estimate made of the cost. The estimate amounted to \$145,000. Therefore, I must answer that it is not the intention of the Government.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—THE GOVERNMENT MORTGAGE.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether any proposals or suggestions, written or verbal, have been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, or by any of its officers or directors, to the Government, or any Minister, for any pecuniary relief, or for the postponing or any alteration in the status of the Government mortgage, or for the freeing of any pledged property, or for the purchase by or surrender to the Government of any lands, or for the surrender of the undertaking to the Government, or for any change of any kind; and, if so, what is the existing condition of affairs?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No applications have been made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the nature suggested in this question. As to verbal conversations between members or officers of the company and members of the Government, I do not feel called upon to say anything.

TRADE WITH THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES.

Mr. MITCHELL moved for:

Copy of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the several Governments of the Australian and Tasmanian Colonies, or any one acting on their behalf, in relation to the establishing of a more direct communication and extension of trade between these Colonies and Canada; also, all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the British Government on the same subject.

He said: I will not take up the time of the House by referring at any length to this matter. I would simply say that in view of the agitation which has been started in England in favor of federating the Empire, I submit this resolution for the purpose of ascertaining whether Canada has had any negotiations with the next greatest colonies of the Empire, the Australian colonies, or whether the latter have expressed any desire, with reference to closer trade communication than already exists. I think it very desirable that information should be given to Canada in relation to the steps taken, if any, to open up trade between Canada and the Australian colonies. We know that between the United States and the Australian colonies a very large

trade exists. We know that there is steam communication between those countries, and that lines of sailing vessels have been established, and have done a very large trade with New York and other American ports. I think it very desirable, in the interest of Canadian manufactures and of the Canadian people, that closer communication, for trade purposes at any rate, should be established between these colonies, and I make this motion to ascertain whether our Government are doing their duty by taking any steps to open up such communication, and what those steps are.

Motion agreed to.

THE RECENT LOAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for :

Copy of the prospectus of the loan recently issued in London; also a statement showing the amounts of the commission and other charges paid thereon and to whom paid, together with the amounts of the said loan subscribed for by the Financial Agents of the Dominion, or by the Bank of Montreal, with the dates of the said subscriptions, and copies of all Orders in Council connected with the said loan.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no objection to the motion and the information will be furnished with the least possible delay, as far as it is in the power of the Government to give it, but, as the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution understands perfectly well, the Government do not possess the names of the parties tendering. In the Public Accounts laid on the Table of the House we have given in detail the information furnished us as to the different tenders, but the information in possession of the Government will be furnished immediately.

Mr. BLAKE. It is impossible then to give the names. I remember some very serious animadversions on my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) some years ago, because he declined to give the names, but the hon. gentleman finds it impossible to do that which my hon. friend was condemned for not doing.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I know nothing about that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman was otherwise occupied then.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not say that the hon. gentleman said so; he was then in a happier place.

Motion agreed to.

ADVERTISEMENTS FOR LOAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for :

Return giving the names of all newspapers in which the Loan recently issued in London was advertised, together with statement of length of time during which said advertisement appeared.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no objection to this. I would suggest to the hon. member, as he is no doubt anxious to get the fullest information before the House, that he include the loans of 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1878 as well.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no objection, but I want to call the attention of this House to a practice which is becoming very inconvenient. Motions have been moved for again and again which could be granted in a few days as they were made; but for reasons of their own, such as those which were alluded to not very long ago, these returns are often encumbered by the Government with a huge mass of perfectly unnecessary and useless matter, costing unnecessary expenditure of thousands of dollars. I have not the faintest objection to the hon. gentleman altering that motion if he likes. I do not think it affects or will affect the question in the slightest degree. I suppose though that it is not going to cause this information, which is of very practical importance, to be delayed for several months until it will be of no use to me or anybody else.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I move that the motion be amended by striking out all after the word "which" in line 2 of the said motion, and inserting the following instead thereof:—

"the Loans of 1874, 1875, 1876, 1878 and 1884, were advertised, together with a statement of length of time, during which the said advertisements appeared."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. How soon will that be furnished?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I imagine I can get the same information as for 1884, which is upon the charges made by the agents. We can turn them all up by going back a few years, the same as we can for 1884.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No necessity to send to England.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

BANK ADVANCES TO GOVERNMENT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for :

Returns of amount of sums advanced to the Government of the Dominion by way of loan by any banks or persons in Canada or England on the 1st February, 1885.

He said: All I want to know is what amount, if any, has been loaned to the Government by those institutions.

Motion agreed to.

OPERATIVES IN FACTORIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for :

Returns, statements or correspondence in possession of the Government, showing the number of operatives employed in factories in the Dominion in 1878 and 1884, together with the amount of capital invested and wages paid.

He said: This has reference to certain statements recently made by the hon. the Minister of Finance in another place. I understood him to say that his comparisons were made between 1878 and 1884. If not with the year 1884, I will alter the motion to whatever year the information he referred to was obtained for. I notice that there are certain sums placed in the warrants of the Governor General, certain charges made for this information, and it is obviously desirable that, even if it be in an imperfect state, whatever information the hon. Finance Minister possesses on the subject, on the strength of which he made these statements, should be laid on the Table at the earliest moment.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may state for the information of the mover that it is scarcely necessary to press his motion, though we have no objection to it, as a Return is now being prepared, to be submitted to the House at once, and will be laid before the House before the financial statement is made. The information is now being put in form, so that it will be accessible, in the readiest possible form, for hon. members of the House.

Motion agreed to.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837 AND 1838.

Mr. HICKEY moved :

That it is expedient that some suitable recognition be made by the Government to the Volunteers of 1837 and 1838 for the very valuable services they rendered in defence of their country at that time.

He said: In bringing this motion before the attention of the House I am quite aware that the claim which is presented in it has also been presented to this Parliament at previous Sessions by other hon. gentlemen. But, Sir, having the honor to represent a county in which many of those veterans reside, I have felt it my duty towards them

to again press this claim upon the attention of the Government and Parliament, and also to pay my homage to those principles which actuated them to stand by their country and defend its Government. In doing so, I am not unmindful of the fact that those who were at that time in arms against the authorities have since become loyal, true and faithful citizens; nor have I forgotten that the cause which those people then endeavored to maintain might fairly be considered an honest and just cause; but this should not overshadow or obliterate the great fact that these loyal and forbearing men who turned out in 1837 and 1838 did so at the command and call of their country. It was not for them to ask or reason why they were called upon to stand by the Crown, theirs was to do their duty. I think that great principle should not be forgotten, and in these days, when we hear hon. gentlemen, who have attained to some fame, talking about annexation and about proclaiming the independence of Canada, it will not be unprofitable to take a retrospective view and learn something from the political scenes of the yesterdays of our country. The House well understands that the great result which was evolved from the patriotic devotion of those men in 1837-38 is that we have this great and glorious country of Canada to-day—a united Canada. Had these men failed at that time in obeying the call of their country, what condition we would have been in to-day it would be difficult to say. Canada might have been a thing of the past altogether, and we might not have had the glorious right of maintaining our nationality as we do now. It has occurred to me that, in the great wealth of the North-West, the Government might find some means of giving a homestead right or a portion of land to those soldier patriots of 1837-38, and in this way would satisfy, I believe, their just and honest claims. I think the present time is opportune, and that those claims might be acknowledged now.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite appreciate the motive that induces my hon. friend to make this motion, and I agree with him in his sense of the loyal spirit which induced the volunteers to obey the call of their country during the disturbances in 1837-38. Those disturbances have long passed. They took place long before the Dominion existed. The claim of those volunteers either in Upper or Lower Canada is upon the Government of those two Provinces. The Dominion being composed of a number of different Provinces, which had no concern in those disturbances and are not called upon in any way to recognise those services. It appears to me that this cannot be the place where those services can be recognised. They should be recognised by the different Provinces where the disturbances took place and where the volunteers performed their duty.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree in the hon. gentleman's view on this subject, as I did before, and I am glad to seize an opportunity of agreeing with him—when the matter came up in a former Parliament, and I may say to the hon. gentleman, who was not a member of that Parliament and may not be aware of the fact, that that view has been already taken by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario in the first Legislature of that Province, under the lead of the late Mr. Sandfield Macdonald, when they felt that it was for them to deal with questions which might arise out of those disturbances, and acted accordingly, and compensated Mr. Montgomery for the burning of his barn by the volunteers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think my hon. friend having expressed his views, had better withdraw his motion.

Motion withdrawn.
Mr. HICKEY.

PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. LESAGE moved for:

Copies of all Reports of Government Engineers made previously to and on this day, in relation to the survey of the several proposed lines for the intersection of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Montreal to a Port on the Atlantic Ocean.

He said (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to take up much of the time of the House while asking that the papers mentioned in this motion may be brought down, for the proper time to decide upon these matters has not yet come. But the matter is of such importance to the people of the district of Quebec, that I shall take this opportunity to call the attention of the Government and of the hon. the Minister of Railways to a certain number of petitions which have been sent to this Parliament by the electors of the county of Dorchester with regard to the survey of the valley of the Etchemin River. This valley, as is well known by hon. members, is situated on the south side of the St. Lawrence and runs from Lévis towards the River St. John on the Maine boundary. It is one of the most splendid valleys of the south shore. At my request, last summer, the Minister of Railways has been pleased to give us a barometric survey. This survey has been renewed during the fall in the same way by a new engineer, who pushed his exploration in the east as far as Churchill Lake in the State of Maine. From that moment we had the satisfaction of learning, through the newspapers, that this valley is the finest and the best adapted for the construction of a railway. We have thus been enabled to ascertain personally, that on 67 miles of road from Lévis to the State of Maine there is a difference of level amounting to 1,218 feet from the platform of the Chaudière Junction to the boundary line, which gives an average gradient of 19 feet per mile, in no case exceeding 50 feet, and that on a very short distance. I do not come here, Mr. Speaker, to ask the House to pronounce at once in favor of extension of the Pacific through the valley of the Etchemin River, for I am not prepared to establish the facts and prove my statements by official returns, these returns not having yet been brought down, and my eloquence not being equal to the task of convincing the House, but I simply come to ask the Government, who have taken into consideration the numerous petitions which have been signed by all the electors of this important division, if after having examined the reports of the barometric surveys, they would feel inclined to grant, as soon as possible, an instrumental survey, such as has been granted to rival routes. I have no desire to involve the Government in useless expenses, but as there may be a debate on this question, I should like to be on an equal footing with my opponents. As to the question of personal interest, I do not deal with this matter from a sectional point of view. Nature has ordained that the Etchemin Valley should be well adapted to the construction of a railway and that it should be situated in my county. Once more I repeat that I do not come to ask the House to oblige the Pacific Railway to go through this valley, but I desire that the Government should take my demand into consideration and furnish me with the returns of which I would be in need should the question come before the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend, the member for Dorchester (Mr. Lesage), will allow me, I would suggest to him to complete his motion by adding something to it. I would desire that the return asked for should be accompanied by the instructions and correspondence between the Government and the engineers. For this purpose I shall ask that the motion of the hon. member be amended by adding to it the following words:—

"also the instructions and correspondence which passed between the several engineers and the Government."

This would complete the return.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Lesage), I must say that the Government will not fail to take into consideration the suggestion which he has just made, with regard to an instrumental survey, in order to obtain the greatest possible amount of scientific information concerning this route, and the Government will not fail to take into account the suggestion of the hon. member. As to the amendment moved by the hon. member for l'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), I would ask him to limit himself to the word "instructions" and not to ask that the correspondence should be brought down. Correspondence of this kind is never laid on the Table of the House, for, being exchanged between engineers and acting engineers it is of a confidential and private nature, and as such is never laid on the Table. As to the instructions, given they must be brought down the moment they are asked for by the hon. member. In consequence, I shall ask him to withdraw from his amendment the words "and correspondence."

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) It seems to me that there can be no objection to laying the official correspondence on the Table of the House. Of course my hon. friend has no intention of moving for the confidential correspondence.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) This correspondence will be comprised under the term "instructions." But if he adds the word "correspondence," the hon. member must see that the whole correspondence between an engineer and an acting engineer—which is of no interest whatever to the public—must be laid on the Table. The official correspondence, that, for instance, which refers to the instructions given by the engineers, will be included in this return.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) The correspondence cannot be comprised in the word "instructions." The word "instructions" is well defined and can be readily understood by itself as well as the word "correspondence," which has also its meaning by itself. No correspondence of a purely confidential nature between the Government and the engineers can be laid on the Table of the House, and my hon. friend does not intend to ask for such papers, but the official correspondence exchanged with the engineers, and their instructions ought to be brought down.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) To avoid further discussion, I will add the word "official" before the word "correspondence."

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS IN ALGOMA.

Mr. DAWSON moved for:

Return of all Customs collections in Algoma during the six months ending 31st December, 1884, showing the amount collected at Port Arthur and its outports, and at Sault Ste. Marie and its outports, respectively; also, the amount collected at Spanish River and such other stations in Algoma as report to Collingwood.

He said: At this period of the Session, I fancy there can be no impropriety in members alluding somewhat to local matters, as there is very little else going on just now, and I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that the Customs revenue in Algoma is increasing very rapidly and becoming an important item in the revenues of the country. Up to the end of the last fiscal year, the Customs revenue at Sault Ste. Marie was \$23,808.95, and at Port Arthur \$199,734.75, while at Spanish River there were collections which I cannot exactly make out, as that part of the district reports at Collingwood, but which I assume to have been about \$6,000, making altogether an amount collected in Algoma of \$229,543.70. Now, Sir, that is a very good showing for such a young

country as Algoma, and I believe the revenue during the year now current will be quite as great as that during the last fiscal year. It is quite evident from this that the population of the district is increasing very fast, and indeed it is so. We hear a great many complaints of an exodus from other districts, that the people are running off to the United States and flying in every direction away from Canada. We hear that very often, but it is a very different story in Algoma. The population is increasing, settlers are coming in every day, and the people who have been lost from other districts are now in Algoma. I believe that is very largely the case. At the last census, the population of Algoma proper was only 20,000, or a little over, and that of the disputed territory 8,000 or thereabout, making altogether 28,000 people in the immense district of Algoma, that is some four years ago. Now, according to the best estimates that can be made, the population is up to 55,000. Port Arthur alone has increased from 2,000 to 6,097, according to a census taken last fall by the municipal authorities. Here we have an instance of the population increasing; there is no exodus from that part of the country. On the Manitoulin Island the population, which was barely 10,000 at the last census, is now estimated by the people themselves to be 13,000 or 14,000. On the north coast of Lake Huron settlement has also been increasing very rapidly, especially back of the Bruce Mines, in a section which used to be considered the most barren part of the whole district; settlements now extend 40 miles back in that particular section. I am sure this House will be much gratified to learn that we have at least one part of the country which is filling up very fast, and where the people are very comfortable and are doing well; in fact, I think they do much better, or at least as well, in these wooded countries as in the prairies of the west. Now, as another evidence of progress, and which is also connected with the motion, I may refer to the increase of the shipping of Algoma, which a few years ago was inconsiderable. The shipping at Port Arthur during the season of navigation of 1884 was as follows:—

	Number of Vessels.	Tonnage.	Tons Freight.	Crews.
Canadian.....	600	407,186	158,315	16,680
American.....	258	95,100	134,577	2,937
Totals.....	858	502,286	292,892	19,617

That is a very satisfactory showing for such a short period—all within two or three years since the district began to grow up. But while the shipping and the trade of that country have been increasing so fast I am happy to say that the losses in shipping from accidents during the past summer have been less than formerly. There have not been so many vessels lost; but still a great deal too many. Last year the hon. Minister of Marine brought forward an Act for inspecting vessels, and I must say that since then the duties of inspectors and all people connected with the shipping, have been pretty well attended to, and the condition of affairs that now exists is in a great measure due to the better supervision exercised by officers employed by the Government. Still, there remains a good deal to be done, as appears from statistics. In Lake Superior there were eight vessels wrecked by heavy weather, with a loss of \$15,000; there were collisions of 12 vessels, involving a loss of \$84,000; stranded, 24, involving a loss of \$50,000; disabled, 8, which were repaired again, involving a loss of \$10,000; ashore, 7, involving a loss of \$66,000; sprung a leak, 7; exploded, 1; total 67 vessels, involving a loss of \$250,000. It thus appears that a good deal is still to be done in the way of a better supervision of vessels. But a good beginning has been made. Fortunately there has been no serious loss of life during the past summer—indeed I think only five or six all told were lost

during the whole season, and they were mostly from accidents. I merely call attention to these matters, Mr. Speaker, in making this motion, to show that that part of the country, at least, is progressing fast, that settlement and traffic are advancing, and that shipping has increased immensely.

Mr. BLAKE. Amongst the interesting information my hon. friend gave us, there was one thing he missed. Would he tell us where Algoma is now? He did not seem to know last Session.

Mr. DAWSON. I shall be very glad to give the hon. gentleman such geographical information as he may require. There is a special Act defining the electoral district of Algoma. It extends from French River on the east to the Winnipeg River at Rat Portage on the west, and from the great lakes on the south to Hudson Bay on the north. It is a pretty extensive district.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is according to the latest advices.

Mr. DAWSON. According to the Act forming the electoral district.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY—MR. BOURINOT'S WORK.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) I would call the attention of the House to the fact that it is impossible for us to get Mr. Bourinot's work in the Library. There are but few copies of it, and I think that those hon. members who wish to refer to this work ought to be enabled to get it, and that a few additional copies ought to be bought for the use of members.

Mr. SPEAKER. That matter will be brought before the Library Committee.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of all sugars imported at Halifax from Jamaica from the 1st of January, 1883, to the 31st of December, 1883; also a return of all sugars from Jamaica entered for the same term at Montreal, either direct or *via* Halifax, giving names of vessel, number of pounds landed; value for duty of each cargo, and rate of duty per 100 lbs. of each shipment.—(Mr. Vail.)

Statement showing the several amounts collected by the Dominion Government for lands sold or leased; for timber, logs or staves, cordwood, telegraph poles or other product of the forest; with the names of persons making such payments, within the bounds and limits of the western part of Ontario, as determined by the decision of the Privy Council against the claim of the Dominion Government.—(Mr. Macenzie.)

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned, at 4.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Minister of Militia and Defence for the year ending 31st December, 1884.—(Mr. Caron.)

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. BEATY moved that in accordance with the recommendation of the first report of the Select Standing Com-
Mr. DAWSON.

mittee on Standing Orders, the time for the reception of petitions for Private Bills be extended to Saturday, the 21st of February instant. He said: I wish to say for the information of the House and of those persons interested in Private Bills, that the Committee desire it to be understood that no further extension will be made.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company, and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 10) to reduce the capital stock of the Federal Bank of Canada, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Small.)

Bill (No. 11) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Allen.)

Bill (No. 13) respecting carriers by land.—(Mr. Mc Carthy.)

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I beg leave to move the adoption of the second report of *The Debates* Committee. I may say that we have dropped all that part of it relating to distribution. The number of copies that will be printed will enable us during the Session to make a daily distribution for the press and also to give them a bound copy at the end of the Session if members should be disposed to deduct the copies given to them. But in the meantime we thought it better to leave it over for further consideration and consultation with the members. The other part of the report relates to the translating staff, and further consultation induced the Committee to adhere to the recommendation of their first report.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved Minute in Council appointing the Right Honorable Sir John A. Macdonald, President of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, the Honorable Sir Leonard Tilley, Minister of Finance, the Honorable Sir Hector Langevin, Minister of Public Works, and the Honorable A. W. McLellan, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as Commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the Act 31 Victoria, Chapter 27, intitled: "An Act respecting the Internal Economy of the House of Commons; and for other purposes."

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, Tuesday, 2nd February, 1885.

COURT OF RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) for instituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Explain.

Mr. McCARTHY. The only explanation I desire to offer is this: That I propose to take the sense of the House on the second reading of the Bill. It has been already referred to Committee, the matter has been fully discussed there; and both the public and the House are familiar with the subject; and I propose, as I have stated, to take the sense of the House on the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 14) to consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the election of members of the House of Commons.

Mr. McCARTHY. Explain.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The Bill which I have moved for leave to introduce is substantially the same as that which was before the House last Session of Parliament, but which, owing to the pressure of business at the close of the Session, we were unable to reach. One of its main objects is to make violations of the provisions of the Bill criminal offences—misconduct on the part of candidates and on the part of electors. The Bill contains several provisions, which I will discuss fully when I move the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE SCOTT ACT.

Mr. TUPPER enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to indemnify the parties who prosecuted under the Scott Act, but failed in their prosecution solely in consequence of the proclamation of the Act being held by the courts to be of no force or effect?

Mr. COSTIGAN. I desire to say that, in the opinion of the Government, there is no reason for assuming any responsibility in regard to the prosecutions referred to.

OFFICE OF MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, How many days was the late Minister of Railways in Canada during the Recess between the Session of 1883 and that of 1884? At what date did he resign? Who has been acting as Minister of Railways since his resignation? Is it intended to fill the office of Minister of Railways? If so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The memorandum with which I have been furnished does not answer the first part of the question—the part with reference to the number of days Sir Charles Tupper was in Canada during the Recess between the Session of 1883 and that of 1884—but I will give the hon. gentleman the information to-morrow. Sir Charles Tupper resigned about the first of June, 1884. The Hon. John Henry Pope has been acting Minister of Railways since that resignation. It is intended to fill the office of Minister of Railways ere long.

OFFICE OF LIBRARIAN OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, When did the office of Librarian of Parliament become vacant? Has a Librarian been appointed? If not, when is it intended that a Librarian shall be appointed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The office of Librarian became vacant on the death of Dr. Todd.

Mr. BLAKE. I asked when.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I say that it was on the death of Dr. Todd.

Mr. BLAKE. But when was that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the 22nd of January, 1884. A librarian has not yet been appointed, one will be appointed ere long—I was going to say to-morrow, only I know the hon. gentleman would laugh.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—SUBSIDY TO THE NORTH SHORE LINE.

Mr. LAURIER moved for :

Copies of all correspondence between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the North Shore Railway Company, for the purchase by

the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company of the said North Shore Railway from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec, or to obtain control of the same, or to make such arrangements as would allow the said Canadian Pacific Railway to extend its railway to Quebec; 2nd, of all correspondence between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway concerning the extension of their railway from St. Martin's Junction to the Harbor of Quebec; 3rd, of all correspondence between the Government and any other persons for the purpose of incorporating such persons for the construction of a railway from the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at St. Martin's Junction to the harbor of Quebec.

He said: It must be within the vivid recollection of hon. members of this House that last Session, when the Government introduced their policy concerning subsidies to railways, they allotted a certain sum to the Government of the Province of Quebec in consideration, as the resolution said, of their having constructed the railway from Quebec to Ottawa, forming a connecting link between the Atlantic and Pacific coasts *via* the Intercolonial and Pacific Railways, and being, as such, a work of national and not merely provincial utility. The reason which was thus summarily recited in the resolution was stated more fully by the then acting hon. Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, that reason being that the railway constructed by the Province of Quebec was really a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway and a part of our national system of railways. This argument of the hon. Minister did not apply simply to that portion of the road which has been acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and which was, at the time that he spoke, actually part of their line, but applied to the whole of the railway as constructed by the Government of Quebec from the City of Ottawa to the harbor of Quebec. The hon. Minister then said further that in his opinion, and indeed in the opinion of the Government of which he formed a part, the best interests of the country required that the whole of the railway constructed by the Quebec Government should be a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that the summer terminus of the railway should be the harbor of Quebec. Indeed, as far as I understood the Minister, he somewhat deprecated the action of the Government of Quebec in failing to secure that national requirement. But I cannot do better than quote the forcible language which was used on that occasion by Sir Charles Tupper. He said:

"We now come to the Province of Quebec; and I may say no person in this House, will question for a moment the fact that if provision had not been made by the Province of Quebec, for the construction of a railway from Quebec to Ottawa, this House would have regarded, the country would have regarded, the Canadian Pacific Railway as entirely incomplete, and would have been prepared to deal with that branch of the question, just as our hon. friends opposite dealt with the question of connecting the Canada Central from Pembroke to Callander, by an appropriation of a sum of money sufficient to accomplish the purpose. The fact that the Government of Quebec anticipated that action, the fact that the Government of Quebec have since Confederation, expended from their own treasury a sum, I believe, of over \$14,000,000 in the construction of railways within the Province of Quebec, instead of diminishing their claim to consideration at this late hour, strengthens it, I think, very much; this fact increases the strength of their position in approaching the Government as they have done, and asking to be recouped a fair amount of that money and to be placed relatively in somewhat the same position as that which they would have occupied if they had not been so forward to promote that which is admitted on all sides to be the great national work of this country. Under these circumstances, the Government of Quebec, having contributed, as I say, over \$14,000,000 in railway construction in that portion of the Dominion, came to this Government with a claim for fair and just consideration as regarded that section of railway construction which they had engaged in and completed and which might fairly be regarded as a portion of the great inter-oceanic line of railway connecting, in fact, across the entire Continent, through Canadian territory, the two oceans. After full and fair consideration of the proposals that were made, and of the fact that they had exhausted the resources of the Province of Quebec in this effort, this successful effort, to construct this most important link of the great national work, the Government came to the conclusion that the Government of Quebec were entitled to a grant of \$12,000 per mile for that portion of the road that had already become a link and a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway,—that portion lying between the city of Montreal and Ottawa; and as regarded the other portion, the only hesitation, the only doubt that existed as to the propriety of expending the \$12,000 per mile from Montreal to the harbor of Quebec, arose from the fact that the Government of Quebec had parted with that portion of the railway, and that, at this moment, it did not afford that short and unrestricted line of communication for the Canadian Pacific

Railway to make the harbor of Quebec that which it is believed, in the interest of the whole of this country, it is desirable it should be made, namely, the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

Indeed so convinced seemed the Government to be that the port of Quebec should be the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway that they thought it proper not only to appropriate the sum of \$6,000 per mile to the Government of Quebec for the line from Montreal to the harbor of that city, but also to ask for an equal amount of \$6,000 per mile to ensure the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal to the harbor of Quebec. The policy which had been propounded was to grant the Province of Quebec a subsidy of \$12,000 per mile, but this subsidy was divided. For the part of the road which had been disposed of in favor of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company—that is to say, from the City of Ottawa to the City of Montreal—the Province was allowed \$12,000 per mile. But for the part from St. Martin's Junction to the port of Quebec, they were only allowed \$6,000 per mile, the difference of \$6,000 being deducted from the subsidy which otherwise would have gone to the Province, in order that it might be applied by the Government in enabling them to extend the railway from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec. Respecting that part of the question Sir Charles Tupper used this explicit language:—

"Under these circumstances it was thought judicious to appropriate \$6,000 per mile to the Government of Quebec, for that portion of the line extending from Montreal to the harbor of Quebec, and to ask Parliament for an appropriation for an equal amount of \$6,000 a mile for the purpose of ensuring the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its present terminus at Montreal to the harbor of Quebec. The resolution states very explicitly the mode in which that appropriation will be used."

It is fair to assume that the Government were impelled to the course which they then took by the strong force of public opinion which they found in favor of that project. The public mind had become uneasy as to the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. A speech delivered by the president of the company, Mr. Stephen, at Portland, had led people to believe, and not unnaturally to believe, that the intention of the company was not to extend their road farther east than the City of Montreal, and after reaching the City of Montreal, to diverge to the south-east, and then, if I may so speak, scamper off to some port on the other side of the line. Public opinion had been considerably agitated on the subject, and the unanimous consensus of opinion was that the railway should be extended along the north shore as far east as where the waters of the St. Lawrence are tapped by the Intercolonial Railway, and that Quebec should be the summer terminus, and some port in the Maritime Provinces the winter terminus; and I remember that a highly representative deputation, composed of delegates from Halifax, St. John and Quebec, had an interview with the Government on that matter. However, whatever may have been the impelling motive of the Government, there was no uncertainty as to their act. They undertook to procure the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway as far east as the harbor of Quebec. I have already quoted the language of Sir Charles Tupper, in which he stated that ample provision for that extension was to be found in the resolution. The resolution to which he referred read thus:—

"For the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, to the harbor of Quebec, in such manner as may be approved by the Governor in Council, \$6,000 per mile, not exceeding in the whole \$960,000."

When this resolution came before the House, my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) pointed out that it was rather wide and indefinite in its scope. He was answered by the Prime Minister that it was made so wide and indefinite the better to enable the Government to carry out the end they had in view. His language was as follows:—

"It is framed so as to enable the Government to procure an extension of this railway from its terminus to the harbor of Quebec.
Mr. LAURIER,

There is no specific mode pointed out, nor is it desirable that there should be. It leaves the question open for the adoption of the best line that can be secured."

In the course of that discussion the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), who I observe is absent to-day, spoke very plainly as to what he believed to be the intention of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. He stated in so many words that he did not believe that they had any intention to go farther east than the City of Montreal, and that so far as could be inferred from their words and deeds, he was fully of opinion that their intention was to divert the trade of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to some American port, as Portland or Boston. He was answered by the Minister of Public Works, whose language as to what was the intention of the Government, and as to what the Canadian Pacific Railway should be compelled to do, was as forcible and definite as language can be. The hon. Minister of Public Works said:

"In answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse I must say this—the hon. gentleman speaks as if the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not to be in the Province of Quebec. That extension is to be from Montreal to Quebec, and in the Province of Quebec, and for the benefit of the whole Dominion, but especially for the Province of Quebec. The intention is to make the harbor of Quebec the eastern terminus in summer of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This has been asked, the people and the press have asked it, and we have come down with these resolutions to carry it out; that is to say, we propose to give \$6,000 per mile in order that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway shall be in the harbor of Quebec."

So that, Mr. Speaker, there cannot be any ambiguity as to what was then the intention and the pledge of the Government in reference to this matter. They directly pledged themselves to procure an extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway as far as the harbor of Quebec; and if the language of the resolution was wide in its scope, the language of the statute, though more explicit, was equally wide. The statute which was framed on the resolution passed by Parliament provided two ways by which the Government could secure the proposed extension. One was that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should buy the section of the North Shore Railway extending from St. Martin's Junction to the waters of the St. Lawrence at Quebec, and the other was that, failing this alternative, failing the co-operation of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company with the Government in that respect, another line should be built from some point near St. Martin's Junction to the waters of the St. Lawrence at Quebec. Here is the language of the statute:

"3. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company may, within six months from the passing of this Act, purchase the North Shore Railway from St. Martin's Junction to Quebec, or may obtain control of the same, or may make with the owners of the said railway such arrangements as will allow the said Canadian Pacific Railway Company to extend its railway to Quebec—failing which, the provisions contained in the three following sections may take effect.

"4. And whereas it may become necessary for the construction of a railway in conformity with the intention and purpose of the subsidy, for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, or some other point on the said railway, to the harbor of Quebec, that a company should be incorporated with the powers requisite for such construction, and for making financial arrangements for the purpose thereof; therefore it is hereby further enacted as follows:—

"For the purpose of incorporating the persons undertaking the construction of the said railway, and those who shall be associated with them in the undertaking, and so soon as a contract shall be made with them by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, for such construction, the Governor may grant to them, under such corporate name as he shall deem expedient, a charter."

Now, Mr. Speaker, such was the state of this matter at the end of last Session. What has taken place since? So far as we can judge, we are standing in exactly the same position as we occupied at the close of last Session. The six months within which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company were to enter upon negotiations for the purchase of the North Shore Railway have lapsed, and the North Shore Railway has not been acquired by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, nor have the company obtained control of the railway, nor have they made any ar-

agement for extending their road to the City of Quebec. And what has been the action of the Government in the matter? So far as we know, the Government have taken no steps to give effect to their intentions, expressed in Parliament during last Session. They began last Session full of fire and zeal, but their zeal appears to have lasted only as long as the Session lasted and to have come to an end with the Session. It would seem, as far as we can know, as if the Government had been compelled by some concealed power to promise what they did. Judging from their activity during the Session, and their inactivity during the recess, we would be led to suppose that they had undertaken an unpleasant duty, which they took occasion to cast off as soon as they could. For my part, I really believe the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) told the truth when he said his belief was that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had no intention of carrying their road farther east than Montreal. I concur in the statement made at the time by Sir Charles Tupper and assented to by the hon. the Prime Minister, and reiterated by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, that the best interests of the country required that the port of Quebec should be made the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and I add this that the winter port should be in some one of the numerous harbors of the Maritime Provinces. The duty of the Government, as expressed by the Government, was to see that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should carry out that intention; if they failed, then some other persons should undertake the duty. At all events, it was the duty of the Government to do something in that matter. The Government, to all appearances, have been perfectly idle; they have taken absolutely no steps to do what they said should, in the best interests of the country, be done. Possibly, however, I may be wrong in my surmise; it may be that, although no result has come from any action of theirs, the Government have been very active, and in order to see how the case stands, I beg to move for these papers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The papers, of course, will be brought down, and I think that it would have been better for the hon. gentleman to have waited until the papers had been brought down. He would then see what has been done, and would probably avoid making some of the statements he has just made. Of course nobody can find fault with the manner in which the hon. gentleman made those statements. They are exactly in accordance with his way of making statements before the House. Of course we cannot find fault with that, but I think it would serve no purpose just now to undertake a discussion on this point before all the papers are brought down. They will be brought down as soon as possible.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF CHIEF JUSTICE MEREDITH

Mr. LAURIER moved for:

Copy of the resignation of the Honorable Judge Meredith as Chief Justice of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec, and of the correspondence which followed that resignation.

He said: Mr. Justice Meredith tendered his resignation in the month of September to the Government, as Chief Justice of the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec. I may be permitted to say at once that the resignation of Mr. Justice Meredith is a great loss to the public of the Province of Quebec. Courteous in manner, of genial disposition, with a high judicial mind, with a vast knowledge of the law, and a spotless character, the Hon. Chief Justice Meredith was a credit to the bench and enjoyed the universal respect of all classes in Lower Canada. Unfortunately the health of Mr. Justice Meredith had been failing some time, and some months previously he had received and accepted a leave of absence. At the expiration of his

leave of absence, in the month of September, finding that his health was still impaired, and that, in all probability, he could not again ascend the bench, he sent in his resignation. If I am correctly informed the Government asked the hon. judge to withdraw his resignation and to accept a further leave of absence for six months. But the very high sense of honor of the hon. judge would not allow him to accept what was tendered. He persisted in his resignation, and ever since the office has been vacant. Five months have elapsed since then and the office is still vacant. Now, I submit it to the sense of the House and it must be apparent to everybody, without argument, that this state of things is highly detrimental to the public at large, and constitutes a great wrong to the other judges whose duties are thereby increased. It must be apparent to everybody, without any argument on my part, that a court which is composed of something like twenty-eight judges cannot work as harmoniously and effectively towards the public as it would, if it were presided over by a Chief Justice, and I put it to the Government and the sense of the House as well that there is no excuse whatever for so long a delay in making the appointment to the important office of Chief Justice of the Province of Quebec. Lawyers are not a scarce article in that Province and there could be no very great difficulty in making a choice, and though in the Province to which I belong the practice has not been followed of making appointments without regard to party, as is done in Ontario, still I submit that in the ranks of the Conservative party of Quebec—since a judge must be selected from the ranks of the Conservative party—it would be easy to find men perfectly competent to become worthy successors of the Hon. Chief Justice Meredith, whether from judges on the bench, or from members of the bar. If I must give the whole of my belief, I must say that I believe that no appointment has yet been made, simply because there have been some political intrigues at the bottom. I would be sorry to believe this, but I cannot see any public motive that can be given as a reason why this office has been kept vacant so long. If any can be given, I would, for my part, be ready and willing to accept it and also be happy to accept it. But, in the meantime, I must call attention to this state of things and say to the Government that it is their imperious duty to make this appointment without any delay—not simply ere long, but without any delay at all.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I can heartily agree with the remarks of my hon. friend respecting the character and standing of Chief Justice Meredith, the great advantage it was to the Province of Quebec to have such a man at the head of the judiciary, and the corresponding loss it was when, from advancing age and ill health, he was obliged to retire. The hon. gentleman has, I think, correctly stated the facts concerning the resignation of the Chief Justice. He and I were neighbors at Rivière du Loup during last summer. He came to see me, and said that, after receiving the views of his medical men and in accordance with his own opinion as to his health, he could not perform his duties satisfactorily to himself. I was exceedingly distressed, I may say, because he was an old personal friend of mine, and, on that ground, and in consequence of my acquaintance with his great abilities and his distinguished standing as a judge, I was extremely sorry to receive the information. I pressed him to try to go on for a few months longer. I said: "I have no doubt that, with the universal feeling that you should remain at your post, the country will accept the action of the Government in giving you, say, six months' longer leave." He said: "I have had a long leave of nine months, which, with my vacation, amounts to nearly a year, and I do not think that I can apply for a further extension of leave." I said: "I am so satisfied that you ought to remain if you can that, if you think another six

months will be of any service to you, I will take the responsibility of asking for the leave of absence from His Excellency without your making any application." So it stood over for a day, and then I received a communication from him stating that what he could not properly ask for he could not properly accept; so I said: "That being your feeling, I have no more to say." The resignation was accepted. The office has not been filled, but it will be filled ere long. There is no political agreement of any kind. There have been, perhaps, conflicting claims of individual judges who may think, each on his own behalf, that he should have the preference. However, we do not hear of any delay in justice, or any impediment to justice. No complaints have reached the Government in consequence of the non-appointment of the Chief Justice. In his absence the senior judge is practically the Chief Justice. I agree, however, with the hon. gentleman that the office should be filled, and it will be filled ere long.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say that I do not think the explanation of the hon. gentleman is at all satisfactory. I am not able to speak from personal knowledge of what the exigencies of the court may be, but I know the exigencies of a court in my own Province under a similar state of things, and I can quite understand the inconvenience which must be caused by the absence of the chief judge where he has the management of a court of twenty-eight judges, as my hon. friend has said. There are difficulties in reference to the disposition of business, which is often left in the hands of the Chief Justice, and it is of much more consequence in point of the want of judicial strength with reference to the working of the whole court than it could be in reference to the much smaller divisions of the High Court of Ontario. I can only express the regret that the Government did not feel the same sense of duty towards the public that the hon. gentleman has explained the late Chief Justice felt. He said that, after having a leave of nine months, and a vacation of nearly three, it was due to the public that he should not retain the office on an extended leave which left it practically empty when it ought to be filled. He declined to accept a further leave because he felt that the office ought to be filled. The hon. gentleman said, "I have no more to say." He acceded, as he must accede, to the view of the Chief Justice, but the Chief Justice might just as well have had the leave, because the office has not been filled, and, as far as the public business, of which he was so tender, is concerned, there has been no improvement consequent upon his resignation. The hon. gentleman speaks of filling the office "ere long" and so forth, but I remember that he spoke of filling another office "ere long"—the office of Minister of Railways.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Is that a previous debate?

Mr. BLAKE. No, it was a question on which no debate was allowed, and consequently it could not be a previous debate. He said that he would fill that office "ere long." My opinion is that in that case it ought to have been one delayed. We have heard that in this matter there is an aspirant for this office, or an office that might be vacated when it is filled, from the centre of Quebec, from the very middle of the city; and that difficulties connected with a subject which was before the House this afternoon have been amongst those which have caused this long delay, to the detriment of the administration of justice, though perhaps to the advantage of the hon. gentleman.

Motion agreed to.

HIGH COMMISSIONER FOR CANADA.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence relative to any payments, claims or allowances on any account whatever in respect to the office of High Commissioner not already brought down;

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

And separate statement in detail, with dates and sums, of all payments made on any such accounts in respect to the office during its tenure by the present incumbent;

An estimate in detail of all sums payable on any such accounts up to this date and yet unpaid;

Also, copies of all correspondence not yet brought down as to the letting or purchase of a residence for the High Commissioner, and as to the repairs and furnishing thereof, with copies of all accounts in connection with the same;

A statement in detail of all sums paid in respect of such letting or purchase or furnishing or repairs;

And an estimate of all sums payable, but not yet paid, in respect thereof.

He said: This motion is practically the same as one carried last Session. It will be in the recollection of the House that sums in round numbers, of about \$28,000 for a residence, and about \$12,000 for furnishing the same, were voted for the High Commissioner. I see by the Public Accounts that the sum of \$41,000 has actually been paid on those accounts. There was also brought down last Session correspondence between the High Commissioner and the gentleman whom he employed in London to negotiate with reference to the purchase or rent of a residence; also, as to the furniture, with the inventory of the same. It would be satisfactory to get further statements which will indicate the completion of the transaction.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—ALLOWANCES TO CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, reports and Orders in Council not covered by the previous Address relating to the allowances proposed to be paid to the Canadian manufacturers of certain goods required by the Canadian Pacific Railway; of all applications for such allowances, and correspondence in connection therewith; a statement of the calculations on which the allowances have been based, and an estimate in detail of the probable sums payable out of the Treasury in respect of each class of goods, assuming them to be made in Canada, to the extent of the company's requirements, and of the *ad valorem* percentages of all allowances on each such class.

He said: This is largely a repetition of motions formerly made. A resolution passed three years ago permitted us to ask separately for these matters which the House unanimously agreed should be brought down ten days from the opening of the Session. These are on other lines, which experience has demonstrated were not covered by that resolution.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—ROUTE.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

A statement of the various matters required to be returned under "The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879," and amendments thereto.

For the fiscal year 1883-84, in each case, separately, as to,—

1. The line of railway specifically provided for by the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

2. The branches and extensions already acquired or controlled by the company.

Like statements with like particulars, separately, as to,—

1. The Eastern Division, and (2) the Western Division of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Statement of the total sum expended up to the 30th June, 1884, by the company under their contract,—

1. For work of construction on the line to be built by the company as particularly specified in the contract.

2. For rolling stock for the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway as particularly specified in the contract.

3. For works of construction on extensions and branches and lines controlled by the Company, not embraced in the Railway particularly specified in the contract.

4. For rolling stock for all extensions and branches not so embraced. Like Statements to those hereinbefore mentioned, up to the 31st December, 1884.

Statement of the receipts of the company up to the 30th June, 1884, on account of:—

(1.) Cash subsidy.

(2.) Land Grant Bonds.

(3.) Bonuses.

- (3.) Land sales or transactions not embraced in the operations connected with the Land Grant Bonds.
 (5.) Number of acres of land subsidy.
 (6.) Amounts of bonuses agreed for though not paid.
 (7.) Government loan.
 Like Statements up to the 31st December, 1884.

He said : This, with the exception of No. 7, in the addition, is precisely a copy of a former motion which was carried.

Mr. POPE. I would remind the hon. gentleman that with reference to some of these headings very likely we cannot obtain the information in the way he asks for it, but I think it will all be included in the annual Return under the Consolidated Railway Act, which will be laid before the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Does my hon. friend say he will not grant the Return ?

Mr. POPE. No, that does not follow. It depends considerably upon the accounts. I do not know whether they are kept according to the divisions which the hon. gentleman mentions.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman should observe that there are several hundreds of miles between the two divisions that are specified, and it is quite obvious that these accounts can be kept together, and are kept together.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRANTS TO THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE moved for :

Statement of the number of persons entering Manitoba or the North-West by rail, during each month of the last calendar year ; and of the number of persons leaving Manitoba or the North-West by rail during each such month ; also, copies of all correspondence, reports, data and statements on which are based the estimates made by the Government of the number of immigrants who have come from specified countries and settled in each Province of Canada, and in the North-West Territories during the year, and of the number of Canadians who have left each Province or Territory, or the Dominion, during the year.

He said : This is also a copy of a motion adopted last Session.

Mr. POPE. There is no objection to bringing down the information asked for, so far as this can be done. There is some information, however, asked for which we cannot give ; but whatever we can furnish will be brought down to the House.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—STOCK.

Mr. BLAKE moved for :

Statement showing the date and rate at which the Ten million dollars of Canadian Pacific Railway stock formerly pledged for a loan of about \$4,950,000 was sold, and the net amount received by the company in respect of such sale.

He said : The House will remember that the amount of stock issued by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and in the hands of the public when the arrangement was made was \$55,000,000, but a further sum of \$10,000,000 was embraced in the arrangement. It was stated in the public press about two months ago that the loan for which this \$10,000,000 of stock was pledged had been paid off and the stock sold, and we are obviously very much interested in knowing at what price the stock was sold, as on that is based the estimate of the 10 per cent. dividend.

Motion agreed to.

ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for :

Correspondence or papers touching applications by Local Governments for advances of money on debt account, and for any papers throwing light on the reasons for the pending Bill on the subject.

He said : it will be in the recollection of the House that the Finance Minister announced the other day that certain circumstances had occurred in connection with applications by Provinces for advances of money on debt account, which in the opinion of the Government, rendered it proper that a Bill dealing with the subject should be introduced. I suppose the applications are on record in some form or other, and it is highly important we should know what they are.

Motion agreed to.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for :

1st. A copy of the Order in Council respecting the submission to the Supreme Court of the case agreed on between the Government of Canada and the Government of each of the Provinces under the Liquor License Act of 1883, and the Act to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883, as to the competency of Parliament to pass the said Acts in whole or in part ;

2nd. A copy of the said case of the factum of the Government of Canada and of the factum of each of the said Provinces—the arguments of counsel in such case and the notes of the short-hand reporter taken during such argument ;

3rd. A copy of the report of said Court in said case ;

4th. All correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of each of said Provinces touching said case, and the submission thereof and the report thereon ; and all correspondence between said Governments before and since said report, respecting the same and the matters in dispute and so referred.

He said : I trust the returns asked for will be brought down very shortly. I do not propose to discuss the question just now ; but, later on, I intend to invite the attention of the House to some of the questions necessarily arising in connection with this matter, and such a discussion cannot be properly conducted unless we have the papers before us. I trust, therefore, no unnecessary delay will occur in bringing them down.

Motion agreed to.

CHARGES AGAINST LIEUT.-COL. O'MALLEY.

Mr. CASEY moved for :

Copy of Report of the Major General Commanding the Militia in reference to the charges against Lieut.-Col. O'Malley, 25th Battalion.

He said : This motion has been referred to in the House on previous occasions and I do not intend to discuss it at all at present, further than to say that I think perhaps it is unfortunate that the course finally adopted in regard to these charges was not adopted sooner, viz., that of having a report made upon them by the Major General commanding the Militia, so that the officer in question, whom I know to be an enthusiastic volunteer, might have had an opportunity of clearing himself sooner of these charges. However, that course has been taken at last, and I am glad to understand that the report of the Major General entirely clears Col. O'Malley from the charges ; I am sure the hon. Minister of Militia himself will agree with me in rejoicing that such is the case. I have no doubt that the report of the Major General will cover all that is necessary to bring to the House about the matter, and I hope the Minister will bring it down as early as possible.

Motion agreed to.

EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT, &c.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for :

Statement showing sums expended on Capital Account, from the 1st day of July, 1884, to the 1st day of February, 1885, and the purposes for which said sums were expended. Also for statement of the gross amount of the debt of the Dominion on the 1st day of February, 1885.

He said : If the hon. gentlemen have no objection I would like to add to the motion : " And a statement of debts and assets to that date, as given in the Public Accounts, pages

13 and 14." I may explain, as I notice the Finance Minister is not in his place, that this information is always on record in the Department, and I think it could be obtained with very little trouble. I do not at all want to bother the Department to bring down a comparative statement; I merely want a statement showing how our debts and assets stand on the 1st of February, as we now have it on the 1st of July.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Minister of Finance is not in his place, but I have no doubt he will agree to the amended notice.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the number of persons who applied in the year 1884 for licenses under the License Act of 1883. The total number of licenses granted in Canada. The total number in each Province, and in each Electoral District. The total number refused a license and the reason for refusal. The total number in each Province who paid part of the fee but did not take out a license. The total amount received by the Government for such licenses in Canada, in each Province of Canada, and also in each Electoral Division; together with a statement showing what salary was paid the commissioners, inspectors, and sub-inspectors under the Act, and giving the names and address of said commissioners, inspectors, and sub-inspectors in every Electoral District of Canada.—(Mr. Landerkin.)

Return of all rifle associations in the Dominion, their headquarters, the annual grant to each, with the names of the members of each of such associations.—(Mr. Bergin.)

For map or maps showing:—

(1.) The location of the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as approved of or constructed.

(2.) Its location, so far as proposed to Government, but not yet approved.

(3.) The location of any branches constructed or acquired, and of any now contemplated by the company, so far as the Government is advised.

(4.) The lands set apart by the company, but not granted.

(5.) The lands granted.

(6.) The lands applied for, but not yet set apart.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing the names and residence of all officials appointed by the Government or Board of License Commissioners under the Liquor License Act of 1883 and amending Act; the salary, fees and emoluments paid to each, and the aggregate costs incurred up to 1st January, 1885, under the said Act, and for carrying out and enforcing the same;

2nd. A statement of the name and residence of each person who obtained a license under the said Act, and who obtained a license under the said Act, as well as under any local law;

3rd. A statement of all sums received by the Government or any persons appointed under the said Acts up to 1st January, 1885, as license fees or otherwise; and the name and residence of the persons from whom received, and the disposal made by the Government, or the officials of the Government, of such fines;

4th. A full and detailed statement of all costs, charges and expenses paid by the Government up to 1st January, 1885, under the said Acts or in connection therewith, or arising therefrom, for the purpose of carrying said Acts into effect and enforcing the same, and testing the constitutionality of said Acts.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 4:55 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 15) to continue an Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. McDougald.)

Bill (No. 16) to amend the law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.—(Mr. Smyth.)

Bill (No. 17) respecting International Ferries.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Bill (No. 19) to provide for the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, by prohibiting Sunday excursions of certain kinds.—(Mr. Charlton.)

WHARVES, DOCKS AND PIERS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 18) respecting wharves, docks and piers constructed in navigable waters.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Explain.

Mr. TUPPER. The object of the Bill is to provide for legalizing—if I may use the term in that connection—the wharves already built in navigable waters, and to provide for the construction of wharves to be built in future. At present there is no legislation in this Parliament dealing with the subject, and the provisions of the Bill are somewhat similar to the measure which was passed in Parliament in 1883, dealing with the construction of booms and dams in navigable waters. I hope the Bill will reach a Committee where its provisions may either meet with approval, or be replaced by others dealing with the question, which, I may say, is one of some importance.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONSOLIDATED INSURANCE ACT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 20) to modify the application of "The Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877."

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is the same Bill as last year. There is no change.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUINQUENNIAL CENSUSES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21) to provide for the taking of a census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. POPE. I may say that the reason for introducing the Bill is that we have made arrangements, or partial arrangements with Manitoba that we will take the census once in five years. With respect to the North-West Territories, probably, we shall not take the census of all of them, but we think it advisable that the census of some of them should be taken.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the hon. gentleman state whether he purposes taking the census *de jure* or *de facto*, because the system may seriously affect the result. In other words, will he report the men who are there, or the men who ought to be there, according to the system he adopted last census.

Mr. POPE. We shall follow the usual plan, the one we have followed hitherto.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REMUNERATION OF CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

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

Resolved, that the Minister of Agriculture shall cause to be prepared one or more tables setting forth the rates of allowances or remuneration of the several census commissioners and enumerators employed in the taking of the census of the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin, not however to exceed in the aggre-

gate such amount for each day of proved effective service for any enumerators, and for each day for like service for any census commissioner as the Governor in Council directs, and the same shall be laid before Parliament within the first fifteen days of the Session next ensuing.

2. Resolved, that such allowances or remuneration shall be paid to the several persons entitled thereto in such manner as the Governor in Council directs, but shall not be payable until the services required of the person receiving the same have been faithfully and entirely performed.

3. Resolved, that such allowances or remuneration, and all expenses to be incurred in carrying into effect any Act of the Parliament of Canada relating to such census shall be paid out of such moneys as are provided by Parliament for that purpose.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE ON BANKRUPTCY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved :

That a Special Committee be appointed to take into consideration and report upon the alleged necessity that exists for the adoption of some system of bankruptcy or insolvency, giving adequate protection against undue preferences; with power to send for persons and papers; that the leave of the House be given for the said Committee to comprise more than 15 members; and that the said Committee be composed of Messrs. Abbot, Baker (Victoria), Beaty, Blondeau, Cameron (Middlesex), Casgrain, Colby, Coursol, Curran, Edgar, Kilvert, Macdonald (King's), Mitchell, Mulock, McGreevy, McIsaac, Macmillan (Middlesex), McMullen, Patterson (Essex), Royal, Scriver, Small, Stairs, Weldon and White (Renfrew).

He said : This subject has excited, as the House knows, the attention of the commercial community, and especially their representatives in the different boards of trade. The commercial classes in England also have called the attention of the Government to the fact that there is no law relating to bankruptcy and insolvency, and have specially referred to what was alleged to be the opportunity to traders of granting undue preferences. In order that the whole subject may be fully examined and ventilated, including the state of the law in the different Provinces, and the expediency or non-expediency of introducing legislation, this Committee has been struck in the hope that its enquiries will enable the House to come to a sound conclusion upon the subject. We know that there is great diversity of opinion on the subject in the House and in the country. The commercial men, on the whole, are in favor of a bankruptcy law, although they are not unanimous as to how far such a law should extend. Under these circumstances, I thought proper to move for this Committee.

Mr. BLAKE. I must say that I think this is not a satisfactory mode for the Government to adopt in dealing with this question. My opinion is that this question will only be satisfactorily dealt with by the Government undertaking the responsibility of dealing with it, and proposing to the House whatever measure they think the public interest requires. If, on the whole, they do not think the public interest requires a measure of this kind, let them say so, and the matter is settled at any rate for this Parliament. If they think the public interest does require such a measure, I think their attention should be directed to it, as the hon. gentleman has just declared the attention of the commercial bodies of England and Canada has been directed to it for some time past. The hon. gentleman has brought once again the excuse he once gave for the appointment of a famous Committee some two Sessions ago—the Committee which attacked the Liquor License Acts—namely, that there are different laws in the different Provinces, and that it requires a Select Committee of Parliament adequately to grasp the divergencies existing in the provincial laws. But, as I said then, I repeat now, that I do not see that the fact that there are divergent laws relating to the civil rights which appertain to the question of dealing with a man's goods in execution, and the preferring of one creditor over another, is a reason why this matter should come to be dealt with in the manner the hon. gentleman proposes. I think the proper course for him to have taken was to have decided whether legislation was in

his opinion necessary, and if he thought so to have brought in a Bill.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I may add that after the experience I have had of similar Committees, I am satisfied that this one will be a repetition of what has occurred before. This is a good mode of preventing measures being brought before this Parliament. In the first place, the Committee is rather numerous and it will be difficult to secure the attendance of a quorum. Secondly, this Committee ought to be empowered to report from time to time, so that we may arrive at some result during the Session. I make this suggestion to the hon. gentleman if he wants really to have a report, a valuable and substantial report, before the end of the Session.

Mr. MILLS. This proposition of the First Minister is very like a plea of incapacity. We remember that when the hon. gentleman and his colleagues were on this side of the House, they accused the Government of being flies on the wheel because they confessed themselves unable to prevent depression and to create prosperity throughout the country. Now, here is a question that obviously comes under the control of the Administration, it is one of the questions which it is the duty of the Government to deal with, and the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches confess their incapacity to deal with it. They confess that the question is surrounded with so many difficulties that they cannot present to Parliament a satisfactory measure, and they ask that a Committee be appointed of gentlemen better qualified to discharge those duties which they seem to shirk or to be unable to perform. It does seem to me, that if the hon. gentleman is unable to propose a proper measure, and admits that neither he nor his colleagues can deal with the question satisfactorily, he is hardly in a position to indicate who in this House are competent to deal with this particular question, and he ought to have proposed a Committee to ascertain who in this House are best qualified to discharge those duties which the Government admit that they themselves are unable efficiently to discharge.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, if we are not competent to select the Committee to deal with the subject, we are not competent to select men to select the Committee. With respect to the remark made by my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), I would say that the Committee is large of necessity, because there are representatives upon it from every one of the Provinces, who will be able to speak with some degree of authority with respect to their several localities. The resolution has been purposely framed without saying that the Committee should report from time to time. They are asked to examine into the whole subject, and to report upon it. If they desire to report from time to time they will ask for permission to do so, and the House, as a general rule, grants that request. In the same way, if they come to such a conclusion as to be prepared to report a Bill, they will ask to report the Bill, and no doubt the House will allow them to report the measure. Hon. gentlemen on the other side say the Government ought to introduce a measure; the Government ought certainly to introduce one if they made up their minds a measure ought to be introduced. But they have not made up their minds, and as they desire to get information they ask that a Committee be formed. That is the custom, and the proper custom, for the Government of the day, who are supposed to lead the House, to take when they desire information. They do it either by a Committee of the House or by a Commission; and when the Government get full information and have considered it they will be in a position, and not before, to make up their minds what course ought to be taken on the important subject. The hon. gentleman says that we should go on without information, that we should make up our minds at once, and because we want information we are not capable. We

have not got the hardihood of ignorance; we desire to get information, and on getting information will prepare a measure of some kind. A Government may be in too great a hurry to introduce a measure. I remember a measure being introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr Mills) to grant all the lands in the North-West to railways, and when that was quoted against the Government the leader of the party said that was merely a private balloon introduced to see what the opinion of the House was, and not for the purpose of legislation at all.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was stated at the time as the hon. gentleman will recollect.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That was a declaration of ignorance and incapacity.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do think the Government might be informed by their own endeavors. They should take the best steps to get the information they require and not shift the responsibility of a measure of this kind to a Committee of the House. I never knew of such a proceeding before.

Mr. BLAKE. I was quite misunderstood by the hon. gentleman, I do not question for a moment the ignorance and incapacity of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. CASEY. It seems to me that this question really includes two separate heads. There is the question as to the necessity of any bankruptcy law and the question as to the exact constitutional mode of dealing with it—as to whether we have a right to pass anything else than a full Bankruptcy Act. With regard to the question of fact, the right hon. the Premier appeared, from the newspaper reports, to be quite satisfied some time ago, when he spoke to the chambers of commerce in England, that there was no doubt as to the desirability of such a law.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman must revive his recollection of what I did say as reported.

Mr. CASEY. My present recollection is that he made no objection to the statement of the chambers of commerce that such a law was desirable, but apologised for not having introduced a law of that kind on the ground that the thick-headed rural population, whose minds were not opened to commercial subjects, were opposed to it. I understood also very clearly, from the reports of the hon. gentleman's remarks, which appeared from time to time, without contradiction, that he assured the English chambers of commerce he would use his best endeavors to persuade his thick-headed supporters to consider the subject and introduce a Bill. But there is the constitutional point. Is it possible that the right hon. gentleman should need any information on the constitutional point? Is it possible that the brilliant success which has attended his late attempts at interpreting the constitution of the country has lead him to doubt in any way his capacity of judging this great constitution of which he had so large a share in forming? It appears from his second explanation—his explanation of his explanation—that it is not in order to settle any of these points the Committee is appointed. It appears that the Government have not made up their minds; they do not know whether it is expedient to introduce a measure of this kind or not, and they have appointed this Committee to make up their minds for them. I do not know if that is in harmony with precedent in this House. I do not remember any instance during the late Administration of the Government having appointed a Committee to make up the Government's mind. In regard to the Bill introduced by the hon. member for Bothwell when he was Minister of the Interior with reference to the granting of lands to railways in the North-West, that may have been a private balloon as the hon. member says. My hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) said it was announced at the time that the Bill was

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

only intended to sound public opinion. At all events, the hon. the Minister of the Interior then took the responsibility for his scheme. He laid it before the House and said he was prepared to stand or fall by it. When an hon. gentleman brings forward a Bill in detail he declares thereby his responsibility for it, and that was what the hon. member for Bothwell did. The leader of the present Government has not even dared to go so far as that. He has not dared to send out a private balloon, but has appointed a Committee to construct a private balloon for him and send it out, as he does not wish to take the risk himself.

Mr. CURRAN. The commercial community, so far as I am informed, and I have very good opportunities of knowing, are thoroughly in earnest about having a Bill for the equitable distribution of insolvents' assets, and I am satisfied they will view with a certain amount of alarm the tone that has been infused into this debate by hon. members opposite, who appear to make it rather a political question for party bickering than to take into consideration the interests of the commercial community who have been asking, for some time past, for a law that will enable them to wind up insolvent estates in such a manner as will mete out justice to all the creditors. I am satisfied that the community at large will view with satisfaction the move to bring this matter to a satisfactory result, and as we are beginning early in the Session the Committee will be able to report at an early day, and we may be able before the end of the Session to get through such a measure as will afford that relief to the community which they are so anxious to obtain.

Motion agreed to.

THE CENSUS.

On the Orders of the Day being called,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire of the Minister of Agriculture whether the fourth volume of the Census has been issued, and, if not, when he expects to be able to place it in our hands? Also, if he can say anything about the forwardness of the fifth volume.

Mr. POPE. I cannot say anything about the fifth volume, because I am not aware of its existence. The fourth volume is nearly ready, and I shall soon be able to lay it on the Table.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In a fortnight?

Mr. POPE. Perhaps not in a fortnight. The printer is getting on well with the volume.

Mr. MILLS. Tomorrow?

Mr. POPE. Not tomorrow.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BENSON. I rise to a question of privilege. My attention has been called to a paragraph which appeared in Wednesday's issue of the *Daily Globe*. It runs as follows:—

"The Annual Report of the Minister of Inland Revenue shows that Mr. Benson, Tory M. P. for South Grenville, owes the Government £3,840 for arrears of rent for water power on the Williamsburg Canal. The Government cannot be expected to collect this debt so long as Mr. Benson supports them faithfully, and Mr. Benson will scarcely be in a position to act independently upon party questions unless he pays up his arrears."

Mr. Speaker, for reasons which it would take too long to explain, the Government have hitherto been unable to supply me with the water power to which this has reference, and having received nothing from the Government I owe nothing to the Government. The Department of Railways and Canals acknowledged this fact, but the Inland Revenue, being a purely collecting Department, refused to recognise any counter claim against any other of the Departments

unless it were allowed by His Excellency the Governor in Council. Therefore, this charge remains on the books of the Inland Revenue Department, though I have explained time and again that I never owed one cent to the Government for water power because I never got it.

Mr. GAULT. I would like to call the attention of the House to a similar article which appeared in the *Globe* in reference to myself. It says that Mr. A. F. Gault, my brother, owes a large amount to the Government for the hydraulic power on the Cornwall Canal, and that, therefore, I cannot give an independent vote. To-day I have gone to the Inland Revenue Department, and I find that Mr. A. F. Gault does not owe one single cent to the Government, but that his rent has been paid to the 1st of January, 1885. To show the favors that this Government grants to its friends, I may say that my brother's mill was burnt down in 1883. The Government was asked if it would not remit the rental for the time the mill was not running, and the Government positively refused to remit one shilling. That is the sort of favor it grants to its friends. I believe, if it was to its enemies, the case would be very different. We know that Mr. George Stephen, the President of the Cornwall Pattern Company, got his privilege for one dollar per annum forever.

An hon. MEMBER. When was that?

Mr. GAULT. I believe that was under the Ministry of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie. However, my brother does not owe one cent to the Government, and the article is untrue.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I can only say that I have no recollection of giving water power to anybody for a mill, and the hon. gentleman had better take an opportunity of proving his statement.

Mr. CASEY. It is very embarrassing to these hon. gentlemen—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

REPORT OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call attention to the fact that, though the Report of the Department of the Interior seems to have been supplied to the press and was laid on the Table on the second day of the Session, members of Parliament cannot get it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I would like members on both sides of the House who represent the Government and the Opposition to speak a little louder. We who sit in this part of the House cannot hear one quarter of what is said by the hon. the Premier or by the leader of the Opposition.

Mr. BLAKE. I was complaining that, although the Report of the Department of the Interior had been laid upon the Table the second day of the Session with great pomp by the First Minister, and had gone to all the newspapers of the country, yet it has not been distributed to the members of the House.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a tone of voice which suits very well.

ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think that, as a matter of privilege, I am entitled to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to a fact affecting some of the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, which I have no doubt you will rectify if you can. There are a great many rooms which have been heretofore put at the disposal of members of this House—if I am correctly informed, some fourteen or fifteen. Now, we have no objection to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House having twice the number of rooms that we on this side have, but it would be a great convenience if there

could be put at the disposal of the seventy gentlemen on this side some four or five of the fifteen rooms which I am informed have been placed at the disposal of members. That would be a great convenience to us in the management of our business and our domestic affairs. I do not want to reflect upon the previous distribution—and it would possibly have been better to refer to this matter with closed doors—I merely want to know if it is possible that four or five rooms can be placed at the disposal of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. I am aware that my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Mackenzie), as an ex-Premier, and the leader of the Opposition have separate rooms, but it would be convenient if a few more could be placed at our disposal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course the Government do not interfere in the distribution of the rooms in this House. All those arrangements rest with the Speaker and the officers of the House, and I have no doubt that you, Sir, will see that every accommodation is given to both sides of the House, and in such a way as to facilitate the public business. I would also say that I do not know that I laid the Report of the Department of the Interior with any great pomp and circumstance of war or of peace; I laid it where I was asked to do so by the Minister of the Interior. As to the distribution of the report, I will not assume any responsibility. That is a matter between the officials of the House and the printing contractor.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. gentleman seems to forget the fact that there is a third party in the House. When he speaks of dividing the rooms into two parts, he ought not to forget that there is a little bit of a room about big enough to turn around in occupied by my hon. friend opposite, myself and another gentleman, from which a good deal of the thunder of the third party is fulminated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would point out to my hon. friend that there is a Government side of the House—they have one side; there is an Opposition side of the House—they have another side; and then there is the outside of the House, occupied by my hon. friend.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank my right hon. friend for the compliment. I think he begins to realise by this time that I occupy a good deal more interest outside the House than he has heretofore given me credit for.

Mr. SPEAKER. With regard to the distribution of the rooms, it is a very difficult matter, because there is not enough rooms to satisfy the wants of all the hon. members of the House; and I have not been able, as yet, to make any satisfactory arrangements. I may say that the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition have had four rooms; that is very nearly the number asked for by the hon. member for South Huron.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think not.

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes, they have had four—one for the leader of the Opposition, one for the hon. member for East York, some hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick have had a room, and there has been the large room, No. 6.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, that has not been at our disposal; it is constantly occupied for Committee purposes. The Colonization Committee sits there.

Mr. SPEAKER. At all events, until this Session I have had no complaints from hon. gentlemen of the Opposition that have not been attended to at once. I now find it so difficult that I think the only satisfactory mode of dealing with the matter is, that as all the committee rooms are open for the use of members, they must make some arrangements among themselves, as I confess I am unable to make a satisfactory allotment. It is perfectly impossible with the rooms now at our disposal to satisfy 200 members. I think the House should ask the Department of Public

Works to make some new arrangement that will meet the case—perhaps another Committee room—and then the present Railway Committee room will be available for members. But I should be very glad indeed, so far as I can, to satisfy hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have no doubt the whips could arrange that matter on either side if they would take it in hand. All we want really is more small rooms apart from those assigned to those hon. gentlemen who ought properly to have them.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have suggested the matter to the whips, and I think it can be done.

Mr. TROW. I think there is some reasonable cause of complaint on the part of the Opposition with reference to rooms. No. 6 really is occupied three-fourths of the Session by various Committees. Last Session no less than four Committees occupied it at various times. The only room I am aware of set apart for our use is that occupied by the leader of the Opposition and another for the hon. member for East York. By the courtesy of yourself and of the hon. member for East Durham (Mr. Williams), the Conservative whip, I procured a room here yesterday, a small room in the lower flat, for which we are extremely thankful. We have nothing to conceal, nothing uncommon goes on in our ranks; yet at the same time it is very convenient to have a room for our own use.

Mr. FARROW. I desire to say a few words on this matter. In the first place I would like to say that the Opposition have no reason for complaint about occupying rooms in this House. My hon. friend who has just spoken says that No. 6 is taken up chiefly by Committees. Now, I wish to say that it is not. I think this is my fifteenth Session, and I have been on the Immigration and Colonization Committee ever since I have been in the House. About four years ago the Opposition members really took possession of that room; they claimed it as their own. Just look into the thing for a moment. How often does that Committee meet, and when does it meet? If the Committee meets once, on the average, a week, it is about all. It meets about ten or half past ten o'clock in the morning, and, generally speaking, the meeting is over by twelve o'clock and then that room is vacant all the rest of the time. Now we have a just cause of complaint on this side of the House. We have not a place to go and write a private letter, or any letter, and we have got to do it in our lodgings, or we have got to cramp ourselves up here after hours on these desks. There has been a real ground of complaint by the rank and file on this side of the House, and though they are loath to get up yet I am not loath to get up and make a complaint, and I am thankful I have an opportunity of saying that we are misused, badly used. I wish we had some one as good as the hon. member from the south riding of my county (Sir Richard Cartwright) to look after our interests; for we have been sadly neglected, and I guarantee that I am speaking the solid wish of three-fourths, if not nine-tenths, of the rank and file on our side of the House. I would also mention that the other large Committee room, No. 8, is entirely taken up with our French friends, so that when I went to the door the other day a man says "Who are you?" I began to wonder if I had so changed in appearance that I was not myself, exactly. Well, at last I got him to understand that I had been a member for a little time, and by dint of great perseverance I got my head in. Then I went to the other room occupied by my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Trow) the Liberal whip who superintends that room, and I could not even get my head in. As soon as I looked in there were as many frowns as there were faces. I wish, Mr. Speaker, seeing that you are the head and front of this whole question, you would give us fair play and no favor.

Mr. SPEAKER.

Mr. COCHRANE. A deputation of members from Ontario constituencies, supporting the Government, waited on yourself, Mr. Speaker, the other day, and we were informed that we could not have a room, as they were all occupied. We thought that we could, perhaps, get No. 6. We went there and found that it was occupied by three members of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition. It seems strange to me that as regards Committee rooms the members are divided into provincial squadrons. You go to one part of the building and you find members from New Brunswick, in another part are members from Nova Scotia, in another part members from Quebec. I do not approve of this action. I hold that we are all members of this grand Dominion, and I deprecate the idea that we should divide ourselves into provincial squadrons in this House. The Opposition have rooms, and the leader of the Opposition has, and is, entitled to a room, and we, the humble members of the House, are entitled to some respect, although we may not burden *Hansard* with speeches that do not contain much information for the electors, but express opinions that injure the prosperity of this country, and I may say that *Hansard* is burdened with speeches that I believe lower the dignity of this House in the estimation of the people. If hon. members of the Opposition have rooms at their disposal, and as the Independent party has a room at its disposal, we humble followers of the Government should have some consideration shown us.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Huron (Mr. Farrow), who informed us, quite unnecessarily, that he was not beside himself, and who almost left his head inside No. 8 the other day by his own account, I think has left the House and, at least, people outside, who may learn what has been said through the medium which the hon. member for Northumberland objects to so much, under a misapprehension. Room No. 8 is a large Committee room appropriated, as I understand, to the sittings of the Privileges and Elections Committee. That Committee seldom sits, and therefore it is practically unused for Committee purposes. It is understood to be at the disposal not of the French members, but of the French members of the Conservative party. That is the disposition of room No. 8. If the hon. gentleman was not recognised the other day when he went to the door and looked in, it was his own friends who did not know him, who found some difficulty in deciphering his title and passport to admission there. No. 8 has very important functions to discharge, as we all know. It has quasi-parliamentary functions. I am the last one, considering the events of last Session and the possible events of this Session, to propose anything in regard to room No. 8 which would interfere with that important part of our Parliamentary machinery which goes on there. While No. 8 is appropriated for purposes of Government supporters, in so far as Committee exigencies will allow, it is for them to decide whether it shall be devoted exclusively to French members who support the Government or to members of whatever Province or nationality they may belong. That is a matter of domestic arrangement, which the hon. member for Huron can settle with his estranged friends, who did not know him the other day, just as he pleases. The other large room is more largely appropriated for Committee purposes than is room No. 8. The Immigration and Colonization Committee meet much more frequently than does the Privileges and Elections Committee, and that room, No. 6, is also used, as I am informed, for some other Committee purposes; but, subject to these exigencies, that room has for a number of years been appropriated to the use of Opposition members generally, and I think it is a very fair and reasonable arrangement of which no one can complain. If there were another large room available I should not object to its appropriation for the use of Government supporters generally. As to the remaining rooms, the question is a very simple one. First, it must

be ascertained how many convenient rooms are available, and then their disposition should be made between the two sides of the House, according to numbers in some rough manner, and further allocation of them should be a matter of domestic arrangement. There was one remark made by the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) in which I heartily agree. I should like to see the rooms, when used, used by members irrespective of the Provinces to which they belong, and I believe such a state of things would do a great deal of good. I am very glad that room No. 6 is not appropriated to any particular Province or nationality, but is used generally by hon. members who are good enough to act with me in this House.

ONTARIO'S BOUNDARIES.

Mr. MILLS enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any legislation, or to invite Parliament to ask for Imperial legislation to define the boundary of the Province of Ontario upon the north and west?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government to propose any legislation. The question as to whether it is necessary to ask for Imperial legislation is now receiving earnest consideration.

Mr. MILLS enquired, Whether the Government propose to contest further the claims of Ontario to the country north of the height of land and south of Hudson's Bay and the Albany River?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government are not aware that they have at any time contested the claim of Ontario to the country north of the height of land and south of Hudson's Bay and the Albany River. There has been no contest in regard to the matter.

Mr. MILLS enquired, What circumstances arose after the 12th of March, 1884, to prevent the Government agreeing to the extension of the order of reference to the Privy Council in relation to the disputed boundaries of Ontario so as to embrace the whole subject of the northerly and westerly boundaries, as recommended by the Minister of Justice and concurred in by an Order in Council?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As the question primarily referred to the boundary between Manitoba and Ontario, it was considered by counsel retained both on behalf of the Dominion and of the Province of Manitoba that the question between the two Provinces should be first settled.

Mr. MILLS. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will say whether that conclusion was reached after the Order in Council was adopted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume so, but I cannot say positively.

MONEY PAID TO J. A. WILKINSON.

Mr. McMULLEN enquired, Whether any, and if so, what sum or sums of money have been paid to J. A. Wilkinson by the Government of the Dominion, from the first day of January, 1884, to the first day of February, 1885. If paid, for what purpose or services, and where?

Mr. POPE. There was a sum of \$69 paid him on 1st February, 1884, and a further sum of \$262 on 23rd May in the same year. That is all. It was paid him as valuator

IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

Mr. EDGAR enquired, Whether any correspondence has taken place between the High Commissioner in London and the Government on the subject of Imperial Federation, and whether the Government has received copies of the resolutions passed at the Conferences on Imperial Federation

held in London during the past year, or any communications upon the subject of Imperial Federation from the Colonial Secretary, or from any organizations formed in London for the purpose of promoting that object?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No correspondence has taken place between the Government and the High Commissioner, or the Colonial Secretary, or any organisation, on the subject of Imperial Federation. The Department of the Secretary of State has received a printed pamphlet containing the speeches and proceedings of one of the Conferences.

Mr. EDGAR enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to submit for the consideration of the House during the present Session any proposals upon the subject of Federation of the Empire?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention.

PRIVATE BANKS AND BROKERS.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce this Session any legislation affecting or in any way dealing with private banks, brokers and brokers' offices.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any such measure this Session.

BENEVOLENT SOCIETIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex) enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce any legislation this Session affecting benevolent or friendly societies?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The only measure which will affect the organisations referred to by the hon. gentleman will be the Insurance Bill, the first reading of which we had to-day.

BANK INSPECTION.

Mr. CASGRAIN enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce some measure for securing a better supervision and inspection of banks?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce any such measure this Session.

EXTENSION OF THE FISHERIES ACT TO THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. HESSON enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to extend the operations of the Fisheries Act to the New Provinces of the North-West Territory, West of Manitoba, and if so when?

Mr. McLELAN. There is at present an inspector, Alexander McQueen, residing at Winnipeg, and an overseer, F. C. Gilchrist, at Fort Qu'Appelle.

HARBORS IN GUYSBORO' COUNTY.

Mr. KIRK enquired, Whether the Government had, during recess of Parliament, a re-survey made of the harbors of New Harbor and Port Hillford, in the county of Guysboro', with a view of ascertaining the probable cost of erecting a breakwater at each of these harbors suitable to the necessities of the fishermen? If so, will the engineer's report be submitted to Parliament at an early day?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In answer to the hon. gentleman I may say that during last summer an examination was made of the harbor of New Harbor, and that the report of the Chief Engineer on that examination may be submitted to Parliament if asked for by an Address. As to the other harbor the Department knows nothing of a harbor bearing that name.

Mr. KIRK. It is also known as Indian Harbor.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry the hon. gentleman gave it under another name. I am not prepared to answer that part of the question to-day.

WHITE POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER.

Mr. FORBES enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to repair, during next summer, the White Point Breakwater, Queen's County, Nova Scotia, recently very badly damaged?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The information I have about this work is to the effect that it would cost a large sum of money to repair it, and that it has been reported to the Department as being one upon which we should not expend so large a sum of money, and therefore it is not the intention to touch it at present.

OFFICE OF MINISTER OF RAILWAYS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The leader of the Opposition asked me yesterday a question, only a portion of which I was able to answer. I may now state that the late Minister of Railways was in Canada during the recess, between the Session of 1883 and that of 1884, sixty days.

DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports and correspondence, not already brought down, in reference to the exercise or non-exercise of the power of disallowance as to any Provincial Acts; with a statement of the dates of prorogation of each of the Provincial Assemblies; and of the dates at which the Acts of the Session were received at Ottawa; and a copy of the despatches addressed to the Lieutenant-Governors on the subject of the transmission to the Government of Canada of such Acts; and like papers with reference to the action on reserved Bills.

He said: In making this motion, I call attention to the fact that an order, which was made at an early period of last Session, for the transactions with reference to these Acts, was not complied with, and I was informed privately that it was because it was desired to make a very careful chronological arrangement which would perhaps prevent the work being done during the Session. I have reason to believe that the return is ready, and I hope it will be presented at once, before the press of business comes on, because as it is a bulky return it will otherwise be really impossible to give proper attention to it after it is before us. I will venture to make a suggestion to the hon. gentleman opposite in this connection. It is quite clear that these important transactions are a proper subject of communication to Parliament. The report of the Minister of Justice at present consists of five lines, in which he addresses to His Excellency the report of the Inspector of Penitentiaries. If the report of the Minister of Justice would contain a few more lines, in which he would declare that he also communicated the whole of the transactions with reference to Provincial Acts, and the report were printed and brought down to us in that form, at the commencement of the Session, it would greatly facilitate our dealing with the subject. The papers, though prepared chronologically and brought down during the Session, are very apt to be disarranged in the process of printing. I took great trouble, when I happened to be Minister, to prepare, in answer to an Address, a very large batch of these papers, and to see that they were chronologically arranged; but in the Sessional Papers they are at sixes and sevens, and it is like looking for a needle in a bundle of hay to find any particular paper. The chronological arrangement of these papers is of considerable consequence, because, when so arranged, they indicate at a glance the turn of mind of each Minister of Justice, and the course of the disallowance of Provincial Acts, and it seems

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

to me that it would be an improvement in the practice if some such arrangement as I suggest were pursued in the future.

Motion agreed to.

ONTARIO'S BOUNDARIES.

Mr. MILLS moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, Imperial, Canadian or Provincial, in the hands of the Government, and not already laid before Parliament, relating to the disputed boundaries of Ontario; also all despatches and correspondence with any of the Provinces and with the Imperial Government upon the same subject.

He said: The House is no doubt familiar with all the facts connected with this boundary dispute, and knows that so far as the claims of Manitoba are concerned, the report of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council confirms the conclusion reached by the arbitrators in 1878. There were questions as to certain portions of the disputed territory which the hon. leader of the Government did not permit to be submitted to the Judicial Committee for their consideration. We have all along understood that hon. gentlemen were most anxious, in accordance with the motion proposed and carried in this House, that this question should be referred to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, to be disposed of. The country is anxious to know whether the Government intend further to contest the claims of Ontario to the territory lying north of the height of land and south of Hudson's Bay and the Albany River. This was not submitted to the Judicial Committee for any report on the subject. The committee have intimated their intention to recommend to Her Majesty a measure, for the purpose of confirming the boundaries, so far as they were called upon to report on the subject; but there is a very considerable section of the disputed boundaries on which the opinion of the committee was not asked, and it is no doubt important, if we are to have Imperial legislation on the subject, that this portion of the boundaries shall be dealt with, as well as that upon which the committee have made a report. I think it is desirable that we should know what the Government intend to do on this subject, and what conclusion they have reached in their correspondence with the Government of Ontario in relation to this portion of the boundary.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, that it is advisable this question should be settled and the whole boundary west and north determined early and for ever. This return will be brought down, as well as any legal correspondence going on just now.

Motion agreed to.

SHORT LINE TO THE SEA COAST.

Mr. CASGRAIN. This motion, which is on the Orders for:

Copy of the report of survey made by Mr. Wicksteed, C.E., of the proper location of the so-called Short Line to the sea coast; also of the reports made by S. L. Light, C. E., and other engineers, and all correspondence relative to the said Short Line, and the surveys thereof—

was granted the day before yesterday; but I desire to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who takes a great interest in this matter, as far as the City of Quebec is concerned, to the importance of bringing down these papers as speedily as possible. The Quebec population to-day is very anxious to have a decision upon this point, and are urging their claims with great force, so that if the report be brought down as soon as possible it will meet the wishes of the people of Quebec, and I think the hon. the Prime Minister has a great regard for his Quebec friends, even those on the Opposition benches. At the same

time, I desire to call attention to the wording of the motion in the Order paper in French, by which it might appear I was casting a slur on the subject itself. The word *cette* is used (*cette courte ligne*) instead of *ainsi appelée* (the said). I beg leave to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

DREDGES, TUGS AND SCOWS.

Mr. JACKSON moved for:

Return showing the number of dredges, tugs and dumping scows built in the United States for the Government of Canada, during the years 1883 and 1884, showing where they were built, giving the contractor's name, and the price paid for the same.

He said: During the Session of 1883 the Government of Canada built or caused to be built, in the city of Lockport, State of New York, two dredges, two tugs, and four dumping scows, for service in the Dominion. I, being a lumberman or timber dealer, having an office in Tonawanda, New York, within some 15 miles of Lockport, and hearing the Canadian Government were getting dredges built at Lockport, went there to ascertain the facts for myself. I saw one of the contractors who was there. I also saw Mr. James Jackson, the senior partner of the firm of Jackson & Son, mill owners, who furnished the contractors with timber, and lumber. From these gentlemen I ascertained the facts desired, with the exception of the price paid by the Government. That price was given to the House by the hon. the Minister of Public Works on the 3rd March, 1884, when he stated that \$53,775 had been paid for two tugs and two dredges, not including the scows. Add the price of those scows to the above, and I believe it would make the price not less than \$65,000. In 1884 the Government duplicated that order. The same contractors, Sutton & Morgan, again built for the Canadian Government, two dredges, two tugs, and four scows. This time the tugs were built in Buffalo and the dredges in Tonawanda. When they were being launched, one of the dredges was named *Sir John Macdonald*, in honor of the hon. the Premier. I have no means of knowing the price paid for these, but I presume it would be about the same amount of \$65,000, which would make \$130,000 paid by the Government within the last two years to foster and build up the industries of the United States. In 1878, and again in 1882, the people were told to vote for the National Policy, in order to build up the industries of this country. In Dundas, in 1877, the First Minister said:

"I and my friends have nailed our colors to the mast. We want to keep Canada for the Canadians, and not allow it to be a slaughter market for the United States. We declare war to the knife against the opposite policy. We are not sailing north by south."

Is this keeping Canada for the Canadians? I say it is not. It is Canada for the United States. We have had numbers of dredges and boats built throughout this Dominion—they have been built in the Maritime Provinces and in Montreal, in Port Dalhousie and in St. Catharines. And I want here to mention that Muir Bros., of Port Dalhousie, and Mr. Shickluna, of St. Catharines, advertised to build dredges and boats equal to any builders in the world. Have we not got machinists and mechanics, have we not skill, and have we not the timber, and the very same timber that was used to build these boats in 1883 was grown in the county of Haldimand, was sent to Tonawanda, and was furnished to Jackson & Son, of Lockport, who furnished it to the contractors, and in 1884 the timber that was put into those dredges and boats built for the Government grew in the counties of Norfolk and Lambton and was shipped to Tonawanda and sold to the same parties at Lockport who furnished it to the contractors. These are facts which cannot be contradicted, and, as a member of this House, I think it my duty to show the people of this country, who have no way of knowing these things, that this Government has

spent this money to advance the enterprises of the United States.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman wishes to have this return a second time, but the statements required by him were communicated to the House last Session. I suppose he wanted to make a statement himself, which I am sorry I could not hear distinctly in my place here, but I understood from him that he found fault with the Government, or with my Department, as a portion of the Government, for having given the contract for these scows and dredges to an American firm. This matter was fully explained last Session. It was shown that we had taken all the precautions we could to have this work done here, and had called on a large number of merchants and others, who were in a position, as we thought, to furnish the timber and to build the scows and dredges, and that these contractors and builders and merchants refused, and stated that they could not do it, and that under these circumstances, as we had to obtain these scows and dredges, they were obtained from this firm—I do not remember now the name—at Lockport, and they completed their contract to the satisfaction of the Department. I showed at that time also, that we had called for tenders for scows in the Province of Quebec, and that we could not obtain tenders for that work. I also showed that a number of other parties who wanted similar work performed had to go to that place in Lockport; and now I may say, in addition to that, that I have obtained a statement to this effect, that the timber required for the construction of a ferry boat for the Canada Atlantic Railway, at Coteau, was obtained from the same locality in the United States, for the same reason, that it could not be obtained here, and that Messrs. Allan & Nicholson, contractors for works at the Galops Canal, after making diligent search throughout the country, from Sault Ste. Marie to the Maritime Provinces, were compelled to have a dredge constructed at Lockport, similar to that supplied to the Dominion Government. We required the best machinery, the best work and the best plan, and we had to obtain it. In addition to that, the machinery for a dredge at Chatham, Ont., is being constructed at Lockport, for Mr. Martin, the president of the Chatham Dredging Company, whose dredge the Department has employed for two years. A year ago the Department, desiring to construct two dredges and scows, invited offers from timber merchants in Canada, who all declined to tender, and the scows remained unbuilt. I may say that this last fall tenders were again invited, but none of these leading merchants submitted offers, and the tender of Hurteau & Co., Montreal, was accepted. The timber was to be delivered at Ottawa; a portion has been delivered, and it seems that what has been received has come in bond from the United States, showing that Hurteau & Co. had to procure the timber out of Canada. The fact is, this work required a special sort of timber, and we have obtained it where it could be got. The hon. gentleman may be sure that it is my desire and the desire of the Government that all these works should be executed here in our own country, and so far as possible that has been done. In order to show that we desired to obtain this timber in Canada, I repeat that last winter we called for tenders in the way I have just stated, and this firm of Hurteau & Co., of Montreal, having tendered, we gave the contract to them, and it is they who have procured the timber from the United States, and delivered it here at Ottawa. Of course, if the hon. gentleman requires this statement again, we will get it for him.

Mr. JACKSON. The hon. Minister of Public Works does not meet my point. There was a second order—an additional order for which the timber could be got in Canada.

Mr. BLAKE. I am very sorry that in this wooden country of ours we are unable to find timber for these pur-

poses. My hon. friend only alluded to one portion of the subject. As to that portion which he did not allude to, it is quite obvious that a very special quality of timber was required, in order that the vessel might be worthy of its name, because the hon. gentleman mentioned that one of these tugs was to be called the *John A Macdonald*. It is a little singular that while we are raising statues to our distinguished men, we have to take American timber to raise a monument to the right hon. gentleman. I hope the tug will get up steam and blow off steam, as its name shows it ought to.

Motion agreed to.

TOLLS ON CERTAIN RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. MULOCK moved for:

- (a.) A statement showing all tolls of the Northern Railway Company of Canada, the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, and the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company respectively;
 (b.) Copies of the respective by-laws of such companies, fixing and regulating such tolls;
 (c.) Copies of any Orders in Council approving of any of such tolls.

He said: I would be glad if the returns asked for here could be brought down at an early date. A widespread impression prevails in the section of country served by the Northern Railway and the Hamilton and North-Western Railway, that their tolls are excessive and unreasonable; and inasmuch as they require the sanction of the Government, in order to their validity, it is proper that those who have grievances should have an opportunity of applying to Parliament for redress. A portion of this motion, I think, is more particularly important, in view of the fact, as I understand it, that the Northern Railway Company has leased the Northern Pacific Junction Railway Company, which was largely aided by this House, with a view of making it, as far as possible, a cheap line, for the convenience of the whole Province. I do not know whether the information I have laid before the House is well founded or not, but the production of the schedule of rates will give us material on which to form an opinion.

Motion agreed to.

ABOLITION OF THE DUTY ON GRAIN, &c.

Mr. CAMERON (West Middlesex) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, memorials, petitions or other documents relating to the abolition of the duty on grain, flour and coal, during 1884 and up to the present time.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no correspondence of this character received by the Government, that I am aware of, nor have I been able to ascertain from the Finance Minister that he has any. But should there be any such correspondence it will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

CHURCH POINT AND TROUT COVE PIERS.

Mr. VAIL moved for:

Copy of the report for 1884, of the resident engineer of the Maritime Provinces, on the Church Point and Trout Cove Piers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to the adoption of the motion, if it is worded so as to call for copy of the report made by the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works. I suggest this change because reports of local engineers sent to the Department are not in shape to be presented to Parliament. They contain information obtained for the chief engineer, who condenses it and places it before the head of the Department.

Mr. VAIL. I have no objection to the change being made, provided the result will be the same; but I am a little
 Mr. BLAKE.

surprised to hear the Minister of Public Works say that this House cannot call upon public officials for what may be considered official reports. It seems to me that the chief engineer is hardly in a position to give us the necessary information, unless he forwards us the report of the resident engineer. I do not know that the chief engineer has been in any of the Maritime Provinces this year—I am sure he has not been in Nova Scotia—and we must in that case depend altogether on any portions of the report submitted by the resident engineer, which he, the chief engineer, may choose to furnish.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This course is always followed in all matters connected with engineering. The chief engineer of a railway, for example, cannot ascertain everything himself, but he obtains data from sub-engineers, and all information is collected by him and embodied in his report.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

RECEIPTS OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. BLAKE. The House may, perhaps, recollect having heard read, some little time ago, a letter, which I re-read the other day and which forms the subject of the present motion—a letter in which the Deputy Minister of the Interior presented to the House of Commons his estimate as to the receipts of the Department from the sale of agricultural and coal lands, rents of grazing lands, timber dues and sale of mineral lands, other than coal, with the royalties from the minerals, between 1st January, 1883, and 31st December, 1891, both inclusive, as amounting to not less than \$53,000,000. I have not had time, because I only received a copy of the report of the Department of the Interior a few moments ago, to ascertain how far this conclusion is borne out, as regards all the elements of which it is composed, for the period which has elapsed and which is covered in the report. The letter speaks of the calendar, while the report deals with the fiscal year, and this year I observe the report does not do what it did last year, viz., give the returns also for the last six months of the year which immediately preceded it; so the information is not before us; nor am I able to ascertain, from the circumstance of having received the report only a few moments ago, how the matter stands in regard to timber dues, royalties and timber and grazing lands. But I observe, taking the fiscal instead of the calendar year, that the report states that the receipts for the fiscal years 1882-1883, from homestead and pre-emption fees, from ordinary sales, cash and scrip, and sales to colonization companies, amounted to, in round numbers, \$925,000, while for the years 1883-1884 the sum under those heads amounted to \$790,000, making an aggregate of \$850,000, or over \$100,000 less than the receipts for the fiscal years 1881-82 from the same sources. Omitting for the moment the revenues from timber dues, royalties from mining lands and rents from grazing lands, which I am not able to deal with at this instant—and of course we know that under the present arrangement and Administration we may expect a great deal from those sources, owing to the mode in which the Government have been husbanding the timber lands of the North-West and dealing with the mineral and grazing lands there—I am unable to state how much should be added to the calculation; but it would require an average, for the nine years, of about \$644,000 a year, from all sources, to meet the estimate laid before Parliament. In these last two fiscal years—and I suspect the revenues for the two calendar years 1883-84 will be somewhat smaller than the revenue for the two fiscal years—the revenues amounted to \$1,790,000, which would leave a sum of \$8,000,000 a year as the average for the next seven years, to be received from all sources, in order that the estimate may be carried out. As the estimate was made with so much care and consideration, and has been so

accurately verified up to this time by results, I am sure it would add to the satisfaction of the House and the country to have the details on which it is based divided into different headings. I therefore beg to move for:

Statement showing the estimated receipts for each year, in respect of each class of public property described in the letter making the aggregate of \$58,000,000 mentioned in the following letter of A. M. Burgess, Deputy Minister of the Interior, read to this House on 4th May, 1883:

"OTTAWA, 4th May, 1883.

"Sir,—Having given the subject my best and fullest consideration, I estimate that the receipts of this Department from the sale of agricultural and coal lands, timber dues, rents of grazing lands and sale of mineral lands other than coal, with the royalties from the minerals, between the 1st of January, 1883, and 31st of December, 1891, both inclusive, will amount to not less than \$58,000,000."

And also, for a statement in detail of the actual receipts in respect of each such class for each of the years 1883 and 1884.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN FISHERIES.

Mr. MULOCK moved for:

Copies of all Minutes of Council, Reports to Council and of correspondence between the Canadian Government and the British Government, or any of its officers or members, not already laid before Parliament, relating to the so-called fishery question, from the 1st of July, 1867, up to the time of the signing of the Washington Treaty.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am under the impression that all Minutes of Council and all papers of any consequence relating to the so-called fishery question were laid before Parliament long ago. If the hon. member thinks of any papers that have been omitted, I shall be glad to receive a hint as to where they shall be found.

Mr. MULOCK. I am aware that, in the year 1872, certain documents relating to the Washington Treaty were laid before the House. On April 12th, of that year, the Governor General transmitted certain documents, and on the 18th of the same month, an Address was adopted by this House, desiring that certain other documents be laid before it. The Address to which I refer was somewhat in the same direction as is that of the present motion, though, perhaps, not quite so comprehensive—at least it does not embrace the same period of time. It stops with the date of the appointment of the commissioners. My motion asks for all correspondence not already brought down—that is, correspondence existing up to the time of the signing of the treaty, which was some time afterwards. I have examined the documents printed in the Sessional Papers, and also those not printed, which are now to be seen in the office of the Clerk of Routine and Records, and it is just from the examinations of those papers that I find evidence to satisfy me that Parliament has not yet been placed in possession of some very important documents. For instance, I may direct the attention of the right hon. Minister to the memorandum which I find in the Sessional Papers of 1872, No. 18. It is a copy of the Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, dated 28th of July, 1871, and submitted to His Excellency the Governor General. It is rather lengthy, but I find in it passages like these:

"The Earl of Kimberly, after observing that the Canadian Government took the initiative in suggesting that a joint British and American Commission should be appointed, with a view to settle the disputes which had arisen as to the interpretation of the treaty of 1818, proceeds to state," &c.

From this it appears that the Earl of Kimberly stated that the Canadian Government took the initiative in those proceedings and negotiations which culminated in the appointment of a Joint Commission, and resulted in the treaty. But if we look at the documents produced, we find, in point of time, that the earliest is one dated on the 26th January, 1871. The appointment of the commissioners was made on the 8th of February, 1871, only thirteen days after the date of the only document we have produced, which was prior in date to the appointment of the commissioners.

Now we know, as a matter of unwritten history, that negotiations between this Government and the Imperial authorities, in the direction of this treaty, in the direction of the appointment of the Commission, occupied a considerable period of time, and it is reasonable to suppose that communications, or correspondence not necessarily of a private character, passed between the Government of Canada and the Government of England before that additional step of appointing the commissioners. But I find a further passage in this report as follows:—

"When the Canadian Government took the initiative of suggesting the appointment of a Joint British and American Commission, they never contemplated the surrender of their territorial rights, and they had no reason to suppose that Her Majesty's Government entertained the sentiments expressed by the Earl of Kimberly in his recent despatch."

Now if the Government contemplated anything at all in regard to the Commission, I presume their views are on record somewhere. They initiated the negotiations which resulted in the Commission. They, no doubt, expressed their views to the Imperial authorities, and no doubt the Imperial authorities duly considered them, if they did not think proper ultimately to adopt them. This memorandum says that the views entertained as to the Commission by the Imperial authorities were not those entertained by the Canadian Government. How were these views of the Government communicated to the Imperial authorities, anterior to the appointment of the Commission? Again I find:

"The Committee of the Privy Council may observe that the opposition of the Government of the United States to reciprocal free trade in the products of the two countries, was just as strong, for some years prior to 1854, as it has been since the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty, and that the Treaty of 1854 was obtained chiefly by the vigorous protection of the fisheries which preceded it, and that but for the conciliatory policy on the subject of the fisheries which Her Majesty's Government induced Canada to adopt, after the abrogation of the treaty, in 1854, by the United States, it is not improbable that there would have been no difficulty in obtaining its renewal. The Committee of the Privy Council have adverted to the policy of Her Majesty's Government because the Earl of Kimberly has stated that there is no difference in principle between a money payment and the system of licenses calculated at so many dollars a ton, which was adopted by the Colonial Government for so many years after the termination of the Reciprocity Treaty."

The report goes on:

"Reference to the correspondence will prove that the license system was reluctantly adopted by the Canadian Government as a substitute for the still more objectionable policy pressed upon it by Her Majesty's Government, it having been clearly understood that the arrangement was of a temporary character."

Then, quoting from Secretary Cardwell's despatch of 3rd March, 1866, the following occurs:—

"Her Majesty's Government do not feel disinclined to allow the United States, for the season of 1866, the freedom of fishing granted to them in 1854, on the distinct understanding that unless some satisfactory arrangement between the two countries be made during the course of the year, this privilege will cease, and all concessions made in the treaty of 1854 will be liable to be withdrawn."

After this quotation the report proceeds:

"The principle of money payment for the concession has ever been most repugnant to the feelings of the Canadian people, and has only been entertained in deference to the wishes of the Imperial Government. What the Canadians were willing, under the circumstances, to accept as an equivalent, was the concession of certain commercial advantages."

Now, here it is stated that the Canadians had a certain policy on this question, that there had been correspondence on this subject, and that the correspondence showed that the representatives of Canada desired commercial advantages rather than a money payment. Now, that correspondence, perhaps, might very justly be laid before the public of Canada at the present time. The Washington Treaty is about to expire, and perhaps the same process may have to be gone through again. I find in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 15th December, 1884, an editorial article, of which the following is a passage:—

"The *Globe* is disposed to censure Sir John A. Macdonald for not having taken steps, as it alleges, to effect a renewal of the fishery

clauses of the Washington Treaty. What action the Premier may have recommended to the British Government is in the meantime a secret, although there is no doubt that an answer has by this time been made to the despatch of the Home authorities a year ago, soliciting the views of the Canadian Government on the subject."

Accordingly, I think it is reasonable to assume that this very great question is, at the present time, receiving the attention of the Government. If not, it is to be regretted, and if as this memorandum says the Imperial authorities, on the last occasion, misapprehended the views entertained by the Government of Canada, it is important, I think, that no such mistake should again happen. It is here stated in solemn documents approved by the Privy Council, and by the Government, presided over by the same gentleman as presides over it to day, that it is not improbable that had the Commission been instructed to press for what is there called reciprocal trade relations, rather than money payments, such a result would have been the outcome; and as none of these documents appear on record, so far as I can find, it seems to me it would be proper and in the interest of the public that we should see these documents, which, according to this minute, show that it is not improbable a Reciprocity Treaty would have been the outcome of the negotiations had our views been presented on our behalf by the Imperial authorities in framing the articles of the Commission, and may be expected as the outcome of future negotiations.

Motion agreed to.

FISHERY BOUNTIES.

Mr. FORTIN moved for:

Statement showing the number and several amounts of the claims for bounties granted for the encouragement of sea fisheries, paid in 1883 and 1884; the names of fishermen and of owners of fishing vessels who received the said bounty, the localities to which they belong and the class of vessel or boat, with the length of keel of the latter, for which they received the said bounty; a statement of the cost of distributing the said bounties, and copies of all correspondence relating to the said bounties.

Mr. McLELAN. The preparation of the statement moved for by the hon. gentleman will involve a great deal of labor and expense, and the examination of some 40,000 papers. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that, as the Annual Report of the Fisheries Department will be laid upon the Table next week, and will contain a great deal more information with respect to the distribution of the fishery bounties than it has done before, he should not press his motion until he sees that report.

Motion withdrawn.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Names of persons in the employ of the Government along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway during the year 1884; the date of their engagement, the length of time employed; the work assigned them and the salary, fee or allowance paid; also the amount of travelling expenses paid to each.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copy of the commission and the names of the commissioners appointed to proceed to British Columbia to enquire into and report upon the Chinese difficulty in that country. The date of the commissioners' engagement, the salary or other allowance paid them, and the amount of travelling and other expenses up to the 1st February, 1885.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Statement showing the number of seizures made at each port of entry in the Dominion during the last fiscal year; also during the six months ending the 31st December last; the amount of fines exacted at each port during each of the said periods; and the manner in which the said fines were disposed of, giving the names of the officers receiving any portion thereof, and the amount received by each of such officers out of the said fund.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, reports, correspondence and papers, respecting the grant or payment of any subsidies to railways, other than the Canadian Pacific Railway, not already brought down; and statements in detail of all such payments to date.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copy of the commission or other authorisation, Order in Council, correspondence and instructions in relation to the commission issued for the investigation of certain facts as to the condition of the industries of Canada during the last recess; copy of the report of the commissioners, and the evidence and data obtained by them; statement in detail of all moneys paid in respect of the commission, and an estimate in detail of all moneys payable but as yet unpaid.—(Mr. Blake.)

Mr. MULOCK,

Statement showing, for the time elapsed since the period covered by the order of the House of Commons of last Session, with reference to the Superannuation Fund: 1. The number of persons on the list for the year as entitled to the benefit of the Act; 2. The number superannuated during the year under the Act; 3. The number retired during the year on a gratuity under the Act; 4. The total amount paid into the fund from the beginning by those who were during the year superannuated or retired on a gratuity; distinguishing between those whose superannuation was caused by the abolition of office, those who were superannuated otherwise, and those who retired on a gratuity; 5. The number of persons on the list for the year who died in the service;—and 6. The total amount paid into the fund from the beginning by those who during the year died in the service.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all reports and despatches not already brought down, from the High Commissioner to the Government or to any Minister, and the correspondence relating thereto.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing—1st. The number of persons on the list of Civil Servants on the first day of January, in the years 1879-80-81-82-83-84 and 85, separately, contributing to the Superannuation Fund; 2nd. The number of persons on the list of Civil Servants on the first day of January, 1885, entitled to the benefit of the Superannuation Act by annuity in case of retirement; 3rd. The total amount paid into the fund from the beginning by each of those superannuated during the year 1884; also the respective amounts paid in by those granted a gratuity during the year 1884.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copies of all correspondence, leases, agreements and statements of payments for rent, or taxes, or allowances to any Government employé for the same, for a building occupied by the engineer or assistant engineers of the Trent Valley Canal, on part of lot 2, west of Colborne street, and north of Frances street, in the valley of Fenelon Falls, Ont.—(Mr. Cockburn.)

Return showing the quantity of wheat, flour, corn and cornmeal imported into and exported from the various Provinces, from the 1st of July to the 31st December, 1884.—(Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.)

Copy of the lease of the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company to the Northern Railway Company of Canada, and Hamilton and North-West Railway Company, or either of them.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CUTTING TIMBER ON INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. BLAKE. It would be in the recollection of the House that at the last Session an Order was made for papers on the subject of cutting timber on the lands of the Indians at Fort William, and on that occasion the hon. Superintendent of Indian Affairs asked the House to suspend its judgment until the papers were brought down. They were brought down, they are very voluminous, I have read them, and I think it my duty to bring the question under the consideration of the House. I think the hon. gentleman will agree that apart from the money involved, it is rather important to that class that some attention should be paid to their complaints, and that the House should have a proper judgment of the matter. The Returns are not printed, and I move:

That the Return to the address of last Session on the subject of timber of the Indians of the Fort William Mission, be printed.

Of course under the Order this will be referred to the Printing Committee, and I merely preface my motion with that statement.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This will be referred to the Printing Committee.

DREDGES, TUGS AND SCOWS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I wish to refer to a statement made by the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Jackson),

on Friday, which I could not hear on this side of the House, with reference to my Department. As reported in *Hansard*, he stated that, in 1883, there had been given by my Department a contract for dredges, tugs and scows, and that he understood that the cost would be about \$65,000, and that an additional contract had been given in 1884 for other dredges, tugs and scows, which he thought might cost another \$65,000, making \$130,000 in all. If I had heard the hon. gentleman then, I would have stated at once, as I state now, that since the beginning of 1884 no other contract was given. There was only the contract which was mentioned in the House, and with reference to which a Return was made last Session. So there is only one contract, and instead of the sum being \$130,000, it is only what was mentioned at that time, about \$60,000.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 22) to amend the Criminal Law, to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed, holes cut in the ice on any navigable or frequented waters.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

RETURNS AND STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BLAKE. I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the fact that a considerable number of Returns ordered last Session have not yet been brought down. I have a list of some of them which I will send across the House. I would also call attention to the fact that though we were very diligent in striking the Standing Committees, these Committees have not yet been called together. It is a pity that we have lost a week in the early part of the Session, and I hope there will be no further delay in getting them to work. If the acting Minister of Railways were here, I would like to ask where the Report of the Minister of Agriculture is.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is made up to the end of the year, but not up to the end of the fiscal year.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 10) to reduce the capital stock of the Federal Bank of Canada, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Small.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With reference to these Bills, they are only printed in English, and must be printed and distributed in French before they can be taken up by Committees.

GOVERNMENT AND LAND COMPANY AGENT.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether Mr. G. A. Simpson is agent for the Government, as well as for the Edmonton Saskatchewan Land Company in the District of Alberta; and whether, in the opinion of the Government, it is expedient that the same person should be agent for the Government and for a land company?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Simpson is not the agent of the Government as well as of the Edmonton Saskatchewan Land Company, but for convenience sake, agents for land companies are allowed to act specially in settling people on even numbered sections.

SABLE ISLAND COMMUNICATION.

Mr. DALY enquired, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to provide for the establish-

ment of telegraphic communication between Sable Island and the mainland of Nova Scotia; and also the means of communicating, by telephone, between the several stations on Sable Island?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The question of providing for the establishment of telegraphic communication between Sable Island and the mainland of Nova Scotia is now receiving the special attention of the Government. As to the means of communicating by telephone between the several stations on Sable Island the intention of the Department of Marine is to have this communication.

NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RAILWAY.

Mr. EDGAR enquired, Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company did, within six months after 12th April, 1884, or subsequently, enter into a contract with the Northern Railway Company of Canada, and the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company, as lessees of the Northern and Pacific Junction Railway Company, agreeing as to through rates and fares according to the provisions of the agreement under which the subsidy of \$12,000 per mile was granted to the last mentioned railway company?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The Government is not aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has done so.

GOVERNMENT YARDS, MONTREAL.

Mr. GAULT enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to let or lease the vacant land for coal or lumber yards fronting on the two new basins on William street, Montreal?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The basins are not completed, and the question as to the best method of utilising these basins is still under consideration.

CANNED GOODS.

Mr. GAULT enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to either repeal, amend or enforce the law passed last Session with relation to canned goods?

Mr. COSIGAN. The intention of the Government is to have the Act amended.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE enquired, Whether the Government will introduce this Session any measure on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the present intention of the Government to introduce any measure on the subject during the present Session.

SUMMERVILLE, (N.S.), BREAKWATER.

Mr. FORBES enquired, Is it the intention of the Government to repair the breakwater at Summerville, Queen's County, N.S., during next summer?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am sorry I cannot answer that to-day, but when the Estimates come down I will be in a position to give an answer to the hon. gentleman.

DYNAMITE LEGISLATION.

Mr. FARROW enquired, Is it the intention of the Government this Session, to prepare special legislation to prevent Canada being made the base of dynamite operations against England or elsewhere?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is the intention,

RAILWAYS IN THE COUNTY OF GREY.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for :

Copy of memorial from the County Council of Grey, praying for a refund of bonuses paid by municipalities of that county in aid of railways which are now used for Dominion purposes or tributary to such.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have enquired about the memorial mentioned in the hon. gentleman's motion, but I am informed that no such memorial has been received.

Mr. LANDERKIN. During the session of the County Council of the County of Grey, a memorial to this effect was passed, I understand unanimously, and I will take this opportunity of stating the position of the County of Grey in reference to the aid the county has given to railways, and I think I shall be able to show to the House that the County Council was justified in memorializing the Government to assist them when they had come to their own assistance so liberally. The County of Grey gave to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company \$300,000 to assist in the building of that road from Toronto to Owen Sound. Some of the municipalities in the riding, I believe, also gave some aid to that line, and portions of the county have also aided other lines of railway. The Georgian Bay and Wellington road was aided by the municipalities along that line to the amount of \$112,000. The Grand Trunk, Georgian Bay and Lake Erie Railway Company was aided to the extent of \$177,000. The total aid given by the county was \$597,000. The County of Grey has borne her share in the burdens of the great enterprises that have been undertaken by the Dominion. She has taken her share in the aid granted to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in the cost of constructing the Intercolonial Railway, and also in the cost of constructing the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is natural to suppose that the members of the County Council would expect that, in conformity with an Act passed last Session, giving aid to other roads similarly situated, this Government would aid the County of Grey by repaying the bonuses granted to these railways. The County of Grey received no assistance from the Government of Canada for the building of her own roads. She had to do that herself with the aid which she received from the Government of Ontario. The county is a new one; the land only came into market in the year 1854, and the county has made wonderful progress, so that in the matter of population I think it stands the third highest, in the Province of Ontario. Last Session the Government, by the legislation which it passed in this House, laid, not only upon that county but upon all the counties in the Dominion of Canada, a very heavy burden. Last Session the Government granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway \$30,000,000, not for the purpose of building the Pacific Railway—for the Government then told us that the Pacific Railway Company was quite able to build the road without additional aid—but for the purpose of putting the road through a little sooner. The amount apportioned to the County of Grey—it being a very large county—as its share of that loan, was not less than \$500,000. The County Council naturally felt the increase of the burden placed upon the people of that county by that loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and no doubt that was one of the causes which compelled the County Council, which moved them to memorialise the Government in a very respectful manner to come to their assistance, after they had so liberally aided their own roads without receiving any assistance whatever from the Dominion Government. These roads were chartered by the Local Government. By the charters, the Local Government and the municipalities had some control over them. They had their directors on the board in the management of these railways. The County Council of Grey had the privilege of appointing a director on the board of the Toronto,

Mr. LANDERKIN.

Grey and Bruce Railway, and I believe they had a similar privilege in regard to the other two railways. They had a voice in the management of the road, they had a voice in the control of the road, they had the power to say what freight rates should be levied; but, by an Act passed two Sessions ago in this House, that power was taken away from the county. The local directorate has ceased to have any power or voice in the management of the road. These roads were made, by the Act that was then passed, lines for the general advantage of Canada, and hence the local control and management was taken away, and those roads became Dominion lines. The people in the county feel that, when the Government, by the Act of Parliament then passed, have taken away their control, that the Government ought to come to the rescue of the people, when they have created Dominion lines out of those which were built for purely local purposes, and ought to assist them as they have rendered assistance elsewhere. The amount of railway indebtedness that was placed upon the people of that county by the Government last Session was, in the matter of the loan to the Pacific Railway, about \$500,000, and, in the matter of subsidies to the railways in the other Provinces, about \$150,000, making a total levy which the Government has imposed upon the County of Grey of about \$650,000. This estimate, I think, will be found quite correct—probably it is under what was really imposed. The representatives of the people in the County Council naturally felt that, when local control was taken away from their roads and they had no voice in the management of them, or power to say how much should be charged for freight or passengers, it was but the necessary sequence of those roads coming under the control of the Dominion Government that they should ask that Government to assist them, inasmuch as it had introduced a policy of assisting local roads. This Government last Session inaugurated a policy of giving aid to roads that had been built for local purposes but had been, by its act, converted into Dominion lines. I do not know that the policy was inaugurated in the ordinary way or by the ordinary channels. I do not know that the Government themselves initiated the policy; I believe that the supporters of the Government from Quebec, to some extent, are responsible for the policy and were the means of putting it in force. We did hear then, and it has become a matter of history, that the Government refused to grant the subsidies that were asked for by their supporters until it became essential to their existence that they should do so, and then they consented. I believe the consummation of that policy took place in room No. 8. I believe it is possible that there may be an extension of that policy going on now, because the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow) told us that he went to No. 8 the other day and could not even get his nose in. They did not want that hon. gentleman to know that they were elaborating a new policy of a kindred nature; I suppose they were not going to take the hon. member for East Huron into their confidence for he could scarcely get his nose into the room and had to retire to No. 6. Now, I will read to the House what was done by the Government and by Parliament last Session, in order to show you that what was asked by the County Council of Grey is but just and fair to their people. When the policy has been initiated, whether it be a good policy or a bad one I am not going to say, but when it has been initiated and put into force for the benefit of other parts of the country, then those people who received the aid, no matter what Province it came from, will no doubt come to the rescue of those people who are situated as are the people of Grey, and will vote as strongly for the Government to aid those who are situated as they are as they did, time and again, that the Government should aid others. Now, I will not read the whole resolution, but I will just read the names of the lines :

To the Government of the Province of Quebec in consideration of their having constructed the railway from Quebec to Ottawa, \$954,000.

For the portion between Montreal and Ottawa, \$1,440,000.

For the construction of a line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax, \$2,550,000.

To the Quebec Central Railway Company for a line of railway from Beauce Junction to the international boundary line, \$211,200.

For the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, near Montreal, to the harbor of Quebec, \$960,000.

To the Great Northern Railway Company for that portion of their railway between St. Jerome and New Glasgow, in the County of Terrebonne, \$32,000.

For a line of railway and bridge between the Jacques Cartier Union Railway Junction with the Canadian Pacific Railway and St. Martin's Junction, \$200,000.

For a line of railway from St. Louis to Richibucto, a subsidy not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, nor exceeding in the whole, \$22,400.

For a line of railway from St. Andrew's to Lachute, in the County of Argenteuil, \$22,400.

For a line of railway from the Grand Piles, on the River St. Maurice, to Lake des Isles, \$217,600.

To the Pontiac Pacific Junction, for a line of railway from Aylmer to Pembroke, \$272,000.

To the Gatineau Railway Company for a line of railway from Kaznabazua to LeDesert, \$160,000.

To the Montreal and Western Railway Company for a line of railway from Lake Simon to Le Desert, \$160,000.

For a branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Metapediac eastward towards Paspébiac, in the Province of Quebec, \$300,000.

All these grants make something in the neighborhood of \$7,000,000. Now, this will entail an additional burden upon the people of the County of Grey, and it was a very natural thing that they should come to this Government and ask in the most respectful manner that this Government, which has made these grants to other portions of the Dominion, should come to their rescue and relieve them from the burdens which they have assumed for the purpose of getting railway communication. I hope the Government will give every consideration to the memorial that was passed by the County Council of Grey—and I can assure the hon. Minister of Public Works that I am perfectly certain it was passed. I understand it was presented to the Government, and I was desirous, at the earliest possible moment, of bringing it before the Government and before the House that they might see that a county which has so largely aided railways throughout the country, and so largely contributed to building railways in other portions of the Dominion, ought not to be forgotten by the Government, but that every consideration for the claims of that county should be given by the Government and by this House.

Mr. LISTER. The justice of the claim put forward by the hon. member for Grey who has just spoken must be my excuse for saying a few words on this subject. I feel that the municipalities which have bonused railways in Ontario for the last eight or ten years, as well as the Province itself, are entitled to be paid back the money expended in the construction of those roads. I look upon this Act of last Session as a piece of unjustifiable confiscation of the railway property of the Province of Ontario. When that Province commenced its railway policy we know there were only one or two roads—I think the Grand Trunk and the Great Western; but owing to the impetus that policy gave to railway construction almost every portion of the Province of Ontario is now served by railways. In the construction of those roads the Province has expended of her own funds upwards of \$8,000,000; and the different municipalities through which the roads run have expended a sum, I believe, exceeding \$7,000,000. Now, Sir, at the last Session of this Parliament the then Minister of Railways, without any excuse whatever, and I believe contrary to the true intent of the British North America Act, caused an Act to be passed by which the railways of the Province of Ontario were made Dominion property. By that Act he took away from the people of Ontario the right to control these roads, the right to say by what law they should be governed, the right to regulate them as they pleased and vested that right in the Parliament of this

Dominion. That, as I stated before, was, in my opinion, an Act of confiscation, because it took away from the people of Ontario the property of that people. Now, I can cite to the House one example, at least, of the bad effect of the legislation of last Session. Some time ago the Province of Ontario passed an Act by which the roads of that Province were made responsible unless they did certain things for the safety of the people whom they carried. There is no such Act of the Dominion Parliament. During the past year a young lad lost his leg through the neglect of one of the railway companies. He brought action against the company, and it was held by the courts that, under the law passed by this Parliament, the Province of Ontario had no right to say what protection these railways should give to the public. That, Sir, is one among many reasons why this Dominion should refund to that Province the money which it has expended. We have contributed, as the hon. member for Grey has just shown, not only for the construction of our own railways, but to the construction of all the great railway highways throughout this country. We have borne our fair proportion, and I may safely say, more than our fair proportion in the construction of these roads, and if this Government thinks that it is in the interest of the country that these roads should be taken away from the jurisdiction of the Local Legislature then I say it is but fair that this Parliament should pay back to the Province the money which that Province has expended in the construction of these roads. And if it does pay that money back a portion of it should go to the municipalities who have contributed the money, because they contributed that money under a certain state of facts. These facts have been altered, these circumstances have been changed by the all-powerful Acts of this Parliament. This is a question upon which no members from the Province of Ontario can differ, upon which every representative from Ontario, Conservative and Reformer, can stand on a common platform, and ask the Government to pay back to the municipalities which have contributed their money and paid it out, every dollar they have so contributed to the construction of those roads; because, if it is in the interest of the whole country that those lines should be Dominion roads it is but fair that the Dominion should pay back to the municipalities the money they have contributed for their construction. I submit again that this is a question upon which every representative from Ontario can unite and urge and force on the Government to do what, in my opinion, is an act of simple justice, namely, to pay back to the municipalities the money which they have paid for the construction of those roads.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Since I spoke on this motion, I have been informed that the memorial in question was mailed last week to the Secretary of State, and, as it was no doubt delayed, it has not yet reached the Department of Railways. That information having been given me, there is no objection to the motion being adopted.

Mr. ALLEN. I think the people of the County of Grey, as well as those of other counties in Ontario, have just reason and cause to object to the course pursued by this Government in respect to their railway policy. They complain, and I think justly, of the distribution of the \$10,000,000, or the amount appropriated last year for recouping the various Provinces for railways taken from their control. We find in the distribution of that amount, that, in round figures, the Province of Quebec received nearly 60 cents in the dollar on the amount appropriated, that the Lower Provinces received nearly 20 cents, British Columbia nearly 10 cents, and the Province of Ontario, west of Kingston, a little less than one cent on the dollar. Well, we complain that this is not fair. We, in Ontario, are always willing to pay a fair share of the improvements of all the other Provinces; but I think it is only fair that we should

be met in the same spirit. I hope the Government will take this matter into consideration, and treat honestly and fairly the County of Grey and the other counties through which railways, which have been declared Dominion railways, have been built. I would recommend that the Government appropriate \$10,000,000 this Session and commence the distribution with Ontario, paying them 60 cents in the dollar and continue the scale contrary to last year's distribution.

Mr. McMULLEN. I hope that during this Session some steps will be taken to recoup those counties which have paid so largely for lines of railway which have come under the control of the Dominion. I believe the County of Dufferin has been worse used than any other county in western Canada. That county contributed very largely towards the construction of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway. Subsequently, in order to secure competition, the people contributed to the construction of the Credit Valley. Those railways ran in opposition to each other for some considerable time; but for some time the Canadian Pacific Railway has, unfortunately for the county, controlled both lines, and now after the people have contributed a very large amount of money in order to secure competition, those two lines are operated by the same company, and the people are charged increased rates as compared with those which formerly prevailed. That county, I repeat, has paid a very large sum of money to both those lines, and the people are placed in this position: that the Ontario Government have virtually lost control of those railways from the fact that the Dominion Government have declared them of general advantage to Canada and under their control, consequently, the Local Government say they have no power to interfere, thus the people of the county are left in a very unfortunate position. I understand a memorial for their relief has been sent to the member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton); I am not certain whether it has been received, but no doubt it will be in due time. I hope the Government will take up this question, and that something will be done to recoup the people of the county for the very large sum they have contributed to railways. The Toronto, Grey and Bruce also runs through the County of Wellington. Last year the Government felt it to be their duty to recoup the Province of Quebec for the very large amount of money expended on a road which became a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the ground that it was of general advantage to Canada and formed a link in the great through line from ocean to ocean. I contend that the Toronto, Grey and Bruce is also a link in that line. The Canadian Pacific Railway have been using that line this year and a portion of last year; they now own it, and it is used in connection with their steamers from Owen Sound to Port Arthur, and probably will continue to be used in that way. If Quebec was entitled to a certain sum because one of its roads had to be appropriated to the use of the Canadian Pacific Railway, on the same ground the people of Dufferin and of Wellington are entitled to be recouped because their road is used as a link in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe it is the intention of a large number of the counties of Ontario to send deputations here for the purpose of urging this whole question on the House and the Government, and I certainly hope some action will be taken in the direction of recouping those counties. When people contributed their money under charters granted by the Ontario Government, and when the Government are deprived of the power of seeing that the rights and privileges and contracts entered into by the companies are carried out, and when the Dominion Government have taken into their own hands full control and power, it is nothing but reasonable and right that the Dominion Government should see that those people's rights and interests are protected, and that the money which they invested in those lines, which are now declared to be of general advantage to Canada,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN,

should be refunded to them, on the same ground as money invested by the people of the Province of Quebec, in a similar road, has been refunded to them. I did not intend to broach this question—I did not know that it would come up to-day; but I deem it my duty to lose no opportunity of pressing earnestly on the House and the Government the necessity of dealing fairly with this whole question, and I hope something will be done in the interests of the people to whom I have referred.

Mr. CASEY. I cannot help expressing my approbation of the course pursued by the hon. members who have spoken on this subject. The policy of aiding not only roads which are through lines, or which may become part of a through line and of our transcontinental railway system, but also local roads, has been already established by the action of the Government during the last two Sessions. I am not going to discuss at present the propriety of that policy, but I wish merely to point out the fact that the Government have adopted that policy. But not only lines that are through lines or may become such have been aided, but aid has been granted to lines which are purely local lines, such for example as that to Lake St. John, which are intended to open up new districts for settlement. If this be the policy of the Government I consider that in a just and fair distribution of the public money there can be no reasonable doubt whatever that the County of Grey and other counties in Ontario which have contributed money to lines of railway should be recouped to some extent. I have to speak more particularly, however, for the county in which I reside, the County of Elgin. That county has given large bonuses in support of railways. It gave a bonus of \$200,000 in support of the Canada Southern Railway Company in 1871. The then town of St. Thomas gave an additional bonus of \$25,000; and since that time St. Thomas, now grown into a city, has given \$50,000 to the Credit Valley Railway Company. Now, it must be borne in mind that the Canada Southern is an important link at present in the western connections of the Canadian Pacific Railway; in fact, it is its regular route to the North-West. The Credit Valley, which has also been bonused by St. Thomas, has become, not only a link in the communications of the Canadian Pacific Railway, but a part of their lines, it being completely under their control. If there is a case in favor of recouping any county for bonuses to railways, I think the case is especially strong in regard to the County of Elgin. I understand from the public press that the County Council has directed a memorial to be prepared to be presented to the Government or the House in reference to this matter, but I believe the memorial has not yet been forwarded. When it comes down I shall perhaps have occasion to call attention to the matter again, but meantime I could not let this opportunity pass without adding my voice to that of the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) and others, as to the justice of the claims of those counties.

Motion agreed to.

McISAAC'S POND, INVERNESS, N.S.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, documents, and reports of engineers relating to improvements of the entrance into McIsaac's Pond, Inverness, Nova Scotia.

He said: In placing this motion in your hands I desire to say a few words in explanation. On Wednesday last I asked:

Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant any money during the present Session of Parliament to make McIsaac's Pond, Inverness, a harbor of refuge for vessels engaged in coasting and fishing on the north-west coast of the Island of Cape Breton?

To which the hon. Minister of Public Works, with his usual courtesy replied:

"In 1879 this matter was brought before my Department, and was reported upon by the chief engineer, who disapproved of the plan. In 1882 a thorough survey of the locality was made by an officer of the Department, and the matter was considered by the chief engineer and an estimate made of the cost. The estimate amounted to \$143,000. Therefore, I must answer that it is not the intention of the Government."

The counties of Nova Scotia, bordering on the Atlantic coast, are famous for their capacious and excellent harbors, open during the whole year, in the winter as well as in the summer, but the counties along the Northumberland Strait, St. George's Bay and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, are notorious for the want of these facilities for developing the industries of these counties. Fortunately, however, for some of the northern counties of Nova Scotia, such as Cumberland, Colchester, Pictou and Antigonish, they have been afforded facilities for distributing their products by means of railways. Inverness, however, is, in that respect, less fortunate than the adjoining counties, and if that county possessed similar facilities for the distribution of its products I have no doubt that it would vie with any of the Atlantic counties in the Province in the shipping and fishing industries, as it excels all of them put together in agricultural products. Besides possessing advantages in soil which none of the Atlantic counties possesses, it also possesses mineral wealth which cannot be properly utilised without facilities for distributing them throughout the world. In the evidence taken before the Select Committee appointed by this House last Session to obtain information as to the geological surveys, etc., I find that Mr. Fletcher, geological surveyor, of Inverness County, in answer to a question, stated:

"Large exposures of coal occur at Chimney Corner, and from Broad Marsh to Broad Cove Mines, at Mabou and Port Hood. They are very extensive and would be very extensively worked were it not that there are no shipping harbors on that shore."

If, therefore, the County of Inverness possessed even one shipping harbor at this point I have no doubt that Broad Cove, being the centre of the great coal area of Inverness, would vie with any of the counties in the shipping portion of Nova Scotia in the shipment of coal. I find by a statement which lately appeared in the press that the arrivals at North Sydney, Cape Breton, which is a coal shipping port, during 1884, with the tonnage, were as follows:—

Class.	Number.	Tonnage.
Ocean steamships	271	240,674
Coasting do	121	35,303
Ships	11	13,148
Barques	159	80,039
Brigantines	189	36,597
Schooners	856	63,428
Totals	1,607	469,189

With the exception of ocean steamships, why is not the shipping from Broad Cove Mines as great as the shipping from North Sydney? This statement shows the shipping that enters the Port of North Sydney alone; but besides it there are several ports in the County of Cape Breton from which very large shipments of coal are made. The shipment of coal from Broad Cove would equal the shipment from North Sydney if similar facilities were provided; and if the expenditure of \$145,000 would give us such facilities why not expend the money? If, however, the chief engineer reported that the improvement desired is impracticable I think it is full time that we should look for some outlet for the enormous coal product which lies dormant in that locality. I am anxious, therefore, to know upon what ground the chief engineer reported against the improvement desired by the people of that section of Inverness.

Motion agreed to.

FUEL OF NORTH-WEST SETTLERS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and regulations, not already brought down, respecting timber for settlers' fuel, applicable to the neighborhood of Moosomin, North-West Territory; all correspondence as to the

demands made during the winter of 1882-83 by the Mounted Police, of 25 cents a load for settlers' firewood; all correspondence concerning the demand made by a sub-agent of Mr. Stephenson during the winter of 1883-84, for 50 cents for a permit, in addition to the charge of 25 cents a cord; all correspondence as to the demands made during the winter of 1884-85, including the demands of the present sub-agent, of 25 cents for affidavits as to how much wood each settler had burned since he first came to the locality; and for all letters and instructions from the Department or from the Winnipeg office upon these subjects.

He said: I have received a letter from a respectable settler in the neighborhood of this place, in which he says:

"In the winter of 1882-83 one of the Mounted Police demanded 25 cents a load for every load of firewood brought by a settler into our then infant village. Last winter, 1883-84, an agent under Mr. Stephenson, Crown Timber Agent at Winnipeg, demanded 50 cents for a permit, not only from every townsman who brought a load, with 25 cents a cord for the same, but also from every settler around, where he had not too far to travel, for the wood he (the settler) burned at his own home. This winter is much worse than either of the last two. Another sub-agent has been appointed, who first demanded 25 cents for an affidavit as to how much wood a settler had burned since he first came to the country, and then 25 cents per cord for all that, together with 50 cents for a permit, telling us no one had any authority to issue permits before his advent to this section of the country."

The gentleman then proceeds to state:

"I think the Dominion Lands Act has reference only to lands where there are wood or timber reserves divided into ten or twenty acre lots to go with the prairie farms, and my conclusion is that, as this is entirely a prairie district, no timber reserve being nearer than I know of than the Moose Mountain, which is about fifty miles south-west of this point, we have no wood in our neighborhood save in what are called bluffs. Some of these contain a quarter of an acre, and few of them reach four acres on one homestead; and the wood in these, which has been burned and charred years ago by prairie fires, and is now fallen and dry, endangering the remaining green poles the next prairie fire which occurs in the locality, is what we have been charged for as above."

It seemed to me that that was an unreasonable course.

Motion agreed to.

SEA LOTS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of departmental instructions and correspondence on the subject of apportionment of sea lots to individuals desiring to place lobster traps in the open sea off the coast of Prince Edward Island.

He said: I have received a letter from Prince Edward Island, in which it is stated that Mr. Duvar, the Inspector of Fisheries there, says that the Government gave him authority to apportion off to each person a lot in the sea for fishing purposes, and that any person wishing to erect lobster traps in the sea must first make application to him; and these are put out in the open sea, and not in the inlets or bays at all. It seemed to me a curious thing that permits should be given for fishing in the open sea, beyond the limits within the jurisdiction of the Government; and in any case, I wish to ascertain the character of the regulations.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—EARNINGS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Statement showing the gross earnings, expenses and net earnings of the Canadian Pacific Railway for each month of the years 1883 and 1884 distinguishing between the main line and the lines now worked under the lease from the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company; and distinguishing also between the main line east of Port Arthur or Fort William and the main line west of that point, giving in each case the mileage open for traffic during the month specified.

He said: I observe that statements have been made public as to the gross expenses and net earnings of the railway for each of several months, but these statements do not distinguish between the leased lines and the main line of the railway, nor do they extend over the whole period to which this motion applies.

Motion agreed to.

MANITOBA INDIAN AGENCY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for:

Copy of the report on the condition and management of the Manitoba Indian Agency under J. A. N. Provencher, the Indian Superintendent

of the Manitoba district, made by the Government Commission of Enquiry, composed of the late W. H. Ross, barrister, and Ebenezer McColl, Indian Agency Inspector, and the evidence upon which the same was made; also, a voucher dated 25th June, 1875, for \$180, signed by one Trembly; a voucher dated 25th June, 1875, for \$1,290, signed by one Trembly; and a voucher dated 25th December, 1875, for \$600, signed by one Trembly.

He said: In 1852 I made this motion, and renewed it in 1883. The return was brought down in a day or two before the close of the Session of 1883—the 22nd of May. The letter communicating the return is dated 29th of March, 1882, and is as follows:—

"I have the honor to transmit herewith the documents described in the accompanying schedule, in compliance with an Address of the House of Commons, asking for a copy of the report on the condition and management of the Manitoba Indian Agency, under J. A. N. Provencher, the Indian Superintendent of the Manitoba district, made by the Government Commission of Enquiry, composed of the late W. H. Ross, barrister, and Ebenezer McColl, Indian Agency Inspector, and the evidence upon which the same was made, etc.

(Signed) "A. VANKOUGHNET."

The schedule promises to give us a copy of the Commissioner's report, a copy of letter from the Hon. David Mills, dated 7th February, 1879, a memorandum to my right hon. friend the Premier, the evidence of J. H. Ashdown and 63 others, white men and Indians, and the vouchers from Trembly. Now, these are the papers we wanted, but where are they? Whether they were not sent by the Department, whether they have been lost by the Clerk of Routine and Records, or abstracted by some interested party, I am unable to say; but they are not here, and the report without the substance is not what we want. Consequently, I move again for these papers.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I may say to the hon. gentlemen that not only the papers he has before him but the evidence and the records, and everything mentioned in the schedule, was laid before this House by myself. It was a very voluminous report, and I am surprised it has not been found. I really believe if a search were made in the Departments here it would be found, because I have brought down everything in accordance with the Order of the House. I must say, however, if this Order passes again, and I suppose it will, the hon. gentleman should ask also, in order to be fair to the party accused, for the defence made by Mr. Provencher.

Mr. CHARLTON. I see that the objections of Mr. Provencher, made in his defence, are included in the schedule of documents submitted.

Mr. BLAKE. It is rather unfortunate that my hon. friend should be driven to ask for these papers again. I think some enquiry ought to be made when a voluminous return of this description is presented by a Minister, and when all that the member of the House can find is the shell of the return, the oyster having been abstracted. This is really important, and I hope my hon. friend will not dispense with an investigation, and merely have the papers copied, if all the documents mentioned are accessible. If they cannot be immediately found, I hope severe measures will be taken and every effort made to have these papers recovered. Two Sessions have already passed since they were asked for, and they are not yet at hand.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The officer who has charge of these documents requires the signature of the party to whom he gave them, so that they ought to be easily traced.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was speaking to the Clerk of the House, but he had not heard of this abstraction, it I may call it so, of these documents. When made aware of it by the hon. gentleman, I called the attention of the Clerk to the matter, who, of course, will enquire into it, and to-morrow or the next day I will know how it stands. If the papers are not found shortly we will have them recopied,
Mr. CHARLTON.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I think this is a question of privilege of this House. If some of the papers have disappeared the House ought to ascertain in what manner they have disappeared. If they are not simply missing or lost, but have been abstracted, it is the duty of the House and the Government to see that some enquiry be made, so as to fix the culpability on the proper parties.

Motion agreed to.

PORT STANLEY AND BURWELL HARBORS OF REFUGE.

Mr. WILSON moved for:

A return of all reports of Government engineers respecting the construction of a harbor of refuge at Port Stanley and Port Burwell, on the north shore of Lake Erie, together with the estimated cost of each.

He said: I believe the Minister of Public Works sent engineers to this point during the latter part of the summer, and I suppose the returns will not be very voluminous. I should like to have them down as soon as convenient, because the people there are very anxious to have the information.

Mr. JACKSON. I should like to ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works if he authorised the engineers to visit Port Rowan as well. During the recess, I have had conversations with many captains and mates sailing on these lakes, and I have asked them where would be the proper place to build a harbor of refuge, and the answer has been universally, except from a few who came from the neighborhood of Port Stanley, that Port Rowan was the proper place. For two or three very important reasons, Port Rowan is the proper place. Take the geographical reason—Port Rowan is just on the west side of Long Point, and Port Burwell and Port Stanley lie in a bay, Port Burwell 40 miles west, and Port Stanley 60 miles west of Long Point. Port Rowan is in the very vicinity where the wrecks take place. In 1883 five large vessels were wrecked within a few miles of Port Rowan, at this very place which the captains and mates declare to be, the proper place for a harbor of refuge; and in 1884 one propeller was wrecked there. I, therefore, ask the hon. the Minister of Public Works whether he instructed his engineers to visit Port Rowan as well as the other points, because those captains and mates all concurred in the opinion that Port Rowan is the proper place to build this harbor of refuge.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was not, of course, aware of the statement which has been made by the hon. gentleman in reference to Port Rowan, but evidently there is a row brewing between the three gentlemen, so I shall have to look into the matter and endeavor to bring about peace between them.

Motion agreed to.

WINTER CROSSING FROM PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. McDONALD (King's) moved for:

Copies of all correspondence with the Government or any member thereof, relating to the placing of piers and procuring of steam tugs at Capes Traverse and Tormentine, to facilitate the winter crossing of mails and passengers to and from Prince Edward Island.

He said: The placing of piers at the points indicated is a very important matter for the people of Prince Edward Island. A vote was taken last year for the purpose of building a pier at Cape Tormentine and at Cape Traverse. The pier at Cape Traverse has been completed or is nearly completed; the pier at Cape Tormentine has not, as far as I know, yet been located. This is very much to be regretted, as anything that will facilitate the winter crossing at this very important place is of very great consequence, not only to the people of Prince Edward Island, but to the people of

the adjoining Maritime Provinces. The importance of this service has been repeatedly pressed upon the attention, not only of this Government, but of former Governments, and it has been almost annually brought before the notice of the House. Yet I regret to say that there has not been as much accomplished as we would wish to see. I trust that the late accident that occurred in crossing the Straits of Northumberland, on the 23rd of this last month, may be the means of hastening the necessary work that should be performed to improve the crossing at that point. It was thought a year ago that the branch line from Sackville to Cape Tormentine would ere this have been completed, and that the piers at Cape Tormentine would at least have been under way. We regret to find that the branch line has not been completed. I am sorry that this work is not in the hands of the Federal Government, as I believe that the people of Prince Edward Island very much prefer that it should be. It is not desirable that a short gap of 30 or 40 miles should intervene between the Intercolonial Railway and the crossing from Prince Edward Island. I am glad to say that the Government has set about providing boat-houses to improve the accommodation at the capes, and although this work has been a little late in being carried out, still it is said to be of great service. The good ship *Northern Light*, at the eastern extremity of the Island, between Pictou and Georgetown, has been doing very good work, and there is no doubt that a large amount of money has been expended in putting her in as thorough a state of repair as was possible; but we all know very well that a vessel, however well built, when she comes to be used in breaking through ice, must have her strength much impaired. I think it has been also shown by the experience gained in running that boat that her model could be improved upon so that greater service would be rendered by her. It has been shown very conclusively, I think, from what I can learn, that, while she may be very well adapted for going through rough ice in the winter, she is not adapted for going through field ice, and I think the time has arrived when the Government should take steps to procure a new boat, with the improvements suggested by the experience which has been gained in the number of years that the *Northern Light* has been running. There is also this to be said, with reference to the service at the capes. I think we want that whole service reconstructed. I believe that, while the men performing that service are doing very good work, the whole service wants to be reorganized; that it requires to be put under the control of a good and efficient officer, who will see his men enrolled at the commencement of the season, and have them always within call at a moment's notice. At present, they are gathered from the surrounding country as they are required, and they are not under that control and command that men in that situation should be. There is no doubt also that they are insufficiently paid. That may, properly speaking, not be the fault of the Government, as I suppose they are paid by the contracting parties. But it is a fact that these men are very poorly paid, since they get only \$3.25 the round trip, which takes one day, two days—and sometimes it takes four or five days, and possibly over a week, on certain occasions. This should not be. These men perform one of the hardest services, perhaps, that is performed for the Government, in the mail service, in any part of the country. They are an active, energetic and hardy class of men, who have to undergo great perils, and certainly, if they were not good men, we would have to deplore many more accidents than have heretofore occurred. I trust the Government will see fit to put this service, as I said before, under the charge of an intelligent officer, who will get the necessary number of men to perform it. They should be regularly enrolled and paid monthly wages, besides getting a certain amount for each round trip. I think the service would be further

improved if another boat was fitted out—a relief boat, you might call it—which would accompany the mail boats on each trip. This boat could be equipped in such a manner that she could provide a shelter for the men in case of an emergency, such as the recent accident, or their being out over night. She might be equipped with a portable sort of heating apparatus, and all the other necessaries that would ensure their comparative safety, in case the boats were compelled to remain out over night, as I regret to say has been the case recently. If the piers were constructed at the capes, the ice boat service reconstructed, another steamer provided to assist the *Northern Light*, and the branch lines from Sackville to Cape Tormentine were completed and in the hands of the Government, I am sure we would have little to complain of. But until that or something equivalent is accomplished, I feel certain that the people of Prince Edward Island will hold this Government responsible, and will demand that the terms of Confederation be carried out, which guaranteed us efficient and continuous steam communication, both winter and summer.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I regret that the hon. member for Kings, P. E. I., has had occasion to draw attention to the fact that the railway from Sackville to Cape Tormentine has not yet been completed. I desire to say, for the information of those hon. gentlemen from that portion of the country who feel an interest in this work, that the company have made very considerable progress in its construction. The road is now nearly all graded, with the exception of three miles at the lower end, and those three miles would have been finished had the pier, for which an appropriation was made last Session, been located during the summer. Besides this, the track-laying is finished for about half the distance, and considerable ballasting has been done on that section of the road. The work, so far, has been carried on by the private means of the company, slightly aided by the Local Government of New Brunswick. It has, however, been done in the most substantial manner, and I have good authority for saying that the engineer of the Government of New Brunswick, who has had an opportunity of inspecting the road, has pronounced it the best road that has been built by a private company in that Province. During the last two Sessions I made application to the Government, on behalf of the company, for a subsidy to aid in the construction of that work, but so far I have made that application without success. I intend to make application again this Session, and I trust, from the interest which those gentlemen display in this work, I shall have their assistance and cooperation in securing the subsidy. I think, if I do have their assistance, that surely the kind-hearted Minister, who is now acting in the place of the Minister of Railways, will comply with the request. If we succeed in getting this aid the company will be able, during the coming season, to complete and equip their road and make it in every respect a first-class road; and I have no doubt that when those hon. gentleman return to this House next Session they will be able to ride by rail from Cape Tormentine to the Intercolonial quite as comfortably as if that road were owned by the Government.

Mr. HACKETT. In seconding the resolution, I desire to say that two years ago we thought this matter was finally settled. At that time this matter of steam communication with Prince Edward Island was referred to a Special Committee of this House. That committee exhausted a great deal of time and patience in endeavoring to arrive at a proper conclusion. We had witnesses from the Maritime Provinces, gentlemen who were acquainted with the subject, who had experience in that steam communication, and others who were acquainted with ice-boats, crossing over the ice to the mainland; and after having had all that evidence, they brought down a report which we considered covered the whole ground. The only regret I have is, that that report, so far, has not been acted upon with that

energy which the people of Prince Edward Island desired. I think if the Government consider that report and act upon it they will arrive at the conclusion that the people of Prince Edward Island deserve and should be given that steam communication which was guaranteed them at the time of Confederation. The recommendation of that report is, in my opinion, the only mode by which communication can be kept up with Prince Edward Island—at least in the winter season. At the present time we make no complaint about the summer service. Last year it was very efficiently performed, and we think this last autumn the *Northern Light* did very good work. Although she has done fairly well, I must say that she does not come up to what was guaranteed to the Island at the time of Confederation. As a means of efficient communication in winter with the mainland, she has been so far a failure. Now, Sir, this question has been specially brought to our minds by the accident which occurred on the straits a few days ago. We all remember the great anxiety that pervaded this House the opening day of the Session, when it was learned that a number of people from Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were for two days and a night exposed, at this season of the year, to the inclement weather of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. Those men were overtaken by a very severe snow storm. They had left Cape Traverse and were unable to reach the mainland. Their only recourse was to provide as good shelter as possible, by means of their little ice-boat, a boat only 12 feet in length, and they were compelled to pass the night on the drifting ice, which was going at the rate of four miles an hour, before a strong north-east gale, in the middle of the Straits of Northumberland. That was an experience which I hope no hon. member will be compelled to endure. We cannot imagine, and it is impossible to describe, the sufferings and hardships of those men on that night. The whole of them, I believe, were frost-bitten—some seriously, some crippled for life; and all this because a small effort was not made to place the service in an efficient condition. If a small steamer had been placed between the two capes, much of the danger might have been avoided. We know that while the *Northern Light* can keep up communication for a certain period at the eastern end of the Island, it has been demonstrated that during the winter there must be an ice-boat service between Cape Tormentine and Cape Traverse. The committee on this subject recommended that the service should be performed by the Government. Let them place a sufficient number of ice-boats on the route, and a small steamer to act in connection with them, and make it a Government service directly, and I believe the difficulties will be far overcome, that in a short time very few complaints on this head will come from Prince Edward Island. But it is not an Island matter altogether, although we are called upon, as representatives of the Island, to refer to it more especially. There is not an hon. gentleman representing a constituency from Sarnia to Halifax who has not, directly or indirectly, an interest in keeping up communication with the Island, because the people of the Island are an agricultural people and are fairly well to do, and they are large consumers of the manufactures of the other Provinces. This is apparent, if you look at the agricultural implements on the farms, and the clothing of the people; you see the tweed manufactures of the older Provinces, the cotton manufactures of Montreal and Moncton, sugar and other products from other Provinces. All these products come to the Island, and it is, therefore, as much in the interest of the producers of these articles, indirectly, that communication with the Island should be kept open, as it is in the interest of the islanders directly. As this matter has been so fully discussed on previous occasions, and as I know hon. gentlemen are thoroughly conversant with it, it will be useless to occupy much time in discussing it. But, as regards the ice-boat service, something must be

Mr. HACKETT.

done to improve it, either by providing a steamboat to assist the ice-boats or in some other way. It will not do to allow the matter to remain any longer in its present condition. The lives of Her Majesty's subjects, as well as those of citizens of foreign countries, are in the hands of the men performing that service. The Government should see that the men, when they leave the shores to make the trip between Capes Tormentine and Traverse, have boats properly equipped, and are provided with everything essential to making the trip with safety. What are the facts in connection with this serious matter to which I have referred, and which occurred only a few days ago? I find a local paper asks this question: Is it true that they started out in the face of a storm, entirely unprovided with food, matches, oils, light or compass? There should be some one in authority who would be held responsible in case of accident. But it appears, that although this service is one which should be faithfully and efficiently performed by the Dominion Government, it is let by tender to the lowest bidder. The contractors receive a mere pittance—I believe only \$10 for each trip. Of course, there is competition—they cut prices low; but they are not sufficiently recompensed, and such accommodation for passengers is not provided as would be provided if the men were sufficiently compensated for their labor. But, notwithstanding the poor equipment of the boats, and the fact that the crew in question was out for 36 hours, exposed to all the cold and blasts of the Gulf of St. Lawrence at that inclement season, it is a proud boast to be able to say that not one bag of the mails was lost. While the men were struggling for their lives, while they were battling with terrible cold, and in a state of despair, so that they were almost ready to lie down and die, they clung to their work with the greatest energy and tenacity, and although some of them were badly frozen and almost dead, Her Majesty's mails were saved. That is something of which our people should be proud—that these heroes of this ice fight never wavered or flinched from the duty they had to perform, and I consider this one of the most heroic actions of these days. But these men will not get one dollar for their courage and the hardships they endured. They did not make the round trip, and consequently they are not entitled to receive any remuneration. I hope, however, that the Postmaster General will overlook this circumstance and see that these men not only receive the compensation for what they did or were expected to do, but will receive a suitable gratuity for performing a noble service, by which some of them have been crippled for life, and although they have families dependent on them, they will be unable to earn a dollar; and I hope the gratuity will be such as will remunerate them for all their labors and sufferings. The hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) has referred to the railway from Sackville to Cape Tormentine. I should much prefer seeing that railway in the hands of the Government, because I believe it will be in the interests of the whole service that the same control should be had over that line as is had over the Government railway in Prince Edward Island and the Intercolonial. But if we cannot have that, I hope he will get such assistance as will enable him to energetically prosecute the work, so as to complete it at as early a date as possible, and have it ready for next year's service at least. What I also desire to see is, that the \$150,000 voted by Parliament last year for the construction of a pier at Cape Tormentine should be expended next summer. I should like to see advertisements issued calling for tenders for the construction of the work. Everyone knows that in the Maritime Provinces, where works are constructed mostly of wood, it is of great advantage to the contractors and the Government that the timber should be got out in winter, and I hope the matter is in such an advanced state that we will, at a very early date, see adver-

tisements issued in this connection. When we have the two piers completed, the railway running down to the wharves, and an improved service, with a sufficient number of ice-boats and with a small steamer to assist them, and the whole service placed under one man, whom the Government can hold responsible, I think we shall be able to keep up communication with the Island, and hon. members will not hear annual complaints from Island representatives, as they hear them now.

Mr. LANDRY (Kent). Whether rightly or wrongly, there exists, no doubt, a very strong feeling in the Province of New Brunswick, and especially so in Prince Edward Island, that the present service is a very inefficient one. What I mean by saying "whether rightly or wrongly," is as to whether any blame should attach to the present or the previous Governments, which have had charge of the matter since Prince Edward Island entered the Union. It may be that the people do not fully appreciate the difficulties in the way of any Government seeking to make the service efficient. But the fact remains, notwithstanding, that the service is not such as to command confidence, and is the subject of complaint by the people generally. Now, Sir, it must be remembered that it is some ten or twelve years since Prince Edward Island was admitted into the Confederation; that at that time it was promised, and in fact an engagement was made, that when it entered the Dominion an efficient mode of communication would be established between the mainland and Prince Edward Island; and it does appear to the people, as it appears to me, that the time has been quite long enough for the Government to have arrived at some definite conclusion as to what is the best mode of ensuring efficient service between the Island and the mainland. As yet it would seem as if no definite conclusion had been arrived at, as to whether it shall be a communication between the two capes, Tormentine and Traverse, the route that is followed by the *Northern Light* or some other route. Representations were made to the Government last Session by my constituents, through me, that the route between Richibucto and the point opposite on the Island was a very easy one, and one over which communication could be maintained the whole year round. I do not know if action has been taken; I have not understood that any has been taken in an affirmative sense, at any rate, and no reply has been received, I believe, stating that that plan would be tested. I cannot speak personally as to that route, but only upon information received from my constituents; but it is asserted by them, by people who, I believe, know of what they speak, because they have long been residents near the shore, that within their memory there have not been more than one or two winters that a boat could not have crossed every day in the year between Richibucto and the opposite point, the name of which I have forgotten for the moment. As I have said, no answer was made, I believe, to representations in this behalf. It was asked that some subsidy, relatively small, should be given to a steamer between those points, and companies were willing and ready to assume the responsibility of trying the route with a steamer, provided that a small subsidy were given them. It is asserted by these people that communication could easily be had between those two points, and that there were only two or three days in one or two winters, during the last twenty-five years or so, when this communication could not be had. It is true that the distance is a little longer than between the two capes, but they assign reasons for their statement that a boat could ply between these places, and I think the Government should, at least, test whether or not those representations are correct. But if the Government have made up their minds that the proper place to have communication between the mainland and the Island is from

cape to cape, it seems to me that a more efficient service should be had than the one existing at the present time, and that as speedily as possible the railways on each side should be made to come to the water's edge, and something more expensive, something which would give greater assurance of safety to passengers, should be done by the Government than exists at the present time. I have thought it my duty to add my voice to what has been said, in order that the attention of the House and the Government may be called more strongly to the matter, and that another series of years may not elapse without something more definite and more secure having been provided for this service. Believing the statements made by my constituents as to the practicability of the route between Richibucto Village on the one side and West Point on the Island side—in fact as being the best and safest—I respectfully urge the Government to grant some subsidy to that route, knowing that a company will easily be found to put a steamer on it and test the accuracy of the representations made.

Mr. JENKINS. Recent experience with the boats on this service has caused a great deal of excitement among the people of Prince Edward Island, and has brought this question very prominently before them. It is now nearly twelve years since Prince Edward Island entered the Union. It is well known that a very large majority of the people of the Island were averse to the Union with the other Provinces. They were desirous of maintaining their independence, of preserving the freedom of their government and the control of their revenues, but they felt it was the wish of the British Government that they should join the Union, and partly from a feeling of loyalty and partly because they thought the terms of Confederation offered to them were likely to conduce to their benefit, they accepted the terms of Confederation and entered the Union. Sir, one of the principal inducements to the people of Prince Edward Island to enter the Union was the promise on the part of the Dominion Government that continuous communication, winter and summer, should be kept up with the mainland. Now, I ask this House, how has this communication been kept up? The members of this Parliament who live on Prince Edward Island have been obliged, for the last ten years, to cross the straits that divide it from the mainland at the risk of their lives. Lately we have seen that twenty-two men were exposed to all the horrors of cold and hunger and exposure, and that they escaped with their lives almost by a miracle. That is the risk that hon. members of this House have been obliged to run for ten years, and I think it is time that Parliament should consider some better and more effectual means of giving us continuous communication between the Island and the mainland. The agreement which was made before Prince Edward Island entered Confederation, to give us this communication, has not been carried out, and we are now no better off than we were twenty years ago before we entered the Union. The people of Prince Edward Island feel that a wrong has been done them; that the Government is not taking that interest in the matter which they should take; that they have not performed the promise which was made, with regard to winter communication; that, in short, the Island is at as great a loss now as it ever was in this respect. It is impossible that any country can thrive unless it has continuous communication with other countries. We have a very fertile Province; we are able to grow food largely, but we have no opportunity, except a few weeks in the fall, for disposing of our produce. Now there are many ways in which I believe the Government could assist us. We have a very short season; our harbors are closed early in the fall, so that our farmers are unable to attend to the work of developing their farms, because they are forced to bring their crops to market before the ice forms. I believe it is quite possible to keep

the harbors of the Island open for five or six weeks longer in the year than is the case at present, and that time would be of vast advantage to the people of the Island, by enabling them to work on their farms and to leave the shipping of their produce until the frost came, and they could no longer attend to their ploughing. This is not a question which affects Prince Edward Island alone, for I take it that what affects one portion of this Dominion affects all; and I think the representatives from the Upper Provinces take as much interest in the matter as those more directly concerned. The *Northern Light* has been alluded to, but I have always considered that it was not adapted to the service. It is not modelled on the proper plan for such work, and there is no doubt that it has been to a great extent a failure. I came over in her the other day, when she ran into a piece of ice, not more than 6 inches in thickness, and stuck there; and she would have been there until now but that fortunately there was a sheet of water open which enabled us to avoid the ice and reach Pictou Harbor. On her return trip she was out a week, and would probably have been out until the spring, but the captain adopted a suggestion I made on the first day the *Northern Light* went out of Charlottetown Harbor, which was that he should turn her stern foremost. He did so, with the result that he made his way through sixteen or eighteen miles of field ice at the rate of two and a-half miles an hour. That is sufficient to show that this boat, which was not built for this service, is not adapted for it; and I can tell hon. gentlemen she does better stern foremost than stem foremost. I can assure this House that the people of Prince Edward Island will not rest contented until they have a boat thoroughly adapted for the service. This is not a matter of a day. We know that there are other countries in which ice has to be combated. In some of the countries of Northern Europe, in polar expeditions, and in Newfoundland, people use steamers built specially for contending with ice; and we should have a steamer constructed on similar principles. My opinion is that there need not be twenty days in the whole year when a steamer may not navigate the channel between the Island and the mainland. It is true that occasionally, between Georgetown and Pictou, a north-east gale causes a heavy flow of ice. On these occasions I believe no steamer can run; but I am quite satisfied that at the capes there are very few days when a steamer cannot run from one side to the other, because the distance is so short that the sailors can see from the masthead the condition of the straits from one side to the other, and if they find that they are not able to run a steamer they can run ice-boats. But I believe this problem of winter navigation will be solved by the running of a moderate sized steamer at the capes in connection with the ice-boats. If it is found that the steamer cannot contend with the ice, she can land the ice-boats, and they can take the mails and passengers to the other side. Now, Sir, this question is a burning one with the people of Prince Edward Island—I am sorry to say it has been a freezing question with some. But it is a question in which the people of Prince Edward Island are deeply interested; they are agitated from one end of the country to the other on the subject, because it is impossible for them to engage in manufactures unless they can carry their products to market continuously. At present, there are three or four months in the year during which we are not able to get our products to market. We possess a fertile soil; we have cheap food, cheap house- rent, and cheap fuel, and we have a climate which is as invigorating as any on this continent; and there is no reason why Prince Edward Island should not have manufactures, except the one reason, that we have not continuous communication with the mainland. Now, Sir, the very sad disaster which has happened will, I trust, show the Government that it is necessary that there should be some supervision over the boats. The contractors are obliged, owing

Mr. JENKINS.

to competition, to place their rates down at the lowest possible point; they are not properly paid, and they are afraid to ask more, for fear that someone else would step in and take the contract from them. Now, I think the Government should take this matter in hand. The service should be in the hands of the Postmaster-General, conducted by him and under his control; he should employ the men, and should see that the boats are properly equipped and are never allowed to go to sea, as the boats now are, without a scrap of provisions, and with no comforts necessary to provide against such a disaster as has occurred. I trust that this will all be changed, and that the Government will see that no boats are allowed to go out without proper supervision. If that were done, disasters of this kind would be almost impossible.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return of the names of all Government officials in the North-West Territories; the date of their appointment and the date upon which they entered upon their respective duties; the salary, fee or other allowance granted to each, including travelling or other expenses; the names and respective locations of sheriffs and registrars; the dates of their respective appointments, and the dates upon which they entered upon their duties, and the date from which their salary commenced to run; the receipts of their respective offices, monthly or annually, from their establishment up to the 1st of January, 1885."

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not sure whether we will be able to obtain all these details, but of course we will do the best we can.

Motion agreed to.

PARRSBORO' BREAKWATER.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for:

Copies of all tenders for construction of breakwater at Parrsboro' lighthouse station, in the County of Cumberland, N. S.; copies of letter from Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, accepting the tender of one Neil McKay, and of telegram postponing the work; also all letters objecting to the said Neil McKay as contractor and to the bondsmen offered by him, and letters tendering other names as bondsmen if required, and all other correspondence on the subject.

Mr. McLELAN. I have no objection to bring down all the papers that are not confidential from our agent on the subject.

Motion agreed to.

NORTH-WEST LANDS, &c.

Mr. MILLS moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, despatches or other communications with the Government of Ontario, in reference to the ownership of the lands, mines or timber, north and west of the height of land to the north of Lakes Superior and Huron since 1878, which have not already been brought down to the House.

He said: The hon. the First Minister, it will be remembered, made a very extraordinary statement in 1882, in reference to the ownership of these lands. He informed the electors of Yorkville and the country at that time that the lands of which the Indian title had not been extinguished before Confederation, and which had been extinguished since, became the property of the Dominion. That proposition is so wholly at variance with the views usually held with regard to the rights of the Crown to the public domain of the various Provinces, that I think it was well to see what correspondence has taken place on this subject, to ascertain how far the views announced by the hon. gentleman at that time have been adhered to by himself and colleagues.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Statement showing the number of passenger trains, freight trains and mixed trains, distinguishing each class, run daily, or weekly, in cases in which there was not a daily train, over each division of the Canadian Pacific Railway, in each week of the years 1883 and 1884, respectively.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement in detail, showing amount of work done, contracts made, and with whom, moneys paid, and to whom, and all expenditures in connection with the improvements of Great Village River, in the county of Colchester, Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Return of all certificates for liquor under section ninety-nine, clause four, second part of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, by the physicians of the County of Halton; giving the name of each physician and the name of each person to whom certificates were granted, from the 1st of May, 1884, to the 1st of May, 1885.—(Mr. McCraney.)

Statement with reference to the cases in which demands for extradition have been made by or upon the Government of Canada; or in which extradition proceedings have been taken in continuation of, and in the same form as, the statement transmitted by the Government of Canada to the Government of the United Kingdom, in or about the year 1876.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement and plan showing the grades and curves on the temporary or permanent line actually constructed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, from the foot of the Rocky Mountains as far as the rails are laid; and the proposed grades and curves on the continuation to Kamloops; showing also, the proposed grades and curves on the permanent line, at a point at which a temporary line of about nine miles has been constructed.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement showing the present position of the transactions on joint account, between the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government, in respect of sales of town sites, indicating: (a.) The sites agreed to be dealt with on joint account, with the areas; (b.) The amount of sales made; (c.) The amount received in respect of such sales; (d.) The amount due in respect of such sales; (e.) The expense of the operation; distinguishing the shares of the Government and of the company in each such statement.—(Mr. Blake.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MANITOBA INDIAN AGENCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honor to inform the House that the papers moved for yesterday by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and which were missing in the Return, have been found. They were among the other papers just below the Return. The address voted yesterday is therefore now unnecessary, and I think some action should be taken.

Mr. CHARLTON. As the papers were mislaid and have been found, I move that the motion made yesterday for the papers be rescinded.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 23) to amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

PATENT ACT OF 1872.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) moved that Bill (No. 25) further to amend "The Patent Act of 1872," be read the first time. He said: The object I have in view is to provide that the innocent purchaser of articles which may have

been patented shall not be held liable for any penalties for the infringement of the patent rights of the patentees, but that these penalties should be imposed only upon the manufacturer and vendor of the articles.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I would once again call attention to the fact that the Standing Committees have not been, as yet, summoned for organisation, although a week has elapsed since they were constituted.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I understand they are summoned for Thursday.

Mr. BLAKE. Why not to-morrow?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will meet ere long.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING.

Mr. McMULLEN. A portion only of the Return I moved for relative to the amounts paid the different publishing companies in the Dominion during the last ten years by the Government has been brought down, and as that constitutes but a mere fragment of the whole, I would like to know what progress is being made in getting the balance ready.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have laid before the House all the information which has been received in the Department. The balance of the information will be brought before the House as soon as possible—very shortly.

DEPUTY SPEAKER AND CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I move the following resolutions:—

That the House do elect a Chairman of Committees of this House at the commencement of every Parliament, as soon as an Address has been agreed to in answer to His Excellency's Speech; and that the member so elected do take the Chair of all Committees of the Whole, including the Committees of Supply and of Ways and Means, in accordance with the rules and usages which regulate the duties of a similar officer generally designated the Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means in the House of Commons of England.

That the member so elected Chairman of Committees do continue to act in that capacity until the end of the Parliament for which he is elected, and in the case of a vacancy by death, resignation or otherwise, the House shall proceed forthwith to elect a successor.

That the foregoing Resolutions be made Standing Orders of this House.

That this House do proceed forthwith to elect a Chairman of Committees to take, during the remainder of this Parliament, the Chair of all Committees of the Whole, including the Committee of Supply and of Ways and Means.

If these resolutions meet with the approbation of the House, I shall follow them up with the following resolutions:—

That whenever the Speaker of the House of Commons, from illness or other cause, finds it necessary to leave the Chair during any part of the sittings of the said House, on any day, he may call upon the Chairman of Committees, or in his absence any member of this House, to take the Chair, and to act as Deputy Speaker during the remainder of such day, unless the Speaker himself resume the Chair before the close of the sittings for that day.

That whenever the House shall be informed by the Clerk at the Table of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of Committees do perform the duties and exercise the authority of Speaker in relation to all the proceedings of the House as Deputy Speaker, until the next meeting of the House, and so on from day to day on the like information being given to the House, until the House shall otherwise order; provided that if the House shall adjourn for more than twenty-four hours the Deputy Speaker shall continue to perform the duties and exercise the authority of Speaker for twenty-four hours only after such adjournment.

That the two foregoing resolutions be made Standing Orders of this House.

These resolutions are intended to introduce the practice which obtains in the English House of Commons, and also, I believe, in many of the Colonial Legislatures. It is found, and we have found, that the Chair of the Speaker is not a bed of roses. In Canada, the health of our Speakers has

suffered from the too long sittings which have taken place. I do not like, Sir, to allude to yourself in your presence, but you have, I believe, had more than one significant hint that the long sittings which you have been obliged, in the performance of your duty, to submit to have been prejudicial to your health. I know that your immediate predecessor suffered materially, and I am sorry to say that my old friend and colleague, Mr. Cockburn, died in consequence of a disease caused by the long sittings in the Chair. There is a partial relief given to the Speaker by the provision that, during his illness or unavoidable absence, he may call to the Chair any member of the House; but it appears to me, and experience shows, that that is altogether an unsatisfactory way of doing business. In the first place, the hon. member who may be called may have no special aptitude for performing the duties of Chairman of Ways and Means or Chairman of Committees of the Whole House and Deputy Speaker. He has no sense of responsibility, and, if any question of Order arises, he is, of course, obliged at once to vacate the seat. He has no weight, he has no prestige or authority. He has no such authority as the Chairman of Ways and Means has in England, who rules on points of Order, subject, of course, to be overruled by the superior, paramount authority of the Speaker, but rules without the disturbance and interruption of the Committee being broken up and the Speaker called to resume the Chair. The experience of the British Parliament all points in one way, in that direction, and there is a series of reports which are to be found in the Journals and Sessional Papers in England showing the general consensus of the House, of the various Committees, and the various Speakers of great experience, such, for instance, as Mr. Lefebvre, who was known to be an authority on all such matters. Although our Sessions do not last as long, I find on enquiry that the average length of sittings *de die in diem* in Canada is fully as great as in England, perhaps on the whole greater, and crowded into a shorter period, thus causing at least as great a draft on the health of the Speaker as in England. We are a hardy race; we have a good climate; but I do not know that the physique of our Speakers will be found to be superior to that of the gentlemen generally selected in England. I shall move the first resolution, which refers to the election of a Chairman of Committees of the Whole House. He is called the Chairman of Ways and Means in England, because, as a matter of practice, in England the House goes into Committee of Ways and Means and Supply immediately after the Speech is answered, and there are certain estimates—I think the Ordnance estimates—which are brought down at once, and the Committee of Ways and Means is formed and organised at the beginning of the Parliament, the Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Ways and Means being elected almost immediately after the election of a Speaker. Our practice is different, and therefore I have adopted the name which seems to be more appropriate—Chairman of Committees of this House—and I see the same reason has induced the other Colonies to adopt the same name instead of the purely technical name of Chairman of Ways and Means. For years past a Chairman of Committees has been chosen in the following Australian Colonies:—In Victoria, where he gets a salary of £800; in Queensland, where he gets a salary of £500; in New South Wales, where the salary is £500; in South Australia, £400; and in New Zealand, £500. In all these Colonies they have found it necessary to have such an officer. We have not examined you, Sir, either upon oath or otherwise upon this subject, but I think the House will see that the regularity of its proceedings and the management of Committees of the Whole will be infinitely better conducted with an officer of this rank and position selected especially by the House, having in fact the same responsibilities in the position as you have in your position as Speaker. I move the adoption of the first resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

On the first resolution,

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the hon. gentleman should have adopted this particular form of reaching the conclusion which he desires to adopt. The course which he has pursued was not at all unreasonable in opening the question, namely, to invite our attention to the two resolutions, the whole mass of resolutions, I may say, of which only the first branch has been moved. I say that was not at all unreasonable, because, of course, the resolutions ought to be considered together. But the course which I think ought to be pursued in a matter of this description differs from that which the hon. gentleman has adopted. My opinion is that a change in our practice, both in reference to the occupation of the Chair and with reference to the appointment of a permanent Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, of Supply, and of the Committees of Whole in this House, that the powers which are given by the resolution to that officer, by reference to the powers given in England, that all the considerations which are involved as to the powers of the Chair itself, and all the considerations as to the salary, etc.,—that a proposal of that kind, when it involves also the proposition that we should pass the Standing Orders and so innovate upon our practice, ought to have been a reference to a Select Committee. When, on former occasions, we have dealt, as a general rule, with alterations in our practice and procedure, even of a less important character than this, we have adopted that course. There is no immediate hurry why we should appoint a Chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means to-day; there is, even, no immediate hurry why we should do it this Session; but there certainly is none why we should do it to-day. There is ample time for consideration, so far as this particular branch of the hon. gentleman's resolution is concerned. We have got on pretty well for nineteen Sessions; we adopted a long time ago the practice of calling one hon. member to the Chair of the Committee of Supply, which is the principal Committee of this House. That has come to be the recognised practice, and the Administration can adhere to it with that degree of rigidity which they think convenient. The course, which I admit is advantageous, of having one gentleman in the Chair of the Committee of Ways and Means is one which has great merit, but it is not necessary to adopt this resolution in order that we may carry it out. When a change analogous to these changes—at any rate, to the second branch of them—was about to be proposed in the Imperial House of Commons in 1853, and again in 1855, Select Committees were instructed to consider the whole question, to report what it had been in the past, to report their advice, and upon their advice steps were taken which were afterwards carried out by the House. The regulation is a permanent one, and as it is to be a permanent and lasting one, it is well to be cautious. In this very first branch of this resolution, I think, apart altogether from the question of the merits of the change, there is a defect. As I read the first branch of this resolution the House would be, after having passed it, entirely in a quandary if it should happen that the gentleman who is elected to be Chairman of Committees should happen to be absent from the Chamber when we are called upon to go into Committee. The second branch provides for filling the vacancy when there is a death, a resignation, or otherwise, by the election of a successor; but that does not apply to the case of a temporary absence from the Chamber; and in the case of a temporary absence from the Chamber there is no provision made for filling the office. This officer is to be Chairman of all Committees of the Whole. What if he is away? We have provision for his absence in the other branch of the resolution, of this second resolution, where you, Sir, are given an authority to call a gentleman to the Chair during your absence. It is said that if the Chairman of Committees be absent you may call some other member. But what if

the Chairman of Committees is absent when the Chair in Committee of the Whole is to be filled? No provision whatever is made to fill that gap. I instance that, Sir, as a reason why it is important that we should look carefully into this matter and investigate it, according to our custom, with the assistance of a small Select Committee of which, I think, you should be one. Now, I have said that our custom has been for a long time to call some member to the Chair for the Committee of Ways and Means, and that that custom has worked satisfactorily on the whole. It would, in my opinion, be an improvement that the same member of this House should, as a rule, be called to the Chair in the other Committees of the Whole. I do not speak of Ways and Means, because I think that Committee is a less important part of our procedure than is Supply, but I speak of Committees of the Whole on private and public legislation. I think it is important that we should adopt that as a practice, just as we have adopted, as a practice, that one man should be called to the other Committees. These are the proceedings of this House which, I think, are the least satisfactorily conducted, and I do not attribute that to the fault of the Chairman of any particular Committee; I attribute it—if the House will permit me to say so—to the fact that we are in the habit of regarding altogether in a too perfunctory light proceedings of Committees of the Whole; that they ought to be regarded much more seriously; that they ought not to be the matters of course which, in too many cases, they are; and so long as they are so regarded by the main body of the Committee of the Whole it matters little who the Chairman may be. Now, the hon. gentleman spoke most of all, Sir, of the question of the Chair of this House. He addressed his observations to that point almost entirely. With that point we are not, however, now dealing; we are dealing with the Chair itself. But I call attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman's discourse was directed to that, and he gave us a very melancholy account of the consequences of filling this chair to previous Speakers, and he hinted that you, Sir, yourself—although none of us, by any outward and visible signs would have conjectured it—had suffered seriously in your health from the discharge of your duties. I hope, Sir, the hon. gentleman's kind feeling and sympathy towards yourself have led him to express a little more strongly than, perhaps, the facts entirely warrant as to the degree in which you have suffered from the discharge of your duties here. Ever since we commenced our existence as a Parliament, ever since the year 1868, we have had a very proper provision incorporated in our legislation by which you are empowered at any time to call another member to the Chair, and calling another member to the Chair, to retire and get those periods of refreshment which, I quite agree, may be essential to the person who has to perform your exalted duties during the stress and strain of a Session. I do not suppose that it is intended the Speakers of this House shall be absent oftener or longer than has been the custom in the past. I agree as to the importance of the Chair being, as a rule, unless in case of emergency, filled by the Speaker of the House himself: and therefore I shall very much more regret that we should appear to lend a color to more frequent absences of the Speaker than those necessary absences which have heretofore prevailed. But the hon. gentleman gave us an account of the unfortunate position, and of the difficulties created by the men who had from time to time filled the Chair at your request and by your order, which, I think, was somewhat exaggerated. He stated that gentlemen had been called who had no special aptitude for the Chair, who had no sense of the responsibilities which devolved upon them in the Chair, who had not that prestige of authority which belonged to you, as Chairman, and hence these difficulties occurred. I do not remember a single difficulty which has occurred in this House during the absence of yourself or your predecessor, Mr. Speaker, while the Chair was filled by some

hon. gentleman from time to time. I believe hon. gentlemen who have been called from time to time to fill the Chair have been persons who were not, of course, as competent as one specially trained for that office and filling that office permanently, but reasonably competent to discharge, and they did discharge, its functions reasonably well; and, therefore, I testify—and I had never the good fortune to be one of them—that they from time to time supplied reasonably well the place of yourself and your predecessors during temporary absence. That, however, again has nothing to do with the present resolution. While I have said that it would be an improvement if we could adopt the practice of calling one individual to the Chair of Committees of the House, not necessarily the same individual for all the Committees, but perhaps one for Supply and Ways and Means, and another for Legislation, which involves different considerations, different training and knowledge, and a different amount of enquiry and information from that which is involved in holding the office of Chairman of Supply and Ways and Means—I would say this, my opinion is that the plan would have considerable advantage. I think if one or two members, say two members, were chosen by those who are of the majority and control the House, and if it were understood that on occasions when you vacate the Chair as Speaker, one of those should be called upon, and upon the occasion of the House going into Committee of the Whole one or other should be chosen, you would find the exigencies of the case fully met. The position is one of dignity and one of usefulness, one which has been cheerfully undertaken by respectable members of this House, when from time to time in this and previous Parliaments they have been asked to undertake it. It is understood to be one which is an important position, and which hon. members are very ready to occupy as part of that service which they owe to the House and the country. Our Sessions last three months only, one-half or sometimes less, than those of the Imperial Parliament. Our attendance is regular compared with that of members in England, and therefore the question whether a member sits in the Chair or in his own chair in this House is not so very material. That plan, therefore, would give an opportunity of training more men than one; it would have the advantage of elasticity. It would have also an advantage which, I think, is not destroyed by the present plan, but which would, perhaps, be rendered more feasible by what I suggest, of selecting members most familiar with each of the two guaranteed languages in this House. We know that by the constitution the use of the English and of the French languages is secured in our proceedings here, as well oral as written; and I say that the rights of the minority in that respect are by us, who happen to be of the majority, to be carefully guarded, and it comes, perhaps, with better grace from one of those who belongs to the majority to say this, or at all events, to open the discussion on this subject, rather than one of the minority. I say that those rights exist from circumstances over which we have no control. Circumstances are too strong for us. A distinguished former member of this House said, as I observed the other day, that he was an Englishman speaking French; but of how many English members, may I ask, can it be truly said that they are Englishmen speaking French? It is not so. We sometimes make efforts, but they are not great successes. You and I, Mr. Speaker, each sometimes try to read some words of French, but you will agree with me that we do not make very much of it. You have an advantage in every respect over myself in that your utterances, even if it were otherwise in regard to the language, would always be understood; but mine being addressed to finite intelligences, would not be so easily understood. And I am quite sure that the difficulty is as clearly exhibited in our cases as it can be. You have sometimes reminded me of the story in *Punch* of the young English couple who went to France on

their honeymoon trip, and while breakfasting at the hotel, the gentleman found some difficulty in making himself understood. Thereupon he dropped into English, and he found the waiters understood him. "Angelina," said he, "these waiters seem to understand English." "Of course, they do," said his wife, who was familiar with the language, "and I recommend you, if you want to tell me any secrets in public, to talk only in French." It is a little otherwise with our friends here. They have shown themselves to be very much more familiar with our language than we seem to be able to get with theirs, and yet it must be conceded that many of them speak to us at a disadvantage when they address the House in a language not their own, and it must be increased when the presiding officers as well as the audience are in the same position. I think the plan mentioned by me is the best. I think the plan which I have suggested, and which would carry out substantially all that the hon. gentleman proposes, would enable us to say that if the Chair of this House were filled by a gentleman whose native language is English, the Chair of the Committees should be filled by one whose native language is French. But the hon. gentleman proposes a great change; he proposes this new plan, and it is just as well to say that, as far as I can judge, the plan is to create a new salaried office. On this subject, indeed, the hon. gentleman did not do more than touch. Just by way of introducing the subject delicately, he told us that in Australia there was a salary of so much, in Queensland a salary of so much, in Victoria a salary of so much. Those circumstances are not very important to us; what we should like to know is what the hon. gentleman proposes for us, whether he proposes that this office shall be a salaried office, and if so, what shall be the salary. We are left in this respect in entire ignorance. I am not, I think, far wrong in predicting that the hon. gentleman does propose to create a new salaried office; and I am rather afraid I must say more, that it is a case, not of an office for which a man is wanted, but of a man who wants an office. I am much afraid it is so, though I do not like to believe it. But can it be that an estimable and amiable member whom we all respect, whom we all esteem, but who will be the first himself to admit that he has not yet exhibited to us on the floor of this House his Parliamentary capacity or fitness for that post, is to be made Chairman of Supply and of Committees and Deputy Speaker of this House? And is he to be made so in compensation for hopes deferred, if not destroyed, of a cabinet office to which he is not to be promoted, perhaps because he is thought not strong enough for the place, and perhaps because it is thought not safe to submit his acceptance of that place to the endorsement of his constituents. For my part I object at this time to the creation of a new salaried office. I think the times are not opportune for an increase of expenditure in this way. I believe the people at large think this legislative machine of itself is costly enough as it stands, and that they will be averse to paying an additional salary even to a member of this House without cogent reason. And especially are they so when it threatens the independence of Parliament and involves an addition to the places which may be held by members of Parliament, and more particularly to the places which may be held by members of Parliament without their receiving the endorsement of their constituents in the step which they take when they become, instead of being independent members of Parliament, members who hold offices at the gift of the Administration just as plainly as if they were Crown offices, and from which time they cease to be independent members of Parliament. They see, Sir, to day indirect means of increasing the patronage which already exists. They see it through companies of which members of Parliament are the principal proprietors, and under which enormous sums are yearly paid in effect to members of Parliament. They see timber

Mr. BLAKE.

limits, they see ranches, they see colonization companies, they see coal lands, they see gold lands, they see railway charters, they see railway subsidies, they see departmental favors, all used as machinery by which this Parliament is being perverted from being a free and independent Parliament to something very different, which, perhaps, it would not be quite parliamentary to mention; and I do not think they will desire to see added to this a new office, which, as I have said, is in the gift of the Administration as much as if it was a proposal that the Ministry should appoint the officer, inasmuch as the Ministry is about, in a little while, when this discussion is over, to move a selection or appointment which the House will doubtless ratify. I object, therefore, to the plan on all these grounds, but I am not sanguine enough to hope that my objection will prevail. This House has already swallowed camels, and I do not suppose that it will now strain at a gnat. If I could I would press on the hon. gentleman the settlement of the question in the sense in which I have referred to the two languages. If the system—the more elastic system which I have mentioned, which I believe would be the best—is to be departed from, and we are about to lay down once for all a plan under which this additional officer shall be appointed, then the time comes to consider what shall be done in that regard, and whether that question should not be regulated formally, as we are now regulating formally the appointment of the officer. We have here between fifty and sixty members whose native language is French. They bear with good nature and forbearance the inconvenience inseparable from the majority being English, with an imperfect knowledge of their language. They usually address us in English, and when they do so, they acquit themselves in that language to the admiration of the House. But great inconvenience to them must result, and it is then our duty to minimise that inconvenience as much as possible; and it would be reasonable to provide that whenever the Chair of this House is filled by a person whose language is English, the other office should be filled by one whose native tongue is French—turn about is fair play in that regard. Now, in these questions to which I have alluded, the whole subject might best be considered in the way I have suggested. I very much prefer that our proceedings with reference to our informal organisation should be disposed of in that way, and, if possible, by unanimous consent. I think I have said enough to show that there is no reason why we should proceed to the decision of this question to-day; I think we ought to consider it in the method to which I have referred. I am prepared, for my part, to vote against the scheme as now brought down, if the House presses it to a vote to-day; but I am prepared to vote for such a cast of the office as that I have referred to, though, on the whole, I think it would be better to endeavor to adjust this matter in the way I suggested at the opening of my remarks—to refer it to a Select Committee to consider the whole subject and to endeavor to ascertain what is the proper way to deal with it—to find precedents and practices and report to this House. I should like to know, at this moment at which we are called on to vote, how many members are acquainted with the powers and usages and practices that ought to be considered with reference to the Chairman of Committees—the powers and rights affecting the Speaker as they obtain in England? We are not informed as to these matters. The scheme does not strike my mind favorably in the first instance; but, desirous rather of finding a method which will accommodate opposing views, I propose the following amendment—leave out the words after "that" and insert the following:—

A Select Committee be appointed to consider and report to this House whether any and what improvements may be made with reference to the chairmanship of the Committee of the Whole.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman commenced by stating that the practice had been that one hon.

member was generally selected as Chairman of Committees of the Whole, and that that was the best practice that could be adopted. Well, it is very difficult to carry it into effect—to carry it out thoroughly. This subject, as the hon. gentleman knows—because I see he has studied the subject and examined the reports of the various committees in England—is one which was fully considered there; it was a matter of very grave consideration and some doubt, and it was only after the whole subject matter had been fully sifted that the House of Commons came to the conclusion that a change was absolutely necessary. The hon. gentleman says that he has not observed, when a Chairman is called to the Committee of the Whole, that there has been any irregularity or inconvenience. The hon. gentleman, if he looks back, will see—any hon. member who has sat in Parliament for some time, must have observed—that the proceedings in Committee of the Whole are not conducted with all the regularity, are not conducted with that deference to Parliamentary propriety that usually obtains when you, Sir, occupy the Chair. A casual chairman selected for the nonce cannot himself feel that confidence, that right to rule and decide, which a chairman clothed with official authority must feel. The hon. gentleman says this is a matter of governmental appointment. The appointment is to be made by the House—by a majority of the House, certainly, but still by the House, by the representatives of the people, and the officer appointed will be no more a governmental appointment than is the Speaker of the House. The majority will decide as they see fit, in a free Parliament of a free people, and if they choose to support the Government of the day, if they choose to approve the recommendations of that Government, it is no impairment of the freedom of the people; it is an exercise of the freedom of the representatives of the people, when they support the Government of the day. The hon. gentleman's main objection, however, is that there is going to be another salary. Well, I think we should pay a few pounds for the purpose of compensating the Chairman of Committees for performing the onerous and responsible duties of such a position. But the hon. gentleman wishes to be economical. Why, Sir, if the hon. gentleman would be more economical in the notices he gives for returns, I venture to say that the cost for returns which he has moved for—many of them of no use or utility, many that will not be printed, or considered by the Printing Committee to be worthy of printing—the cost of the returns which he asks for will provide the salary of the Chairman of Committees five times over. And then, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, above all things, is so anxious that my friends from Lower Canada who speak French shall have their interests protected. Sir, the hon. gentleman has thought that he might introduce a little sectionalism—that he might set English against French, and French against English. The thing is obvious—he gets such a support from the French Canadians that he feels that he must defend their rights, and must prevent them being trampled upon. The hon. gentleman's motive is kind, it is philanthropic. The hon. gentleman, flowing over with love for his fellow-men, and especially for his French Canadian fellow-men, makes this proposition because he has heard that a gentleman who is not a French Canadian may probably be proposed. It is rather unworthy, that, Mr. Speaker, of the hon. gentleman; it is not very dignified, and I am quite sure that the shaft will fail of its object. It is too thin, Mr. Speaker. My French Canadian friends understand this; they understand the object and the motive too well to pay much attention to the hon. gentleman's newborn philanthropy and French Canadianism. Mr. Speaker, I do not consent to the appointment of this committee. The subject has been threshed out by the experience of the House of Commons in England, to which we always refer with pleasure and instruction. We, as a general rule, in unprovided cases, adopt the rules of the House of Commons. It is provided in our own rules that in unprovided cases we

shall adopt the practice of the House of Commons. We propose, in this case, to adopt that practice, and I shall oppose the motion in amendment.

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman has made two or three points, which he evidently considers very strong ones, against the proposal of my hon. friend on this side of the House. He says, Sir, that the Chairman of Committees would be just as independent of the Government as you yourself. Well, Sir, admit that; admit that the Chairman of Committees would be equally independent with the Speaker. The difference remains that the Chairman of Committees, instead of having a seat, like yourself, outside of the party contentions of the House, acting as arbiter on points of Order, would be an active member of the House, occupying a seat in the House, and with the privilege of voting on every party question, and casting his vote for the Government to which he owes his appointment. I conclude that if the Chairman of Committees is to be only as independent as the Speaker, he should not have a seat in the House, and should not vote on party questions any more than the Speaker does. On the second point, that the cost of the returns moved for by my hon. friend who proposed this amendment would be equal to five times the salary of the proposed new officer, the right hon. gentleman spoke with some feeling; he spoke with some energy, with something approaching anger, about the number of returns moved for by the hon. leader of the Opposition; and I do not wonder at it, Mr. Speaker. These returns have been called for, for the information of the public and the members of this House. "Oh," says the right hon. gentleman, "lots of them won't be printed; lots of them are not worthy to be printed." Well, Sir, I agree that if these returns are a true representation of the facts, many of them are scarcely fit for publication; because returns have been presented to this House before now, and will be again, I am quite sure, bringing things to light which ought to disgust the public, not only with the Government who do such things, but with the people who tolerate such a Government. It is true that, for the credit of the country, some of these returns should not be printed. But the hon. gentleman says that the cost of these returns would pay the salary of this Chairman of Committees five times over. If so, it follows that that gentleman is to have a very small salary, or that the cost of bringing down these returns is to be extravagant. We have heard \$2,000 mentioned as the probable salary of this Chairman. If the right hon. leader of the Government can make the preparation of these returns cost \$10,000, it will certainly be a glorious harvest time for the sessional clerks, and for those who have friends to be appointed sessional clerks. But what hurt the right hon. gentleman most was the "unworthy sectionalism" displayed by my hon. friend and leader. Well, Sir, it is certainly a crushing accusation to come from that quarter. If the action of the hon. leader of the Opposition seems to the right hon. Premier such a display of sectionalism as to pass the bounds of propriety, it must indeed have been a most disgusting display of sectionalism; because, if the sectionalism of yielding to, taking care of, and conciliating, the prejudices and feelings and interests of the different sections of the country was ever carried to perfection by any individual, I am quite sure the right hon. gentleman will be not only prepared to confess, but to boast, that it has been carried to perfection by himself. That which he now denounces as sectionalism has been one of the secrets of his own success. But is it sectionalism, in any sense, to provide for the convenience of the minority in this House? Is it even unworthy of our attention to provide for that recognition of their influence, their prejudices and their feelings, which can be granted without the slightest detriment to the feelings of any member of this House, or any interference with the business of this House? I think

it is not so. I believe the proposition of my hon. leader is worthy of him, and worthy of the acceptance of this House, and I am sure it will be as gladly acceded to by the English-speaking members of this House as by those who speak French. We have recognised the principle of it already, more or less, in the appointment of Speakers. It has not been a hard and fast rule, but it has been almost the uniform practice that the Speakers should be taken alternately from those who speak the two languages; and it has sometimes been urged that we should have an English-speaking Speaker in the Senate, and a French-speaking Speaker here, or *vice versa*. In the present case, the Speaker of the Senate, as well as yourself, is a gentleman whose native language is English, and that adds force to the contention in favour of the amendment. But, Sir, the right hon. gentleman concludes that this exhibition of sectionalism lacks dignity; it is "undignified," he said, in his most rolling tones.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh!

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friends evidently recognise the imitation. They are so accustomed to cheer the tones I refer to, that when I imitate them they are bound to cheer also. He said it was "unworthy, undignified," and he capped the climax by saying, "It is too thin." If the speech seems undignified to the right hon. gentleman who considers the use of slang of that sort to be a highly dignified proceeding, it certainly was undignified, and I am very much ashamed of it.

Amendment (Mr. Blake), negatived on the following division:—

YEAS:
Messieurs

Allen,	Fleming,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Forbes,	Mills,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Malock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bécharde,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Ray,
Bourassa,	Holton,	Rinfret,
Barpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Scrivier,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Laderkin,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Catudal,	Langelier,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Laurier,	Trow,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	Watson,
Edgar,	Mackenzie,	Wells,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Wilson.—59.
Fisher,	McIsaac,	

NAYS:
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dundas,	McNeill,
Allison,	Dupont,	Massue,
Amyot,	Farrow,	Mitchell,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Ferguson (Welland),	Montplaisir,
Baker (Victoria),	Fortin,	O'Brien.
Barnard,	Foster,	Orton,
Beaty,	Gagné,	Outimet,
Bell,	Gaudet,	Paint,
Belleau,	Gault,	Patterson (Essex),
Benoit,	Gigault,	Pinsonneault,
Benson,	Girouard,	Pruyn,
Bergeron,	Gordon,	Reid,
Bergin,	Grandbois,	Riopel,
Billy,	Guilbault,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Guillet,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bossé,	Hackett,	Royal,
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Rykert,
Bowell,	Hay,	Shakespeare,
Bryson,	Hesson,	Small,
Burnham,	Hickey,	Smyth,
Burns,	Hilliard,	Sproule,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Stairs,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Taschereau,
Carling,	Ives,	Tassé,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Taylor,
Chapleau,	Kilvert,	Temple,

Mr. CASEY.

Cochrane,	Kinney,	Tilley,
Colby,	Kranz,	Townshend,
Costigan,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Daoust,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Dawson,	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Macmaster,	Williams,
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Brookville),
Desjardins,	McDougald (Picton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dickinson,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Woodworth,
Doëd,	McLelan,	Wright.—121.
Dugas,		

Mr. ROYAL. I move that after the second paragraph the following paragraph be inserted:—

And that the member elected to serve as Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees shall be required to possess a full and practical knowledge of the language which is not that of the Speaker for the time being.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This will give a fine opportunity for introducing a competitive examination.

Mr. GIROUARD. The House will be the judge of that.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MILLS moved:

That the main motion be amended by inserting after the words "so elected do" the words "if in his place in this House."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will find that in England the Chairman of Ways and Means, as in this resolution, takes the Chair, as a matter of course, in all committees and in the Committee of the Whole House, but should he be absent another Chairman can be appointed. However, I have not the slightest objection to accept the hon. gentleman's amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. IVES. It strikes me there might possibly be some misunderstanding in reference to the wording of the amendment of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal). His amendment says that the Chairman of the Committee shall possess a practical knowledge of the language, not the language of the Speaker, for the time being. I do not know, as it is, that there are only two languages. We have a good many Germans in Canada, and the Minister of Agriculture is bringing them in more rapidly every year. I think it is, therefore, worth considering whether the wording is not a little loose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps if Ah-Sin should be here, or an Indian, he might object; but as there are only two languages recognised by the Constitutional Act, the French and English, I do not think the question can possibly arise.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to on the foregoing division reversed.

Second resolution agreed to on a division.

Third resolution agreed to.

Fourth resolution agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved

That Malachy Daly, Esq., member for the County of Halifax, do take the Chair at all Committees of the Whole House, in accordance with the foregoing resolutions.

Mr. CASEY. It will be now in order, under the standing Orders of the House, to appoint a committee or a Board of Examiners to enquire as to whether the gentleman proposed has a full and practical knowledge of the French language.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I hope the hon. gentleman will not be at that trouble. He knows as well as I that the hon. gentleman who was proposed is a gentleman who, although he cannot speak the French as well as his own

language, understands it fully, and I am sure will be quite competent to make himself understood by hon. members of this House.

Mr. CASEY. I know that, and was only drawing attention to the peculiarity of the arrangement which may make it difficult at times to go into effect.

Motion agreed to on a division.

On the fifth resolution,

Mr. BLAKE. I rise to a question of order. The hon. gentleman has not signified the consent of the Crown to this.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right, but I have obtained the consent of the Crown in writing.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has not yet signified the consent of the Crown.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is captious.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If "captious" is not a parliamentary word, I will take it back. The hon. gentleman is not captious. I move the resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. The question of order being now settled, I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to another question, which appears to me to be of considerable consequence with reference to this resolution. The Constitutional Act has provided for the mode in which a Speaker shall be appointed, and for the functions of the Speaker. The 44th section provides that:

"The House of Commons, on its first assembling after a general election, shall proceed with all practicable speed to elect one of its members to be Speaker;"

And then the next section provides for the case of a vacancy. The 46th section provides that:

"The Speaker shall preside at all meetings of the House of Commons;"

And the 47th section that:

"Until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides, in case of the absence for any reason of the Speaker from the Chair of the House of Commons for a period of forty-eight consecutive hours, the House may elect another of its members,"

for certain purposes; but the Constitutional Act does not itself make any provision for the case which is being met by this proposed resolution. It provides only for the case of the absence of the Speaker and the action of the House thereupon. The difficulty with reference to the action of the Speaker himself was provided for, as I mentioned awhile ago, in the first Session of the first Parliament, by chapter 2, the second Act we passed; and under that, by Act of Parliament, it was provided that:

"Whenever the Speaker of the House of Commons, from illness or other cause, finds it necessary to leave the Chair during any part of the sittings of the said House on any day, he may call upon any member thereof to take the Chair and to act as Speaker during the remainder of such day, unless the Speaker himself resume the Chair before the close of the sittings for that day;"

and so forth. Therefore, by an Act of Parliament, you were given a full and free power and discretion to choose any one from amongst the members of this House whom you thought fit to take the Chair, and such person was bound to take the Chair and have the authority. Now, the proposed resolution is that you shall "call upon the Chairman of Committees, or in his absence, any member of the House to take the Chair." I do not object to that rule at all. I think it is an extremely reasonable thing, in furtherance of the intention of the House and the English practice, that you should call upon the Chairman of Committees, or in his absence, any member of the House. But it is clear that the discretion given to you by this Act of Parliament is qualified and limited by the proposed Standing

Order requiring you to call upon a designated member, and, in his absence only, upon another member of the House. Of course, the House of Commons, no more than the Senate, can alter the law of the land by a resolution. That is well understood. That is a fundamental point. Therefore it is by Bill that this change, which I entirely approve of in itself, must be made. If it is desired by the House of Commons to lay it down as a rule that a designated member must be called upon, we are altering the Act, and we cannot do that by a Standing Order or by a resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman, that this House cannot by a resolution alter an Act of Parliament. There is no doubt about that, and that is not my intention in moving these resolutions. These resolutions are introduced for the purpose of basing and founding an Act of Parliament upon them, and the moment they are passed a Bill will be introduced.

Mr. MILLS. Then they are not the Orders of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no question which comes before the Parliament which cannot be commenced by resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. No, there is no question which comes before Parliament which cannot be commenced by a resolution, but it must be a resolution upon which a Bill is to be founded. This is not a resolution for the founding of a Bill, but a resolution complete in itself, which the hon. gentleman proposes to make a Standing Order. It is now for the first time that we hear of the hon. gentleman's proposed Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is nothing said about this being a Standing Order in the resolution now in your hands. We will come to that by-and-bye. In the meantime, I may assure the hon. gentleman that I have the Bill drafted.

Mr. BLAKE. We have this difficulty. We have already elected the Chairman of Committees. The Committee of Ways and Means will be struck very soon, we hope, and committees of this House will be in existence. Is this resolution to have any force in the meantime? Are you to be bound by it? On the face of it, you appear to be bound by it, but you are not bound by it, and it is an illegal order until the Bill is passed.

Resolution agreed to.

On the sixth resolution,

Mr. BLAKE. We have already arranged by a Standing Order, until and unless a Bill shall be passed, to override an Act of our own Parliament. I presume the hon. gentleman is equally able to override the Constitutional Act by a like Order. The Constitutional Act is an Act of the Imperial Parliament, for which the hon. gentleman has been supposed to have some deference, and the 47th section of that Act declares that, "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides"—mark you, Sir, not until the House of Commons, by a Standing Order or otherwise, otherwise provides, but "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides," and the only way in which the Parliament of Canada can provide is by an Act of Parliament—"in case of the absence for any reason of the Speaker from the Chair of the House of Commons for a period of forty-eight consecutive hours, the House may elect another of its members to act as Speaker, and the member so elected shall, during the continuance of such absence of the Speaker, have and execute all the powers, privileges and duties of Speaker." Now, there is a provision which was the same as, or was based upon, the then provision in England for this case. It is in the same words, and I maintain that any variation from that provision, any alteration of the relations of the House to the Chair in the case of the

absence of the Speaker, cannot be accomplished otherwise than by Bill. Here you find, "until the Parliament of Canada otherwise provides," certain things are to be done. Now, what does the hon. gentleman propose? "That whenever the House shall be informed by the Clerk at the Table of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker," so that, if you are absent at any time, not merely for forty-eight hours, but for that or any other time, "the Chairman of Committees shall perform the duties and exercise the authority of Speaker." What is provided in the 47th section is that "the House may elect another of its members to be Speaker." I maintain that we, by Standing Order, have no right to amend this 47th clause of the Constitutional Act, and provide that a designated member shall be called to the Chair. It must be done by Bill, and by Bill only, and the hon. gentleman's Standing Order, unless and until a Bill be passed, is a void Standing Order, in so far as it varies from the Constitutional Act, and is otherwise useless and waste paper.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that unless and until the Act passes, the present provision in the British North America Act must prevail—unless and until it be otherwise; and we are now proceeding for the purpose of otherwise providing.

Mr. CASEY. Will the election of a Chairman of Committees, who is also to act as Deputy Speaker, be also null and void unless and until the Act is passed? And after the Act is passed, will it be necessary to re-elect that gentleman?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Resolution agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. To meet the view, to a certain extent, of the hon. gentleman, and instead of moving that the two foregoing resolutions be made Standing Orders of this House, I move for leave to bring in a Bill founded upon them.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the first time I have seen the hon. gentleman having intended to do a thing, and wanting to do a thing, being quite decided to do a thing, not know the way to do it. If the hon. gentleman had said these resolutions were intended to initiate proceedings for a Bill, and intending that and knowing that, he gave us notice they were going to be Standing Orders, and then sprang the Bill upon us, I am sorry to say the hon. gentleman should, upon this occasion, not have known the way. I rather suspect it was because he did not know the difficulty. If he had known the difficulty and intended to accomplish the object, I am quite sure we would not have seen this last resolution put upon the paper which the hon. gentleman has just now moved.

Motion agreed to, and Bill (No. 26) to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker read the first time.

REMUNERATION OF CENSUS COMMISSIONERS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CARON. In the absence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, I beg leave to move that you do now leave the Chair, and that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*,—That the Minister of Agriculture shall cause to be prepared one or more tables, setting forth the rates of allowances or remuneration of the several Census Commissioners and enumerators employed in the taking of the census of the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin, not, however, to exceed in the aggregate such amount for each day of proved effective service for any enumerator and for each day of like service for any Census Commissioner as the Governor in Council directs, and the same shall be laid before Parliament within the first fifteen days of the Session next ensuing.

2. *Resolved*,—That such allowances or remuneration shall be paid to the several persons entitled thereto, in such manner as the Governor in Council directs, but shall not be payable until the services required

Mr. BLAKE.

of the person receiving the same have been faithfully and entirely performed.

3. *Resolved*,—That such allowances or remuneration and all expenses to be incurred in carrying into effect any Act of the Parliament of Canada relating to such census shall be paid out of such moneys as are provided by Parliament for that purpose.

These resolutions are for the purpose of providing for the remuneration of the enumerators to be appointed for taking the census in Manitoba and the North-West Territories. It has been considered desirable to have the census in the Province of Manitoba and also in the North-West Territories taken every five years instead of every ten. I think it is very desirable that in a new and growing country like Manitoba its progress and development should be ascertained and published more frequently than once in ten years. As to the North-West Territories, I think it is also very desirable that their agricultural development and the producing capabilities of that very fertile country, in the way of agricultural products and cattle, should be ascertained and published to the world oftener than once in ten years. I know that at the present time those statistics are collected, but I think that under the new system they will be collected in a very much more satisfactory and complete manner than they are at present.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry that the hon. member has proposed these resolutions to-day. I think the proceedings, if not absolutely irregular, are premature. It is not a resolution upon which to found a Bill at all, and no Bill is actually introduced by the Minister of Agriculture for the taking of a census in the North-West Territories; and yet we have here the money resolution for that Bill. Now, as a rule, we do not take money resolutions on Bills until after the House has had the second reading of the Bill, and for the reason that money resolutions, when reported, are referred to the committee to which the Bill has been referred. But the Bill itself has not been printed. We are unable to scrutinise its provisions, to see if they harmonise with the money resolutions; and we really have not, therefore, a fair opportunity of seeing how they fit into the resolutions of the Bill. There is no difference of opinion as to the principle of the Bill. From this side of the House, some years ago, the suggestion was made that there should be a quinquennial instead of a more distant census. These resolutions contain, however, certain very peculiar provisions as to details for the payment of the enumerators. I know not whether the hon. gentleman (Mr. Caron) has received instructions from the Minister who is in charge of the Department to give full explanations as to the reasons why they have been inserted; but if the hon. gentleman had devoted himself to that point, instead of discussing the principle of a quinquennial census, which belongs to the Bill and not to the resolutions, his remarks would have been more pertinent to what is immediately before us. What is immediately before us is as to these details. There is an illusory provision as to the control of Parliament over these salaries. The resolution reads:

"That the Minister of Agriculture shall cause to be prepared one or more tables, setting forth the rates of allowance or remuneration," and so forth, "and the same shall be laid before Parliament within the first fifteen days of the Session next ensuing."

We do not know the principle on which these men are to be remunerated. We should have some further information as to the principle on which the public money is to be expended. Moreover, the resolutions should indicate the principle. This House should not give a vague and indefinite power to the hon. Minister, particularly when there is no need to do so. The census has been taken in these very Territories. It was done in 1881. The decennial census has been taken more than once in the country. The hon. Minister must know the proper principle, and if he does not know it he must find it out; he must lay down a principle after a little while, before he passes the Order in

Council. Why should he not state to the House that such and such a principle is to be applied to the remuneration of the enumerators, and ask the House to sanction it, not ask the House to give the whole matter into his discretion. The resolutions also set forth that the allowances or remuneration and all expenses shall be paid out of such moneys as are provided by Parliament. My objection is to asking this House to surrender its functions of passing upon these proposals and handing over exclusive control and an indefinite power to fix the remuneration to the hon. Minister of the Department.

Mr. CARON. The leader of the Opposition is quite right in asking for the information which I have received from my colleague, who, unfortunately, owing to illness, is prevented from being in his seat to-day. As the House knows, under the old Act, the remuneration given to commissioners was \$4 per day, and \$3 per day to each enumerator. Payment was made up under the old Act—and it will be made up in like manner if these resolutions are carried into effect and a Bill based on them is accepted by the House—on a calculation of the days of service, the number of miles travelled and the number of families taken, the payment to commissioners not to exceed the amount I have stated, \$4 per day, and that of enumerators, \$3 per day. In addition to the amount stated, additional compensation was given in the case of some outlying parts of the Province, such as the upper part of the county of Ottawa. As in some remote portions of the older Provinces, so in the North-West Territory and Province of Manitoba, although the rule of \$4 per day to commissioners and \$3 per day to enumerators was laid down extras had to be paid, due to the sparseness of the population and the great length of mileage which had to be travelled, and also from the difficulties experienced in many instances by enumerators in getting from one place to another. Nevertheless, the rule adopted by the Department of Agriculture is intended to be followed—according to information I have received—which is, payment of \$4 per day to commissioners and \$3 to enumerators.

Motion agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will alter the resolutions by inserting the maximum rate of payment to which he has referred.

Mr. CARON. The information I have given is the information which I have received. I know that the maximum which the Minister intended to lay down as the rule to be adopted is \$4 per day for each commissioner, and \$3 for each enumerator. In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I do not desire to make the change which the leader of the Opposition has suggested; but I do not mean to ask concurrence in the resolutions until that point has been satisfactorily settled.

Mr. BLAKE. There will, of course, be allowed the same freedom of debate on the motion to concur as in committee?

Mr. CARON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLS. We see the practical inconvenience of being called on to consider these resolutions without knowing precisely at this moment what is contained in the Bill. I do not know from the provisions of the resolutions whether the Government intend taking the census over the entire North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin, or merely in particular organised districts. I think we should know what the Government propose to do before we are called on to take action. The hon. Minister in charge of the resolutions must be aware that unless the Government are prepared to dispute the decision of the Judicial Committee in regard to the boundaries of Manitoba, all those parts of the District of Keewatin in which there were no

civilised settlers were embraced either in the Province of Ontario or the Province of Manitoba. The settlers along the Rainy River are now held to be within the Province of Ontario, and not within the District of Keewatin. Hon. gentlemen opposite, by the alterations they made in the boundaries of Manitoba, included in it the Icelandic settlements which were in the District of Keewatin, so that there are no settlers in the District of Keewatin, except a few wandering tribes, or sections of tribes of Indians. There are no people to provide a government for; there is no necessity for a government, and in fact there can be no civilized government within that particular district, and I cannot understand why the hon. gentleman should propose resolutions to take the census in a district in which there are no settlers, and in which there are not likely to be any for some time to come; for all those sections of the District of Keewatin which were at all likely to be settled for years to come are, as I have already stated, within either the Province of Manitoba or the Province of Ontario. Then, with regard to the North-West Territory, there are certain districts which the hon. gentleman marked out by Order in Council, into which settlers are going, which are surveyed and set out for settlement. I can understand why the census should be taken in those districts, as the hon. gentleman proposes, but surely the hon. gentleman does not propose to take the census of the Indian population on lands which are not set out for settlement. Surely the census is being taken with some object in view, either for the purpose of providing representation to the population in those districts, or for the purpose of giving aid to people going in there. So far, then, as those districts are concerned, which are set out for settlement and to which a population is going with a view of making a permanent settlement, there is a reason for taking a census. But with regard to other sections of the North-West Territories there can be no reason for taking the census and incurring a large expenditure unnecessarily. If there is one thing more than another which devolves upon the House, it is to look carefully after the public expenditure. When the Government make a proposal, it is the business of the House to see the extent of the authority which they seek to take, and to confine that authority within a reasonable limit. The duties of the Government are administrative, and it is the duty of the representatives of the people to determine how far they shall authorise the Government to take the census within five years. I think we should have had the Bill before us, so that we could have seen precisely what the proposal is, and seen that the taking of the census is confined to those districts which are set out for settlement; and only where it is necessary, where settlement goes on rapidly should the census be taken oftener than once in ten years.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These resolutions were introduced by the hon. the Minister of Agriculture to expedite the business, and of course if the Bill does not meet with the approbation of the House, these resolutions fall; they are of no value. The considerations which the hon. gentleman has very properly brought up will have full weight with the House when that measure is taken. It is for the House to see whether the census has to be taken at all, except the usual decennial census, and it is for Parliament to see to what portion of the North-West, Manitoba or Keewatin the Bill shall apply. These resolutions are merely to fix the rate of remuneration, and they in no way pledge the House, except as to this point, especially when the proposition of the leader of the Opposition is carried into effect, and a maximum is stated.

Mr. MILLS. But the District of Keewatin and the North-West Territory are stated without limit.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course. But the limit must be put in the Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. In the absence of the Minister of Agriculture, I would suggest to the hon. gentleman in charge of the measure, that it might be desirable to do as was intended to be done in taking the original census—that is, to lay on the Table of the House a schedule of the questions which these proposed enumerators are to ask and the information they should obtain. I mention that because I think it might be of very considerable practical importance in the future, that there should be presented as clear a view as possible of the condition of the people of the North-West to-day. I am quite convinced that in a few years their progress will be very great, and any comparison with this census would be of great value in every point of view. There are two or three matters which, at the proper time, I would like to call attention to, which have been omitted in our present census, and which I think it is greatly to be regretted were omitted, more particularly—and the hon. gentleman and the First Minister will see the force of it—that we have no information as to the quality and condition of the buildings in the Dominion of Canada. In all other censuses that I know of, and certainly in Great Britain and Ireland, great care is taken to show of what material the houses consist, of how many rooms the houses are composed, and valuable and important deductions touching the welfare of the population are and have been drawn from this information. I called attention to it in 1881, but, unfortunately, it was not attended to, and a valuable element of information has thereby been lost. Now, I think that in the case of the North-West Territories it would be of special interest to those who may be here five years hence to have this information.

Mr. CARON. I will make a note of the remarks which have fallen from hon. gentlemen, and will call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to them. I am quite certain he will give the information if possible.

Resolutions agreed to, and ordered to be reported.

THE BUDGET.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is the hon. Minister of Finance in a position to give us any information as to when we may expect the financial statement?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot, at present.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would beg, if the Finance Minister does not object, that the Public Accounts should be referred, together with the Auditor-General's report, to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts. There has been, perhaps necessarily, some little delay in calling the Committee together, and it would be a convenience to have the Public Accounts before them to-morrow.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I have no objection. The meeting to-morrow is for organization.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Mr. SPEAKER. Do you move it?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Minister of Railways and Canals for the year ending 30th June, 1884.—(Mr. Pope.)

Report of the Postmaster-General for the year ending 30th June, 1884.—(Mr. Carling.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 27) to provide for the punishment of seduction and like offences.—Mr. Charlton.

THE PUBLIC DEBT.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, The gross amount of the public debt on 1st January, 1885?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The amount of the gross debt of the Dominion of Canada on the 1st January, 1885, was \$253,739,146.77.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. GIGAULT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to take any action with reference to the suggestions made in the report of the Select Committee appointed during the last Session of Parliament to enquire into the agricultural interests of Canada, to the effect:—"That the Government take into earnest and favorable consideration the advisability of establishing a bureau of agriculture, and an experimental farm in connection therewith?"

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This subject now engages the attention of the Government, and we hope to be able to come down with a measure on the subject this Session.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT.

Mr. AUGER asked, Whether the Government has, as provided by the second sub-section of section 56, of the Act 30 Vic., chap. 30, intituled: "An Act respecting the sale of Intoxicating Liquors, and the issue of licenses therefor," made regulations directing in what manner the license fund shall be applied; and if so, what are the salaries of the commissioners and of the inspectors?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have made no regulations on the subject as yet.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EXPENSES AND EARNINGS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the working expenses and the earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for each month of the first six months of the current fiscal year, as returned by the Moncton Office to the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. POPE. In the month of July, the earnings were \$205,000, and the expenditure \$250,000; in August the earnings were \$197,948, and the expenditure \$253,869; in September the earnings were \$213,196, and the expenditure \$255,146; in October the earnings were \$233,754, and the expenditure \$266,775; in November the earnings were \$206,663, and the expenditure \$232,159; and in December the earnings were \$152,154, and the expenditure \$187,550.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. AUGER asked, Is it the intention of the Government to employ the House of Commons *Hansard* reporters

during the recess at such reporting as may be required to be done in connection with the Supreme Court, before the official arbitrators, in special arbitrations or other cases in which such reporting is chargeable to the Dominion Government.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The salary of the reporters has been fixed by resolution of last Session, but if it is the desire of the House that their services should be utilised during the recess, the Government will enquire into the matter. But, as I said before, the House has fixed their salary, by resolution, for their work only during the Session.

THE CASE OF D. J. HUGHES.

Mr. WILSON asked, Whether the Government has investigated the charges of certain petitioners of the County of Elgin, against the official conduct of D. J. Hughes, County Judge of Elgin? If so, do they intend to appoint a commissioner or to take any further action in the matter? If so, what action, and when will it be taken? Has there been correspondence between the Government and D. J. Hughes in the matter?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has not investigated the charge. They do not intend to appoint a Commission, because, on careful examination of the whole matter, they are of opinion that it is not a case for enquiry under 45 Vic., chap. 12. As to the third branch of the question, a copy of the charges was sent to the judge, and he replied they were too general to answer. The Minister eliminated those charges in respect of which he did not think it necessary to ask an explanation. The other charges were then sent to the judge, who replied. The petitioner (Stanton) asked for a copy of this reply. On enquiry of the judge whether he had any objection, he replied that he preferred that his answer should be sent down to the House with the charges which had been made against him.

INDIAN ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1884:

Mr. COCKBURN asked, Whether any band or bands of Indians, by order of the Governor in Council, have been declared fit to have the Indian Advancement Act of 1884 applied to them?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No band or bands of Indians have been declared fit to have the Indian Advancement Act of 1884 applied to them. The Act was not to be applied to Indian bands earlier than the first of January, 1885.

Mr. COCKBURN asked, Whether any steps have been taken by correspondence with Indian agents or otherwise, with a view to bring into operation the provisions of the Indian Advancement Act of 1884?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The attention of Indian agents has been called to the provisions of the Act, and they have been instructed to bring the same under the consideration of such of the bands within their agency as might be considered sufficiently advanced in civilisation to have the provisions of the Act applied to them.

MR. J. H. MORGAN.

Mr. COCKBURN asked, Who is J. H. Morgan, whose name appears in the Public Accounts for 1884 as having received \$3,125 for services as Forestry Commissioner? When was he appointed, and upon whose recommendation? What are his duties? Has he made any report to the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Joseph Henry Morgan, was, upon recommendation of Sir John A. Macdonald, appointed by Order in Council of 22nd February, 1883, a

Commissioner to enquire into and report upon the subject of the protection of the public forests of Canada. He has made a report, a summary of which is published in the Report of the Minister of the Interior for 1884, part 6.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883.

Mr. FOSTER asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to maintain the Boards of Commissioners appointed under the provisions of the Liquor License Act of 1883 in counties and cities which have adopted the Canada Temperance Act of 1878; if so, whether since the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Canada *in re the "Liquor License Act of 1883,"* if any instructions have been issued to boards in such counties and cities looking towards the enforcement of the Act; and, if not, if it is the intention of the Government to issue any such instructions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The whole subject of this question is under the consideration of the Government.

BREAKWATER AT BAYFIELD, N.S.

Mr. McISAAC asked, Is it the intention of the Government to provide this Session for the completion or further extension of the breakwater at Bayfield, N. S.?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am not in a position to say to the hon. gentleman whether the Government will provide for this work during this Session.

A DIVORCE COURT.

Mr. FARROW asked, Is it the intention of the Government to create a Divorce Court instead of having applications for divorce come before the two Houses of Parliament?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is not the intention of the Government to introduce a Divorce Bill.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT NAPANEE.

Mr. PRUYN asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to recommend the construction of a Customs and Post Office building at Napanee?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I must say to the hon. gentleman that I have not yet been able to bring this matter under the consideration of the Government.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—SECTION B.

Mr. CASEY asked, Has the sum of \$395,600, awarded as damages to Manning, Macdonald, McLaren & Co., contractors for Section B, Canadian Pacific Railway, by Messrs. Brydges and Light, two of the arbitrators to whom the claims of the said contractors for damages were submitted, or any part of such sum, been paid to said contractors? If so, in what amounts and on what dates?

Mr. POPE. There was a certificate issued on 2nd July for \$100,000; on 14th July one for \$50,000; on 21st October, one for \$245,600, making a total of \$395,600.

Mr. CASEY asked, Has the intention of the Government, as stated by Sir Charles Tupper in Committee of Supply, on 17th April, 1884, to take the opinion of eminent counsel as to the binding character of the award of Messrs. Brydges and Light, giving damages to the contractors for Section B, Canadian Pacific Railway, to the extent of \$395,600, and as to the action to be taken in case it was not considered binding, before paying anything on account of said award, been carried out? If so, what was the opinion of the counsel consulted, and what action has been taken?

Mr. POPE. Eminent counsel was selected, as Sir Charles Tupper said in this House at that time would be the case;

and the advice was that there was no use in contesting the award.

Mr. CASEY asked, Did Judge Clarke, the nominee of the Government on the Section B arbitration make any separate report to the Government in regard to the contractor's claims for damages, or in regard to the award of Messrs. Brydges and Light which the latter state he (Clarke) refused to sign? If so, what is the nature of such report?

Mr. POPE. We have no such report.

TELEGRAPHS IN CAPE BRETON.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to extend the telegraph system from Cape North along the north-west coast of Cape Breton in connection with the existing telegraph lines?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This matter was brought to my notice the other day by the superintendent of telegraph lines; I have taken no action in the matter as yet.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) asked, Whether the Government have taken any steps towards promoting the extension of our trade relations with other countries, British or foreign? If so, with what country and with what prospect of success?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government have taken steps towards promoting the extension of our trade relations with other countries, but I may state to the hon. member that in the opinion of the Government it would not be in the public interest to name the countries at this moment.

GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. PAINT moved for:

Copies of all reports made by engineers employed by the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company in Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, with the plans, papers and correspondence connected therewith; also, for copies of all correspondence with the Dominion Government and the Government of Nova Scotia on the same subject; also, copies of all contracts by and between the said company and other persons; also, a statement of all moneys paid out and expended on contracts for salaries, wages and labor; showing also the amounts, if any, still due and owing by the said company to their contractors, agents or workmen. And also a statement of the number of miles completed and graded in each of the counties of Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou.

He said: My object, Mr. Speaker, in moving for this Return is to procure reliable information in connection with the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company, which was incorporated in 1882, by an Act of this Parliament: I desire to ascertain why this company has done so little useful work. I want to know if there is any just foundation for the report so strongly made by a reliable party that this company has not paid its debts to the contractors, laborers and others, although the shareholders were reported to be millionaires. I wish, in short, to ascertain the total indebtedness of the Short Line Railway Company, and to arrive at some just plan whereby the contractors may be paid in order to avoid their total ruin; and I desire also to arrive at a just basis for the payment of the laborers and others, who are still in the locality of the works and within the Province, and who are deprived of the necessaries of life by being denied wages due them. In regard to the Short Line Railway passing through the Counties of Cumberland, Colchester, and Pictou, I am not here to say that it should not be constructed, but rather to give my support and influence, if needed, to assist in maturing a plan whereby, first, the debts of the company may be paid, and, second, the railway ultimately completed. But at this point I do not wish to be misunderstood.

Mr. POPE.

Whatever arrangements are made for railway extension into Cape Breton, my aim is that no entanglements shall be had in connection with any projected railway in Nova Scotia, and for this reason: There are parties who would undertake the construction of the 80 miles of railway in Cape Breton by itself; but if they are compelled to construct some 90 miles of Short Line Railway in Nova Scotia which would run side by side with the Intercolonial, they would not be disposed to undertake the contract in the Island of Cape Breton. My interest as the representative of one of the counties of Cape Breton lies in having the railway constructed by the shortest and most feasible route, and that route has already been surveyed from the Strait of Canso to St. Peter's Canal, 30 miles, and the additional 50 miles, from St. Peter's Canal to Louisburg have been surveyed but not located. The counties already named on the mainland, Cumberland, Colchester and Pictou, are intersected by railways, while Cape Breton has not one mile, except that which is situated in the locality of the Sydney Mines, with a line connecting the harbor of Louisburg and Sydney, but all owned by the coal company. Cape Breton has 90,000 people who desire and long for railway accommodation. At this time I appeal to the House on their behalf. Since 1851, a period of some 34 years, the agitation with respect to this railway has been continued, but nothing has been done up to date. It may be urged that the sum available in the Dominion Treasury is not so large as formerly when subsidies were given. As one member from the Island I take the responsibility of saying that if the Dominion Government will give us 2,000,000 acres of good land in the North-West, that grant will ensure the construction of the road. It is time this much needed railway was an accomplished fact, constructed either by the Government or by a company. The necessities of the Government may compel us to accept 2,000,000 acres of land in the North-West in lieu of a cash subsidy, such a gift being perfectly in order when made to a portion of a grand trunk line such as this will be, extending as it will do from Vancouver to Louisburg. The disposal of these lands will be an easy mode for the Dominion Government to do justice in the matter of our through railway; besides, the advantages of such a transaction would not be altogether on our side, for the whole Dominion would be benefited and the bond of mutual dependence would be strengthened. Whatever arguments apply to the granting of a Dominion subsidy to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that great transcontinental line of Canada, apply with equal or greater force to a railway in Cape Breton from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, as a portion of the great trunk line already constructed to the Strait of Canso, and only requiring the building of 80 miles to bring the railway to an unsurpassed terminus. In regard to the disposal of the land, I said that the advantage would not be altogether on our side. By giving Nova Scotia a share in the North-West Territory the people of that Province would be interested in developing and filling up those railway lands, and they would naturally be desirous of furnishing an outlet for the passengers, mails and products of the North-West Territory. So far as the Island of Cape Breton is concerned, nature has decreed that the outlet shall be by way of Louisburg, for no other harbor in the Island is so accessible at all seasons of the year. I may be asked: Why do you not apply to the Nova Scotia Government? It is true that Government ought to take a deep interest in this railway, but it is only a few days since two hon. gentlemen were here from that Province, Messrs. Morrison and Church, seeking from the Government what is very much like better terms, and, therefore, I do not think that a great deal can be expected from them. Moreover, when the Nova Scotia Local Government gave the Dominion a good and sufficient title to the Pictou and Truro Branch Railway, including its extension—in all 130 miles—

worth \$4,000,000 for the sum of \$1,200,000, since this transaction they maintain that they have relieved themselves of all responsibility for carrying the road into Cape Breton, and have placed the obligation on the Federal Government or, at all events, strengthened our claim for liberal consideration. I am not here, Sir, to plead the cause of the Local Government, nor to aid them in relieving themselves of their responsibility in this matter. But, Sir, we have seen how much has been done in building branch lines in different parts of the Dominion. I notice that 208 miles of railway were built in Prince Edward Island, which is only half the size of Cape Breton; a railway from the Intercolonial, the St. Charles Branch, carried into Lévis opposite the City of Quebec, costing nearly one and a-half million dollars—nearly sufficient in itself to build our road to the Island of Cape Breton; the Vancouver Island Railway, under construction, was provided for last winter in this House; a number of branches were built or are being constructed on the great river of Miramichi; a branch, 27 miles in length, carried to Dalhousie—to the harbor of Richibucto, connecting it with the Intercolonial; 43 miles from the Intercolonial to Parrsboro', and another short line projected to Pugwash, which, in my opinion, should be built; and still another line projected in the vicinity of Metepediac. I am glad to see all these lines being constructed; I am pleased that the several counties in which they exist are deriving these benefits. But, Sir, I plead on behalf of Cape Breton, and I wish to say that the electors of that Island look upon the short line project with contempt, and consider it a perfect flumbug. I desire to say further that there is a great probability that although the Island of Cape Breton sent five members to this House to support the Government—there is a possibility that they may not come again, if the Government does not do something for the railway this Session. When I see all these other railways in the different counties, I am led to exclaim, I wish Sir Charles Tupper had resided in Cape Breton; but I know, I feel assured, that the right hon. leader of this House and his Cabinet will be disposed to do us justice. We were assured on the floor of this House a year ago that this short line route would be extended into Cape Breton. We have been waiting for that good time to come for two or three years past, but up to this time with no better result than the miserable failure in Nova Scotia. And although, Sir, Cape Breton has not, as we consider, received justice in this matter, I am here to say we are still Liberal-Conservative supporters in this House.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I fully concur with my hon. friend from Richmond, N. S. (Mr. Paint), with respect to the feeling which exists in the Island of Cape Breton in reference to railway extension through that Island. It would almost be impossible to exaggerate the intense feeling which exists on that Island in regard to that question. Disappointment after disappointment followed for several years, and the disappointment of last year was not the least, because then we had the assurance that at an early day a railway would be commenced and finished from the Strait of Canso, Sydney or Louisburg. However, Sir, I doubt very much if this is the place to discuss one particular phase of that question—I mean the various arguments with respect to the route of the railway. My own idea was and is still that the determination of the route through the Island of Cape Breton should be left exclusively at the discretion of any company who would undertake to build the railway through the Island. I apprehend that in past days the enforcement of particular routes upon railway companies may have been the reason why disappointment followed disappointment successively. It would be unwise, it would be unfair, it would be against the interests of the Island of Cape Breton to tie the company down to any particular route, and therefore I think it

is premature even to mention the route now. When the Government are in a position to subsidise a company sufficiently to enable them to build that road, or when the Government undertake the construction of the road themselves, it will be ample time for the member for Richmond, the member for Cape Breton County, the member for Victoria, or the member for Inverness, to present the claims of the respective localities, and to give reasons why any particular route should be selected. On that phase of the subject I have determined not to speak. My object in rising now is merely to make a statement in behalf of the Short Line Railway Company, in reference to which the hon. member has spoken. I am authorised by the engineer and the general manager of the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company to state that no correspondence has taken place, and that no plans in regard to routes in Cape Breton had been talked of or submitted to the Government; that no location of the line had been made or considered by the company, and that none would be made until the different routes had been surveyed and reported upon; that while different routes recommended by members of Parliament and other interested parties would be carefully surveyed and estimated, it was the intention of the company to ask those members of Parliament and others interested to present such statements as each might desire to make in favor of the route which he preferred; and that such statements, together with the engineer's report, would be submitted to the directors of the company for approval before any route in Cape Breton would be adopted, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. My object in rising on this occasion was simply to state this in behalf of the company and to assure my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Paint) that it is in the interest of a railway extension in Cape Breton to leave the selection of the route exclusively to the discretion of the company undertaking to build the railway subject to the approval of the Governor in Council.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria, B.C.) I would like to correct an error which the hon. member for Richmond, N.S. (Mr. Paint) made when he included in the amounts expended on railways in the Dominion of Canada, an amount for a line on Vancouver Island, which has not yet been constructed, and which has not, nor will it when built, cost the Dominion one dollar. On the contrary, it will cost the Province of British Columbia a great deal, and it puts me very much in mind of dropping a shilling and picking up a sixpence.

Mr. POPE. I may say to my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Paint) that the Government have already shown by their acts that they have taken a great interest in this road. A subsidy has already been voted for it; and the interest the Government took in it at that time has not lessened one whit to this hour. We feel the importance of that section of country being opened up by railway communication, and we will do, as we have hitherto done, all we can for it.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT ST. THOMAS.

Mr. WILSON moved for:

Copies of all reports and correspondence not already brought down relating to the construction of the Post Office, Inland Revenue and Custom house at St. Thomas, giving the amount expended to date; also the names of all persons to whom any portion of the expenditure has been paid, together with the amount paid to each, and for what?

He said: I regret exceedingly that I find it necessary on this occasion to make a similar complaint to that which I made a year ago, that is as to the slowness of the construction of the buildings at St. Thomas. It appears to me that there might be a little more expedition in the completion of those buildings, and I think the Government, if they were aware of the offices which their various servants there have

to occupy, and the impairment of their general health which is caused thereby, would find an inducement for urging forward the work a little more rapidly. I cannot understand why they do not exercise more energy in the completion of those buildings, unless perhaps, it is in order that some of the officials in the employment of the Government may be able to draw a little larger salary the longer the buildings are delayed. One of those officials, who was formerly a member of this House, has been employed by the Government ever since the construction of those buildings was commenced. The buildings were announced to be constructed just before the last general election, no doubt with the intention of producing an effect there,—no doubt with the object that that individual might be returned; and I might say here in passing, that judging from the liberal amount he is receiving from the Government, it is much better for him that he was defeated and I returned. I do not suppose, if I had been defeated and he returned, that I would have received the good things he has been receiving during the time those buildings have been going on. But, Sir, I find the amount given to this individual a very liberal one indeed. I have taken the trouble to compare the amount received by him as clerk of works with the amount paid to other clerks of works in various parts of the Dominion, and I find that he receives the largest amount. He must certainly be a very highly favored individual at the hands of the present Government. The Auditor-General's report shows that the contractor for the work received \$16,000 odd. What do you suppose this clerk of works receives? The liberal amount of \$1,980, nearly one-eighth of the whole amount paid to the contractor. Now, that does seem to me to be more than he ought to have received, and it is perhaps one of the reasons why the progress of the work has been so slow; because, when the buildings are completed, of course his usefulness in that capacity will be gone, and until something new turns up for him at the hands of the Government he will be without his daily pay. I wish also to call the attention of the Government to another fact. I think they will agree with me that in the interests of the officers, especially those employed in the collecting of Customs, their health ought to be considered. The hon. Minister of Customs will know full well that the building occupied at present by these clerks is not suitable at all and very injurious to their health. I might say further that though the Government may consider they are not wholly to blame for the delay in construction, as the gentleman who had the contract, Mr. Henry Linden, found in the past great difficulty in obtaining the stone for the building on account of those with whom he entered into contract not being able to supply it as fast as required—though perhaps that will be to a certain extent his excuse and be considered as a satisfactory excuse, as far as the Government is concerned, I do not look upon it in that light. I think that it was the bounden duty of the Government to see that the contractor proceeded with the work with all due speed. The hon. the Minister of Public Works, whom I now see in his place, may be able to state the reason why the very large amount of \$1,980 was paid to the clerk of works when there was only \$16,000 paid the contractor. Mr. Arkell does not appear at all in the report of 1883 as clerk of works. I do not know why he did not appear in that report, and I called the attention of the House to that fact last year. In this year's report I find since then he has been appointed clerk of the works and did not appear as such before, as he had received no pay prior to that time. I hope the Government will proceed with all despatch to get the buildings completed, and at the same time I would desire to see here done what it has been the custom to do in other places where the Government put up public buildings, namely, make provision for laying a pavement in front of the building.

Mr. WILSON.

We have given the Government the advantage of grading and thus relieved them from that necessity; and as it is advisable we should have correct time kept by the Government in the future, I would mention to the hon. the Minister of Public Works the propriety of placing in the tower built for the purpose a very good clock.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You want to go on tick.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. When I saw my hon. friend in his seat, I felt sure he would call my attention to that matter this, as he did last year. I am very much pleased to tell him that the work is proceeding very well now and will be completed in a very short time. The delay occasioned in the construction of the building was not due to the contractor or the Government or their employés. The contractor had made a contract with parties to furnish him with the stone required, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit that the quality of the stone is a very good one; but the party who agreed to furnish the stone was delayed or disappointed and could not furnish it in time, thus occasioning delay. Of course when we begin with a certain kind of stone we must finish with the same kind in order that the building may be throughout of the same color, and that the upper part may not be of such color as would disfigure the structure. The hon. gentleman speaks of the clerk of works. Well, the clerk of works, his predecessor, was a representative of the county. It shows the representatives of that county are men to be trusted, and perhaps the hon. gentleman himself may some day or other occupy this trustworthy position. As to the price paid per day, it was that paid for a trusted man or one having special aptitude for this work, and is not an excessive rate. The hon. gentleman now suggests a few different improvements. He suggests that there should be a sidewalk. Well, it is likely a sidewalk will go with the building as is generally the case with all buildings of some importance. As the building does not pay any revenue to the town, we may give it a good sidewalk, and I do not suppose, though the county has the advantage of being represented by the hon. gentleman, we will make a different rule in this case. As to the clock, this matter will have to be considered.

Mr. MILLS. It takes time.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I cannot say whether we will give the time to the hon. gentleman in St. Thomas; but at all events the suggestion has been made from different quarters. The building, however, not having been completed, I do not think the matter should be laid before my colleagues now; but it will be considered when the building is about being completed. The papers will be brought down.

Mr. CASEY. I am astonished to hear the hon. Minister say that no unusual price has been paid for the services of Mr. Arkell as clerk of works on this building. On looking at the Public Accounts I find he was paid \$1,980 previous to the first of June, 1884, and apparently for the year 1883-84, as it was put in the accounts for that year. The hon. gentleman appears to be under the impression that Mr. Arkell received only \$3 a day for the number of days he was employed. \$1,980 is a great deal more than \$3 a day for one year; that would only bring the amount to about \$900, or less than one-half that paid. Or if you take it that Mr. Arkell only got \$3 a day and that this amount paid was for all the time he was engaged on the works, it would carry his engagement back two years and two months—in fact to the time he sat in this House. The hon. Minister must be misinformed as to the rate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No; he was paid for the time he was employed.

Mr. CASEY. Then he was employed during the time he sat here as a member.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think not.

Mr. CASEY. \$1,980, total payment, made up at \$3 per day, would give 660 days, or two years and two months of working days, which would bring the employment back, dating from the last of June, 1884, to the time this House was last in Session in 1882, previous to the general elections, when Mr. Arkell was still a member. I do not suppose he was paid at that time, and I presume the Minister has been misinformed as to the rate of his pay. But, when I compare the salary of Mr. Arkell with that of other clerks of works in the year 1883-84, I find that he has received \$700 more than any other clerk of works in the whole Dominion of Canada, engaged on any buildings whatever. The services of Mr. Arkell were considered to be worth \$700 more than the services of any other clerk of works, and not only so, but, when I compare the works on which he was engaged with works of the same importance elsewhere, I find very grave discrepancies. The nearest comparison I can find is the Dominion buildings at St. Catharines, on which \$16,300 were spent, while \$16,580 were spent on the buildings at St. Thomas; but the clerk of works at St. Catharines was paid only \$150, while at St. Thomas he was paid \$1,980. It is evident that a very different scale of remuneration prevails in St. Catharines from that which prevails in St. Thomas. At another place, Clifton, \$17,300 were spent on the works and only \$637 on the clerk of the works. If I go a little farther and refer to larger sums, the discrepancy is still more remarkable. I find that the clerk of works who looked after the building of the Manitoba Penitentiary, near Winnipeg—and that is a place where living is supposed to be pretty dear—a building on which \$38,880 were spent, was paid \$145.60 for his services. The clerk who looked after the works at Hamilton, on which \$89,730 were spent, was paid \$1,281, which is the nearest approach to Mr. Arkell's salary, being \$700 less, while six times as much money was spent on the works under his care. If we go again to the North-West, I find that the large sum of \$122,837 was expended on the Parliament buildings in Winnipeg. The expenditure of this money was looked after by no less than three clerks, one receiving \$1,000, one \$500, and a third \$200, the whole three receiving \$1,700, or \$230 less than Mr. Arkell got for looking after the expenditure of \$16,580 in St. Thomas. I think the hon. the Minister must admit that he has adopted a very different scale of remuneration in these different cases, and I can only draw one conclusion, that there is some special virtue in connection with the constituency of East Elgin, which confers not only distinction but special capacity for public service on those who have at some time or other represented it. As Mr. Arkell is not a man of any special previous experience in this kind of work, and considering that he spends most of his time, in the autumn and winter at all events, in buying grain at a point twelve or fifteen miles distant from St. Thomas, it cannot be imagined that his excessive pay is due to any special aptitude in the man himself, or to any special attention which he pays to the work, but that the special pay is due to the exceptional virtue conferred upon him by his having at one time represented that remarkable riding of East Elgin, a virtue which has made his services worth \$700 more than those of any other similar official in the Dominion, and ten or twelve times as much as officials who have superintended the expenditure of several times as much money elsewhere.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I think the hon. the Minister ought to give the date of the first payment to this person. I do not think the hon. gentleman can pass these remarks in silence. There is a grave charge made of over payment, and the date should be given.

11

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have not the date of the payments, but this motion asks for the papers, and the date will be given in those papers when they come down. If a question had been placed on the Orders, I would have given the answer.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I suppose the hon. gentleman was reading from a document in his hands.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I had this note about the delay that had occurred. The hon. gentleman had called the attention of the Department to that, and I thought he would speak of it to-day, and therefore I asked the officer of my Department to give me a statement about the delay that had occurred, which resulted, as I mentioned just now, from the failure of the party who was to furnish the stone to the contractor to give it at the proper time.

Mr. CASEY. I would suggest that the date of payment should be added to the Return.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course I will give that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman will, of course, see that the statement he has made is entirely irreconcilable with the Public Accounts in regard to this matter. He has stated that this gentleman is paid \$3 a day.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. \$90 a month.

Mr. BLAKE. We count Sundays as well?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. That is \$3 a day. It is always done in that way.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say it is always done, but I am glad to know it, because when we talked of \$3 a day for a surveyor of works, I supposed it is paid for the days on which he surveyed them, and I presumed that he went to church on Sundays. That is \$1,080 a year. The accounts show a payment to this gentleman of \$1,980 in the year, which is very nearly double what he should have received according to the hon. Minister's statement. I think, as my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) has said, that calls for some explanation.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will give the time from which he was employed and the amount of money he received every month up to the last date.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am informed this gentleman is not a mechanic at all: Who recommended him for this position?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. His services in this House recommended him, and nothing else. I say the facts which were disclosed and discussed in reference to this matter before require the attention of the House. Here is an expenditure of \$16,000, and \$2,000 is paid to an member of the House who knows nothing whatever, I have been informed, and it was stated before in this House, about the practical details of the post of clerk of works, but he gets the \$2,000 of the public money for superintending an expenditure of \$16,000. These are the facts as they appear, and they are not disputed by the Minister.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF BANKS.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I had occasion some time ago to call the attention of the Government by putting a question whether it was their intention to introduce some measure during this Session in order to get a better supervision of banks and banking institutions. They answered that it was not their intention to do so, at any rate during the present Session. Now, I think that, under the different circumstances which have appeared lately before the public concerning banks, some legislation is required better than that which we have now, in order to give more security to the

public. It is true that a bank may be considered a private institution. To a certain extent it is, but, looking at it in a broader light, it is a public institution, and so much so that to-day the banks are obliged to furnish to the Government certain returns. Well, these returns are not sufficient to guarantee the public as to the accuracy of the figures. I need not go very far back to show to the Minister of Finance that a deposit that he had in one of these banks is to-day in a very precarious situation, and that also a deposit made in the same bank by the Local Legislature of Quebec is also in a very perilous position. Now, if that particular bank had given a true and reliable return, surely it would have been the duty, both of the Local Government of the Province of Quebec and of the Government of the Dominion, to make no deposit in that bank. I consider that some kind of legislation ought to be had further to secure the public interest. The public are sometimes deceived by these returns. In one instance the stock of a certain bank was stated by the Government returns to be worth some 170 or 175 per cent., but when the true state of the bank's affairs came to be known those figures dwindled down to about 60. It is true, it may be said that it is the fault of the shareholders who sometimes elect men as directors who ought not to be confided with that trust. But the shareholders may have elected as directors men whom they believe to be worthy, but who turn out afterwards to be dishonest. Now, if these men are guilty of misappropriation of funds, or of other delinquencies, they ought to be brought before the tribunals of the country; and it is with that view that I intend to press this motion and to take the opinion of the House upon it. For instance, there should be a measure which would guard the shareholders and prevent the bank directors from endorsing, for some of their patrons or some of their friends, to a large extent. I consider that to be a breach of trust, and I affirm to this House that such has been done repeatedly, and such breach of trust ought to be punished. Moreover, Sir, these banks very often contain funds which are the only means of widows and orphans, and such funds ought to be protected by the Government. I know that in the Province of Quebec bank stocks are considered to be immoveable property which tutors and guardians have no right to sell, and therefore there is a security for minors, which, I think, ought to be extended all over the Dominion. Look at the general credit of our banks for the last twenty years or so. Previous to that time our banks enjoyed a good credit all over the country and were on a solid foundation; but since that time we have a long list of losses by banks who have been doing a bad business, of failures and disasters. The public losses in these respects have been very severe, and I think they might have been prevented by sound legislation. Look at the Bank of Upper Canada, for instance. What has become of its assets? I dare say there are many members on the floor of this House whose families have lost through that bank. I will not say what was the cause of it, but I think politics had something to do with it at the time. What has become of the City Bank, and of the Federal Bank? What has become of the stock of the Jacques Cartier Bank, of the Banque Ville Marie, of the Banque du Peuple? The latter has reduced its capital to one-half. Then there is the Mechanics' Bank and the Metropolitan Bank, and very likely there are others.

Mr. VAIL. The Consolidated Bank.

Mr. BOWELL. And the old Commercial Bank.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Well, what has become of the assets of all these banks to-day? Twenty years ago all our banking institutions were on a solid basis, but to-day we must say that many of them are not on a solid basis. Well, Sir, I think that sound legislation would prevent a recurrence of the disasters which have fallen upon the unfortunate shareholders and the country. I think we

Mr. CASGRAIN.

should pass a measure which would give to the Minister of Justice or the Finance Minister a direct supervision over these banks, and give power to enquire into the state of their affairs. Of course, the information might be considered confidential by the Government in case the particular bank was in a good condition, and then it would not be necessary to publish the affairs of the bank; but the moment the affairs of a bank appear to be unsound the fact should be divulged so that public misfortune may be prevented. There is another point. If a man is appointed as bank director he must consider his office as one of trust; he is not to be appointed a director in order to forward his own private interests to the bank's detriment, but he must consider his position as one of trust in which he is to manage the business for the benefit of the shareholders. He ought not to be a debtor of the bank to more than the actual amount of his stock in that bank—a thing that has occurred in many instances. If we look at the returns of the different banking institutions we find the directors too often are large borrowers of the funds of the bank, and in such cases, of course, they look to their own private interests first and afterwards to the interests of the shareholders. I maintain that it would be for the interests of the country at the present moment that we should have a law which would secure the public and the shareholders. I therefore move:

That it is expedient that some measure be adopted for securing by legislation a better supervision and inspection of banks.

If the Government do not take up the matter themselves I shall undertake myself to do the best I can in that direction.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the hon. mover of the resolution, supposing that he would indicate the course that should be pursued in order to guarantee the interest of the public and of the stockholders. But I failed to gather—perhaps because I did not hear distinctly all he said—I failed to gather from him much information relative to the system that he would propose to adopt if he introduced a measure upon this subject. The suggestions made by the hon. member were such suggestions as would be made on an amendment being proposed to the Banking Act, controlling the directors as to their using the funds of the bank and various matters of like character, rather than with respect to the security of the stockholders and the public, to whom the hon. gentleman particularly referred. He thought it was desirable that the Government should be clothed with the power to send some officer to visit the different banks in the country, and if the condition of a bank was good, to say nothing about it, but if bad, to take such steps as would expose its condition. The difficulty that would arise if the Government under any circumstances—unless, indeed, they were of a very extraordinary and peculiar nature—sent an officer to inspect a bank, was obvious. The very fact of its being known, no matter how strong the bank might be, that the Government had sent an officer to examine into its condition, would be most damaging to its interests, especially so if the Government adopted the suggestion of the hon. member, to say nothing about the result. This is a question of great importance, I admit, and when we were amending the Banking Act a few years ago, it was discussed very fully by the Government and by gentlemen, both bank directors and others. There are various difficulties in the way. If we had, as in the United States, national banks, with comparatively small capital, doing a business in the locality where they were established, without having a large number of branches in different parts of the country, it would be comparatively easy to have an inspection, as is done in the United States by the comptroller of currency or by his representative; but difficulty has been found even in the United States, for we know that an inspection has been made and a favorable report

submitted with respect to the condition of a bank, and six months afterwards the bank has been in difficulties, and the persons who trusted the bank had lost money.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Who was wrong, the inspector or the Government?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If an Act were passed by Parliament to-morrow authorizing the inspection of banks, and the Government officer visited a bank and made a report that the business was sound and in good condition, and six months afterwards the bank became involved in financial trouble, who would be held responsible. The Government would be held responsible. It would be said that we deposited money there, we took the notes freely—the Government has provided that notes must be first paid in advance of all other claims—we deposited money there at a high rate of interest because the Government had reported favorably on the bank; and, no doubt, people would come to Parliament for compensation, because they had deposited money on the certificate of the inspector. It is an exceedingly difficult question, and hon. members who have anything to do with banking business know that even if the Government secured the best man in the country for the position of inspector, he might be acquainted with the standing of the Merchants Bank in Montreal, but he could form a very vague opinion of the character of the securities in its different branches throughout the Dominion, and in this way it is much more difficult to provide for inspection than it otherwise would be. There are those who object to inspection, and say, why inspect banks more than other companies? The Government has secured persons holding the circulation. But if a person will deposit money at 5 or 6 per cent. on a higher rate, because a particular bank is disposed to give more than other banks, it is a matter for the parties themselves to consider, as they would do if they were dealing with any other corporation. That is an objection pressed by many who object to bank inspection. But while this subject was under discussion the Government endeavored to ascertain whether we could, in addition to guaranteeing the circulation, secure a system of efficient inspection, because inefficient inspection is worse than no inspection; and the Government, after considering the matter and hearing the arguments *pro*, and *con*, decided that, as the difficulties were so great, they would not ask Parliament to establish inspection. I know that this matter has again been pressed on the Government during the last two or three months, but surrounded as the question is with so many difficulties the Government authorised me to state, in answer to a question put by the hon. gentleman who has moved this motion, that it was not the intention of the Government to introduce a measure in regard to bank inspection, at all events during the present Session.

Mr. HESSON. This is a question of very considerable importance, and to a great extent I agree with what has fallen from the Minister of Finance in regard to the danger which would arise from improper inspection. If the Government found that a bank required inspection and they adopted the suggestion of the hon. member who has moved this motion, there is no doubt that the bank would be damaged by it. I cannot but feel that the injury or evil arising out of the banking system might be very largely mitigated if the Government would adopt what may be regarded as a very rash policy at the first glance, but one to which I fully believe this country will come sooner or later, and that is to withdraw from the chartered banks the privilege of circulating their own bills. I am satisfied that until the Government adopts that policy, until they give the banks to understand that when their charters lapsed that privilege will be withheld in future, and the Government will take the whole of the paper issue into their own charge, the evil will go on, and go on increasing, as my friend has pointed out,

to the injury of the stockholders and depositors and also the unfortunate bill-holders. I do not see why any institutions should possess that privilege simply because they make a demand for it. It is quite sufficient that people should have to risk deposits, if they have the good fortune to be able to make deposits, but it is another thing that men drawing their weekly or monthly wages, should be called upon to suffer loss on the circulation of the bank, and that capitalists should be able to buy up the circulation and make large profits out of the unfortunate note holders who are unable to wait until the assets of the bank are realised. The time has come for a change, and on the termination of the present bank charters the Government should take on themselves the responsibility of issuing the whole of the paper circulation of the country.

Mr. IVES. I do not agree with the mover of this resolution in his view that bank inspection would be of practical advantage. In fact, my observation has taught me that in the United States, where it is possible, it has been anything but effective; and I think with the Finance Minister, that here it is hardly possible. The inspector by the time he had inspected the head office would have to go to the different branches, and it would be quite possible for a dishonest management to deceive the inspector, and to furnish him with paper or notes at the different branches which would verify the returns, whereas it might be transported from the head office to the branches, or from one branch to another. If directors and managers of banks are not competent and honest it is impossible for any inspection we could adopt, or which the Government might attempt to carry into effect, to be effective. But I think there are some particulars as to which the Banking Act might be amended in the direction of improving the security of the public, and one particular to which I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister, if he contemplates amending the Act is this: that a more stringent provision might be made, obliging the directors of banks to dispose of immoveable or chattel property which may fall into their hands. It is well known that it is quite common for directors of banks, when property falls into their hands, to hold it for years, and to put it down in their statement of assets at exactly what it cost them, when in reality it is not worth one third or one half its cost. It appears year after year in their statement of assets; the public know nothing about it; the managers and directors do know, but it appears in their statement at a fictitious value. This is a matter which regulates the dividends paid by banks, and I believe there are cases in which banks are made weaker by paying dividends which they have not earned, by reason of the fictitious value of these assets, whereas, if this property were not held, and they were compelled to write off the losses, the public would be aware of their extent, and the bank would not be weakened by having to pay dividends on more than the actual value of their assets. I think a provision obliging banks to sell all such property within a certain time, for whatever it may bring, would result in our getting annually a more accurate account of the standing of the banks than we can at present. Our large institutions, doing business all over the country, in the course of years, accumulate a large amount of property which they find it difficult to sell, which they are loath to sell at the prices they are able to obtain for it; they do not care to acknowledge that they have sold it for less than they paid, and they therefore carry it on and it appears at the price which it cost them, and the result is that they pay higher dividends than they are able to pay. They pay more than they should pay, and they grow weaker for that reason. I do not mean to say that such provision as I have suggested would be a panacea, but I think it would be one of the best amendments which could be made to the Banking Act.

Mr. CHARLTON. It strikes me, that the suggestion of my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), that banks should be obliged to dispose of real estate and chattel property which may come into their hands, is a strong argument in favor of the proposition of the hon. gentleman at my side (Mr. Casgrain), that there should be some kind of inspection of banks. The argument advanced by the Finance Minister that such inspection would be damaging to our banking institutions would not have, I think, very much force, if the law provided for a periodical and regular inspection of all banks, as the law should provide. There may be difficulties attending the inspection of banks, but this is a matter of detail. If it is necessary and proper that the affairs of banks should be inspected, it rests with the Government or those who settle the details of the Bill to grapple with the question as to the difficulties of inspection. There can be no doubt that the inspection clauses of the National Banking Law of the United States have been effective, and have been a great guarantee of protection to the public of that country.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was it in the case of Ward & Ward?

Mr. CHARLTON. My hon. friend reminds me of Ward & Ward. But theirs was not a national bank; they were a firm of brokers on Wall street. It is true that many national banks in the United States have come to grief, after the inspectors had pronounced them solvent, but this has been caused by perjury and concealment on the part of the officers of the bank, the result of robbery. But there can be no doubt whatever that the affairs of the several thousands of national banks of the United States are kept in proper order, that they are prevented by the national inspection from embarking in speculations, which they would be likely to embark in but for that inspection. It is not necessary that the inspector should judge as to the character of the securities or the business paper in the hands of the bank; and certain provisions might be arranged for, as, for instance, prohibiting the directors from borrowing more than a certain sum of money in proportion to their stock; preventing banks from lending on a single line of discount, beyond a certain proportion of their stock; and various salutary restrictions might be provided, and the only way of securing the observance of these restrictions would be by an efficient system of inspection. I believe that such a system is imperatively called for. I believe many of our banks—in fact, we know that many of them—have been unsound, have been proved insolvent, and in many cases I believe the business of these banks, under proper restriction and inspection, would have been kept in a position of preventing such calamities. I take pleasure in seconding the motion, believing that some properly devised measure for the inspection of banks would have a salutary effect on the public credit, conducing to the interests of those who have to do with the banks as borrowers, or who make the banks their creditors by becoming depositors in them.

Mr. BLAKE. There are no doubt certain difficulties in the way of making a system of inspection effective, particularly in the respect to which the hon. Finance Minister has alluded. Notwithstanding, my own opinion is that these difficulties ought to be grappled with, and that the present condition of our banking system has demonstrated that it is very unsatisfactory. We have had, as my hon. friend from L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) has pointed out, a very great series of catastrophes; and we find in tracing these cases that the returns in almost all of them—made, I believe, under the sanction, if not by Order of this Parliament—have been returns which cannot be characterised as otherwise than false. There are returns made which it is impossible to reconcile with honesty and attention to the concerns of the bank. Either there was a gross want of attention or

Mr. IVES.

there was dishonesty on the part of the officials who made the returns. Now we are responsible in that regard. We offer to the public at present a certain security. We say: We have provided for returns, and these returns are published from time to time in the *Official Gazette*, and they come before you, and they show you the condition of the banks; we publish them in order that the public may be informed and may judge of them. But we know—I do not at all say in all the banks—but we know from time to time, in the institutions which have broken down, that these returns have been really falsified; therefore, the evils which the hon. gentleman adverts to, of a parliamentary security given to the public—which turns out to be fallacious—exists at the present day, but exists in a manner and to an extent which requires to be considered. Now, I would make a practical suggestion on that subject. I maintain that the Government, with reference to these measures, ought to see to it that the criminal law is, in the first place, in a proper condition to take hold of those who are guilty of these falsifications, and, secondly, to see that the provisions of the criminal law are enforced. I am not now discussing the constitutional question of criminal procedure and criminal jurisdiction; we know that in election cases provision has been made for the Attorney-General taking part in the prosecutions or arranging them; but in some way or other it ought to be made plain that the power of this Legislature is intended to be exercised in the vindication of the law in cases in which that law has been abused. Up to this time the instances of its abuse and the instances of punishment for that abuse contrast in a very unsatisfactory manner, and nothing is more unfortunate than that a law should be a dead letter. You tell the public that these returns are made under the sanction of an oath, and yet they are falsified; and it turns out now that much may be done and is done in the direction of falsification, and very little punishment seems to follow. With reference to the observation which the hon. gentleman made, as to the responsibility of the Government, it seems to me open to a very strong comment. He says, You send your inspector out, and he visits the bank and reports that it is all right, and if, six months afterwards, the bank fails to whom does the public look? It comes to the Government, and he says the Government are responsible. But I would ask the hon. Minister whether it is not a greater guarantee to the public of the confidence of the Government in a banking institution, that the Government deposits its money to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars in that institution—whether the fact that the Dominion Government had deposited with the bank is not, to depositors, to note-holders, to shareholders, and to all concerned, a guarantee of its solvency of a much more pointed character than the mere return of an inspector; and yet, under our present law, as the hon. gentleman administers that law, he gives a guarantee which costs to private individuals who rely upon it, I do not know how much, and us also, large sums of money. So, it seems to me, with reference to the doctrine which the hon. gentleman has laid down, of the responsibility of the Government to the public for these declarations of the inspector of the solvency of banks, that a very strong comment is to be made as to his own conduct in dealing with insolvent banks and fraudulent returns. Now, the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has suggested that we should take care that the banks should realise their dead assets. Of course, it would be a good thing if we could compel them to do so. It would also be a good thing if we could compel them to abstain from making these big accounts which they make, and which are really the cause of their difficulties—the creation of credits of immense magnitude, out of proportion to their resources. In such cases, the person to whom the credit is granted, and who is carrying on a gigantic business, reaps all the advantage and the

bank all the disadvantage, in the event of misfortune. It would be a good thing if we could restrict banks in making these large accounts, and compel them to realise their assets. But you cannot do it. What would happen if you tried to compel a bank to realise its real property which it had taken for a debt? It would simply happen that the bank would keep the security in a mortgage instead of in an absolute deed, until such time as it could be realised. You cannot interfere with the internal economy of these banks in that way. There are modes of evading such interference, as there are modes of evading the provision of the law which limits the credits of directors; for it does sometimes happen that more money goes to the credit of a director than the Banking Act allows. It seems to me that such restrictions would be ineffective; but something might be done to effect a more vigorous application of the law to those who make these returns, and the hon. gentleman might draw some instruction from the observations which have been made and which condemn his practice in the past.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The remarks of the hon. gentleman are more directed to the expediency of amending the Banking Act and having a supervision, so far as supervision could be had, and punishing banks making false returns under the Bank Act. Well, if the present Bank Act is not stringent enough, and the powers given to punish banks making false or fraudulent returns are insufficient, that question is well worthy of consideration; but that is not the motion made by the hon. gentleman. The motion made is:

"That it is expedient that some measure be adopted for securing by legislation a better supervision and inspection of banks."

Now, I think my hon. friend the Minister of Finance has given a satisfactory answer to that proposition, that it would not be effective, that it would mislead the public, and would be of little practical value. In the United States they have a system of inspection, which has failed in very many instances. We have no system of Government inspection in the same sense in Canada; yet I take it that the proportion of failures in Canada does not exceed the proportion of failures in the United States. But besides, as my hon. friend has stated, the opportunities for an effective inspection in the United States are infinitely greater than in Canada, owing to the difference in the two systems. The banks in the United States, as a general rule, especially in the State of New York, with which we are more intimately concerned in matters of trade, have a small capital, running from \$50,000 to \$100,000, and so on. They are small private banks, doing business in a limited area; and an astute inspector sent to inspect a bank in any village or town in which it may be situated, has an opportunity of examining its securities—the commercial paper and other securities—and enquiring as to the standing of the various customers of the bank. He can only approximately arrive at a correct valuation, but he can do so approximately. But how can we arrive at a valuation of the assets of a bank having fifty or sixty agencies? The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), would submit to inspection the branches of a bank. If it be impossible to have an effective examination and to have anything like an efficient valuation of the assets of a bank, and if there cannot be an efficient valuation of those assets, the fact of an inspection merely misleads the public. They will, rightly or wrongly, put confidence in the Government's inspection. They will say: Well, the Government has just inspected this bank, it is all right, and we can make our deposits in it. The hon. gentleman spoke about the Government strengthening banks by making deposits. Well, it is sometimes in the interests of the Government, and the Government have no interest, except that of the public, to do so. It has been, in my experience, looking

back, found requisite or expedient by several governments, in times of great depression, to prevent universal ruin, universal panic, to come to the help of some of the banking institutions. Those hon. gentlemen who have lived as long as I have will, if they look back, find that governments have, on occasion, prevented universal panic by acting in concert with strong banking institutions, in helping to sustain banks which were not quite so strong. That has happened and will happen everywhere. It has happened in England where governments have come to the rescue of the Bank of England, in times of panic, to prevent a run on the bank. Every government must, of course, act on its own responsibility, to the best of its judgment, in coming promptly to the protection of the commercial and financial world and the people generally. If they make mistakes they are liable to animadversion, but no government ought to deprive itself of the power of assuming that position in times of great depression, great commercial distress and panic. Now the hon. gentleman from the west riding of Durham (Mr. Blake) makes certain suggestions which, as I have already said, are of value, and the Minister of Justice will, I have no doubt, look over the Banking Act and direct his attention particularly to this one point, that the returns should be carefully considered as they are made, so that if the law be not sufficiently effective now, most stringent measures should be adopted, on the criminal side of the law, to punish all parties who make false or misleading returns, and that faults of omission in returns should be considered equally criminal with faults of positive mistake. I think that is worthy of consideration, and I hope, after this discussion, my hon. friend will not consider it requisite to press his motion to division.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not entirely disposed to dissent from what the hon. the First Minister has said, but I think he will agree with me that the interference of the Government for the purpose of protecting a particular bank or particular banks is a most extreme measure, only justifiable under most extreme circumstances—in times, as I think he said, of extreme depression or panic, or for the purpose of averting extreme depression or extreme panic. It ought to be guarded carefully and exercised under a sense of heavy responsibility. I am not at all sure that an Act of indemnity ought not to be applied for, and most undoubtedly it ought to be considered as being in the highest degree an act done on the responsibility of the Executive, to be guarded with all possible precautions—Orders in Council and the like. That point we may have an opportunity of discussing on other occasions; but now, with respect to the matter more particularly in hand, I think the case stands somewhat thus: There have been, unfortunately, very great scandals connected with the failures of certain recent banks, and there is a general impression on the public mind that there has been a failure of justice, that bank directors and bank presidents, and other persons connected with banks, have failed most signally in their duty, and no proper means exist for punishing them. That is the popular impression, whether correctly founded or not. I recognise, as fully as the hon. gentleman, or as the hon. the Finance Minister can, that there is great difficulty in obtaining adequate inspection. I do not see myself how any Government inspector, or set of inspectors, could arrive at any fair idea of the value of the discounts of these large banks. I admit that is a very great difficulty. I am not certain, however, that more care might not be taken, or that the inspection might not be judiciously used for the purpose of ascertaining whether, discounts apart, the regulations laid down by our Banking Act are complied with; but of this I am very sure, that in practice, at any rate, our criminal law requires to be strengthened. Acts have been shown to have been committed by persons entrusted with the funds of shareholders and depositors which ought to have received severe punishment. In England

and the United States acts of a like nature have received extremely severe punishment; and though I do not think there is need that our criminal law should be amended, I think in this and many other cases there is urgent need that the Government of this country should take steps, at an early day, to endeavor to extradite criminals of this kind. That would be a very important additional safeguard to all our banking institutions. On the whole, I dare say, my hon. friend having obtained an interesting discussion on this subject and been the means of eliciting some very valuable suggestions with reference to it, might comply with the request of the hon. the First Minister, though that is for him to decide. I hope the Finance Minister and the First Minister, who, having been Minister of Justice in former years, is especially able to take charge of this matter—having had great experience in banking matters in the olden time—will consider the suggestions of my hon. friend, with the view of strengthening the criminal law, and will not disregard my own suggestion, that the immediate extension of the extradition treaty will be of great value to all the depositors and shareholders in this community.

Sir JOHN A MACDONALD. I have, I think, indicated to the House that there is an Extradition Treaty now being negotiated between England and the United States, which I hope will come to fruition, and I believe, if so, it will cover every real offender against the criminal law.

Mr. IVES. I quite agree with the hon. the leader of the Opposition, that it would be difficult to formulate a provision in the way of an amendment of the Banking Act that would prevent directors of banks from evading the provision requiring them to dispose of their dead and ineffective assets, but I still think it would be quite possible to do it. I believe his difficulty about changing the ownership for a mortgage would be got over by obliging them to sell such assets for cash. If we had a provision of that kind, which would clear off the dead and ineffective assets, and an amendment to the criminal law which might bring about more care on the part of the directors, the two working together would do good; but it would be very easy, under any amendment to the criminal law, for the directors to hide themselves behind ineffective and dead assets and make their statements really show what they declare in returns to the Government.

Motion negatived.

RAILWAY COMMUNICATION WITH OTTAWA.

Mr. LANDERKIN moved for:

Return showing the amount contributed to the Canada Central Railway between Ottawa and Brockville, either by the Government of Canada, the Provincial Government of Ontario, or by the municipalities along the line of railway. Also for similar returns concerning the Ottawa and St. Lawrence Railway from Ottawa to Prescott; together with the conditions upon which such grants were made to both railways; also statement showing the present train service on both lines of railway.

He said: My attention was called to this subject in coming to Ottawa. I found that the train service on one of these lines at least was very different from what it formerly was. I might state, for the information of the House, that on the trip coming down on the Grand Trunk Railway, we started from Toronto at ten o'clock at night and reached Brockville, a distance of nearly 225 miles, in about seven hours. We then took the train at Brockville, and did not reach Ottawa until eleven, so that it took us almost as long to come the distance of 70 miles as to come the distance of 225 miles. We had no delays or accidents on the short road. The train was apparently a mixed train. I understand nothing but mixed trains run on the line; that the express trains that formerly ran on that line and on the Ottawa and St. Lawrence line have been taken off; that the service has altogether degenerated, and I want to ascertain, in the interests of the people of this country, what amount

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

of interest the people had invested in this road, what amount of interest the Government of Canada had invested in this road, what amount of interest the Government of Ontario had invested in this road. I want to see why it is that the vested rights of the people, if they have any vested rights, are not respected. Hon. members of this House are well aware that, perhaps, there has been no Session—there has been none, in my recollection—when our mails have been received so irregularly as during this Session. We cannot count, with any degree of certainty, upon receiving our mails at a stated period. Formerly the trains were on time, the mails were regularly received, the connection was good and there was very little to complain of. They used to have regular connections between the trunk lines and the local roads which were doing public service for the municipalities in which they were constructed. I want to know how much the difference is due to the change of policy in the management of these roads. I would like to know if it is that which has been the means of causing our local railways to fall into disuse, and the interests of these local railways to be sacrificed, and the interests of the people on those roads to be neglected, as they are in many places. This is only one instance. I have other instances in my mind, and I may move for the papers in regard to them, in order to call the attention of the House to the matter, not with the view of complaint, but in order to see if we cannot get a remedy. This country has aided very largely the Pacific Railway. It has given very largely for the building, maintenance and equipment of the Pacific Railway, which has absorbed these two lines. When it suits the convenience of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, they will run the trains and the kind of trains they choose, without consulting the interests, the convenience, or the well being of the people on those lines of railway. Is there no power to stop this sort of thing? If the Government grant largely to these roads, have they no control over them? Formerly, when these roads were under the control of the municipalities, every member of this House will remember the more efficient service we had on the St. Lawrence and Ottawa, and on the Ottawa and Brockville roads. The places that are served by these lines are no inconsiderable places. The City of Ottawa and the country between Ottawa and Brockville are served and accommodated by these roads. It is but natural that these people should take a deep interest in seeing if their local rights are going to be overridden by a policy which took away the local rights of the local railways, and centered them all in Dominion lines. If this is one of the results of this policy which was inaugurated here two or three Sessions ago, it is well the people of this country should know it; and if there is no protection for the people, no guarantee that the money they have invested in these roads will ensure them regular trains and efficient service, with a proper rate of speed, then it is time this House and the country should know it. My attention was drawn to this matter coming down, and it has since been drawn to it by the irregularity of the mails that come here, and I have felt it due to myself and to the country to have it duly considered, so that we may see if no remedy can be found for these localities whose lines have been absorbed by Dominion legislation. We may be told, perhaps, that the lessening of the service is due to the great depression that exists in this country; that it is owing to the hard times that the traffic has fallen off; that there is no longer the necessity existing for the continuance of those trains which we formerly had. In all the years gone by, except, I think, the last year, these roads have been able to have several trains upon them, with a large amount of work to perform. If the state and condition of the country is such that it cannot now afford to keep up regular trains, that will run at some reasonable rate of speed, then of course it will be for us to complain. We know that the Government who carried on the affairs

of this country a few years ago, were charged with being flies on the wheel, but during the time they were in power they had to regulate the trains on this road, they had the work to perform and we had an efficient service on this road. What has become of the flies now? Where are the flies now?

Mr. IVES. They are in Opposition.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, the flies have become so numerous now that they have clogged the wheels of commerce, not only on these roads but on other roads. Now, while I am speaking, there is another matter I wish to bring before the House. Last Session I drew the attention of the Postmaster-General to the need of giving to that most important line of railway from Stratford to Wiarton, two mails a day, and the hon. gentleman promised that he would give the matter his earnest consideration. His consideration has resulted in this, that now we have three trains a week less on that road and only one service a day at noon, and one the next day in the morning. In the days when the flies were on the wheel we used to have a mail every morning, but now, since this enlightened and liberal policy was inaugurated, by which the industries of the country were to be protected, we have a morning service, and the next day we have no service until noon. The empty trains have been taken off the road. We appealed to the railway company about it, but they say the condition of the trade of this country will not warrant them in keeping on the number of trains they formerly had, so they have been discontinued. Consequently it was impossible, I presume, for the Postmaster-General, in the depressed condition of the country, when it became necessary for the Grand Trunk Railway Company to remove its trains—it was impossible for him, I suppose, to give a better service to the large towns, the rapidly increasing towns—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Yes, the towns are increasing, but the service on the road is decreasing. Now, Mr. Speaker, the attention of the Government having been called to this matter, I hope they will bring down the papers, so that we may be able to form an estimate of what amount the people have given, what amount of vested interest they have in the road—so that we may be able to see if any remedy can be provided by this House, whereby the vested rights and interests of the people may be protected.

Mr. RYKERT. I am not aware that this House is bound to pass resolutions for the personal convenience of hon. members. Of course, it is very interesting to hear the hon. gentleman complain of the inconvenience to which he was subjected in coming to Ottawa; that is a matter, of course, very interesting to himself and perhaps to others outside. But I contend that in all resolutions moved in this House, the hon. member making the motion should show to the House some substantial reason why the resolution should be passed. The hon. gentleman knows well that the returns in compliance with resolutions, when made to the satisfaction of hon. members, mean the expenditure of a large amount of money; and if this motion were carried as it now stands, it would involve the expenditure of a very considerable amount of money. What I complain of is, that the hon. gentleman should come to this House and ask for information which it cannot be possessed of. If the hon. gentleman were as studious about this matter as he is about other matters, he would discover, upon reference to parliamentary documents, that no money was ever granted to this railway company between the points indicated. He would discover, also, that his friends in the Ontario Legislature were the proper parties to apply to for redress and for the information he so much desires.

Mr. LANDERKIN. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to explain, I would say there is an item in the railway statistics of Canada where a grant is made to the Canada Central of \$1,444,000.

Mr. BOWELL. That is the extension of the Canada Central to the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. RYKERT. If the hon. gentleman will only study the railway history of Canada he will see quite a difference between the railway to which he refers and the Brockville and Ottawa Railway. I say, if the hon. gentleman desires to have the information he speaks of, he should apply to his friends in the Ontario Legislature and they can give it to him. If they cannot give it to him I can afford him all the information he requires. If we were to accept the resolution, as moved by the hon. gentleman, we must admit then, that the Government of Canada has given money towards the Brockville and Ottawa Railway Company. The hon. gentleman will recollect that some years ago a sum of money was granted by the Local Legislature for a portion of the Canada Central Railway, from Carleton Place to Sand Point—a sum of \$119,000; but the hon. gentleman will not find that the Government of Canada ever voted a sum of money to the Brockville and Ottawa Company. He will find that some years ago a charter was asked and a Bill was passed by the old Parliament of Canada, for the building of a railway from the City of Quebec to Lake Huron, passing by the City of Ottawa, and following the line of the Ottawa River to Lake Huron. That was in 1856, so he will see that so far as this railway is concerned it cannot be a local railway. At that time the Parliament of Canada, in its wisdom, voted 4,000,000 acres of land to assist the building of that railway. That charter expired, but in 1861 there was an Act passed through the Legislature, which is called the Canada Central Railway Act, by means of which a portion of that line originally proposed by the Bill of 1856 was kept alive, and the land grant was, by some extraordinary manoeuvring, Sir, continued and recognised, to a certain extent, for the building of that railway. That charter also expired, but was subsequently revived in part. Nothing was done, so far as that railway was concerned, until some years afterwards, when the people of Ottawa thought it would be a very good idea to run a road from this city to Carleton Place, a distance of 2½ miles. They built that road and then leased a portion of the Brockville and Ottawa Railway, from Carleton Place to Sand Point, for 999 years, and called that the Canada Central Railway. The original Act of Parliament declared that that railway should run direct from Quebec to Ottawa, and thence to Lake Huron, keeping within 25 miles of the Ottawa River. They built a road from Ottawa to Carleton Place, almost at right angles to Brockville, and then leased a portion of the Brockville and Ottawa Railway for 999 years, and called that the Canada Central Railway Company, and they thought that came within the provisions of the Act. Well, Sir, what did they do then? This company first applied to the Parliament of Canada for aid, and it was not recognised. They then applied to the Government of Sandfield Macdonald, in 1871, but he refused to recognise them, and contended they had no claim whatever for the 12,000 acres per mile. The company claimed, because they had built 28½ miles in the direction of Brockville, and had leased another portion of railway at right angles to it and called it the Canada Central Railway Company, they were, therefore, entitled to receive 342,000 acres of the best land in Ontario. Sandfield Macdonald repudiated that claim. It was supported by the Hon. Mr. Scott, who was then a member of that Legislature, but the claim was finally refused. When the Sandfield Macdonald Government fell and the Hon. Mr. Scott was taken into the Government, then we find an Act was passed by the leader of the Government—the leader of the Opposition was then

at the head of the Government—by means of which the company were enabled to sue the Province of Ontario—it was called the Petition of Rights Act. That petition was filed shortly afterwards, and the case was submitted to the courts and tried. Three witnesses were called by the railway company and examined, but none were examined on the part of the other side, and judgment went against the Province. Some months after that, I, in my place in the Ontario Legislature, urged that justice had not been done to the Province, and I asked Mr. Mowat to appeal the case. After a time an appeal was made to the higher court; but instead of adding additional evidence, instead of showing to the court what the facts really were, as regards the position of the railway and the franchise conferred by Acts of Parliament, they appealed from the decision on the facts presented to the court, and that decision was confirmed. The result was that judgment went against the Province for 342,000 acres of land. The hon. gentleman will ask: What connection that has with this matter. I will show the hon. member and the House the connection. Instead of the Government of Canada having given a dollar to the railway company, the company obtained a loan of \$1,354,000 from Brockville, the township of Elizabethtown, and the counties of Lanark and Renfrew, for which the company gave to the said municipalities a first mortgage on the road. Payments fell into arrear, and at the time the municipal loan fund was settled by the Ontario Legislature it amounted to nearly \$2,500,000. The Act passed by Mr. Mowat provided that where a municipality had borrowed money from the loan fund and had taken security therefor, that that security belonged to the Province. The township of Elizabethtown and Brockville and the counties of Lanark and Renfrew had, as before stated, taken a mortgage on the Brockville and Ottawa Railway to provide for the repayment of the money. The mortgage was in existence, it was a good and valid security, but notwithstanding that, Mr. Mowat's Government reduced the claim of those municipalities from \$2,500,000 to \$556,000, thereby throwing away nearly \$2,000,000 of money of the Province of Ontario. And then what did they do? They coolly asked the House to set off the judgment against the Province against the mortgage they held from the different municipalities. So that by this transaction the Province lost \$2,000,000; and if the hon. gentleman will refer to the records of the Legislature and to the several motions on this subject, he will discover that the mortgage which had been given by the railway municipalities was wiped out by the judgment against the Province. So far as the Government of Canada is concerned, it had nothing to do with granting this money. It was money owing by certain municipalities which they were well able to pay, and those municipalities took security for their advances, and, moreover, having that security, the Government could have enforced payment. But they failed to do so and thought it better, in the interest of some person or of their party, to have the judgment wiped out for 342,000 acres of land and give up the mortgage they held as security for the indebtedness of the municipalities which had borrowed the money.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Allow me to interrupt the hon. member. There is a likelihood of there being a small attendance of members this evening, and with the consent of the House I will move the adjournment at six o'clock; and, in order to be able to do this, I will ask that the debate on this motion be adjourned.

Mr. RYKERT. I would like to move an amendment to the motion before the House—because it will not be convenient for me to be present at its next sitting. The following is the amendment:—

That the resolution be amended by adding the following words after "railway" in the fourth line, "also showing what securities were taken for the amount so advanced to the said railway company, and what disposition was made of such securities."

Mr. RYKERT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of papers, correspondence and accounts in relation to the School of Cavalry at Quebec, from 1st July, 1884, to 31st January, 1885.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 5:55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

EXTENSION OF TIME.—PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. KRANZ moved:

That the time for receiving Private Bills be extended to Wednesday, the fifth day of March next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.—(Mr. Dickinson.)

Bill (No. 29) to amend the Acts relating to Patents of Inventions.—(Mr. Smyth.)

INDIAN SUPERINTENDENTS.

Mr. LISTER asked, Has the office of Indian Superintendent been abolished? If so, the names of the several incumbents at the time of its abolition. Has a new office been created in its place? If so, its name and the names of the several incumbents. Has or have any person or persons who held the office of Indian Superintendent been appointed to the new office? If so, the names of such persons?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The office of Indian Superintendent has not been abolished. No new office has been created in its place, and no one has been appointed to it. There are three Indian Superintendents in Ontario, namely, Mr. Gilkison at Brantford, Mr. Walton at Parry Sound, and Mr. Phipps at Manitowaning, Manitoulin Island; one in Quebec, Mr. Boucher, at Betsiamis, on the Lower St. Lawrence; one in British Columbia, Dr. Powell, at Victoria; two in New Brunswick, Mr. Sargeant, at Chatham, and Mr. Farrell, at Fredericton; and one on Prince Edward Island, Mr. Arsennault, on Lennox Island.

OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS.

Mr. BELLEAU (Translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to introduce this Session a measure to alter the constitution of the Board of Official Arbitrators of the Dominion?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to this question, I beg to inform the hon. member that the Government are now taking into consideration a measure to that effect; but it has not yet been decided when the measure will be introduced.

IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS AT LÉVIS.

Mr. BELLEAU (Translation) enquired, Whether it is the intention of the Government to commence soon the construction, at Lévis, of the immigrant buildings for which a sum was voted by the House last year and the year before?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). The Government have not yet determined exactly where these buildings will be located. As soon as the site is chosen the construction will be commenced.

THE EXCHANGE BANK OF CANADA.

Mr. HOLTON asked, Has the Government obtained a copy of the judgment recently delivered by Mr. Justice Mathieu, of the Superior Court for Lower Canada, dismissing its claim, as a privileged claim, upon the assets of the Exchange Bank of Canada in liquidation, and, if so, is it intended to lay it upon the Table of this House, with the opinion of the Minister of Justice, and of the legal advisers of the Crown, upon the question involved?

2. Has the Government obtained any security from Senator Ogilvie for the repayment of money loaned to the Exchange Bank and guaranteed by him?

3. Has the Government taken any proceedings against Senator Ogilvie to compel him to pay the amount of his guarantee in this matter, or to give security therefor, and, if so, when? If not, is it their intention to do so?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has obtained a copy of the judgment recently delivered by Mr. Justice Mathieu. There is no intention of laying it upon the Table of the House, but the hon. gentleman can move for it if he wishes. Of course it can be procured; it is like any other judgment of a court, and can be obtained by any hon. member or any person in the Dominion. The opinion of the Minister of Justice is an opinion for the information of the Crown; and so with the legal advisers of the Crown upon the question. The Government has not obtained any security from Senator Ogilvie for the repayment of the money loaned to the Exchange Bank and guaranteed by him. As to the third part of the question, the Government have not taken any proceedings against Senator Ogilvie, inasmuch as this judgment is now in appeal, and if the Crown's priority is upheld by the Court of Appeal, there will be no necessity for taking proceedings against Senator Ogilvie.

PRIVILEGE—NEWSPAPER ATTACK.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to make an explanation in reference to an item which I see in the *Free Press* of yesterday, and which, I believe, was inspired by an hon. member of this House. It reads as follows:—

"The constituents of Dr. Sproule, the member for East Grey, are not to be congratulated on the choice they made in sending that gentleman to represent them in Parliament. About six months ago the County Council handed a memorial to the doctor, which was passed by the municipality, praying the Dominion Government to grant some compensation for having largely deprived the people of their railway facilities by the legislation which declared all these lines for the benefit of the whole Dominion. He was instructed to forward the memorial to the Government, and at the same time to use his endeavors with the party of which he is so servile a supporter, to obtain some concessions."

Then it goes on to say:

"Sir Hector Langevin said that the memorial was never received by the Government. Later on a note from Sproule—at least it is said so—made the Minister of Public Works state that it was said to be mailed two or three days ago. Now where has this memorial been for the past few months, will be a pertinent question to ask Mr. Sproule."

I would like to say in reference to that item, that the memorial was passed at the June session of the County

Council of Grey. It was not sent to me, as the papers will show. A letter accompanying this memorial will show that I only received this memorial early in December. It was dated in the clerk's office on the 1st of December, and I think I received it on the 4th, with instructions to lay it before the Governor in Council and endeavor to obtain the prayer of the petition. I thought the best time to do so would be after the Session of Parliament commenced, and therefore I brought it along with me and forwarded it to the Secretary of State, and direct to the Governor in Council. As to the way I supported the prayer of that petition, I think it might reasonably be left to my own judgment.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I understood the hon. gentleman to indicate that the article was inspired by an hon. member of this House. I wish the hon. gentleman would state who the hon. member is.

RAILWAY COMMUNICATION WITH OTTAWA.

House resumed adjourned debate on Mr. Landerkin's proposed motion for Return showing the amounts contributed to the Canada Central Railway between Ottawa and Brockville, either by the Government of Canada, the Provincial Government of Ontario, or by the municipalities along that line of railway; and the motion of Mr. Rykert in amendment thereto.

Mr. RYKERT. When the House adjourned yesterday, I was endeavoring to show the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and also this House, how highly favored the Canada Central Railway had been at the hands of the Ontario Government. I pointed out the fact that this company had, through one means or another, involved the Province of Ontario in an expenditure of upwards of \$2,000,000. I showed that the Government had, in the first place, given \$119,000 for a portion of the road from Sand Point to Pembroke. I also showed that money had been taken from the municipal loan fund of the old Parliament of Canada and had been loaned to Brockville, the Township of Elizabethtown, and the Counties of Lanark and Renfrew, to the amount of \$1,354,900; that it accumulated to \$2,500,000, and that, by the grace of the Mowat Government, that amount was reduced to \$550,000, although at that time the municipalities had a valid security, a first mortgage on the road, for the payment of the whole amount. I also showed that the Ontario Legislature had passed an Act by which the Government was allowed to be sued by the Canada Central upon petition of right, and judgment was obtained against the Province for 342,000 acres, and that judgment was set off against the mortgage. Ontario thus lost about \$2,000,000 by the Canada Central Railway. But that is not all. Not only the Reform Government of Ontario granted favors to the Canada Central, but we find that in the second Session of the Reform Government of Mr. Mackenzie no less a sum than \$1,440,000 was voted for the extension of that railway towards the Canadian Pacific Railway. The motion of the hon. gentleman does not go beyond the City of Ottawa. Yesterday he interrupted me when I was making some observations, and pointed out the fact that he found in the accounts of last year an item of \$16,800 paid to the Canada Central Company. True it was granted and paid. But the hon. gentleman's motion does not reach that far. It only covers the road from Brockville to Ottawa, and I say the Government of Canada never gave a single dollar to that portion of the Railway, but that the money was voted towards the extension of the railway. The House does not require any such return as is asked for. It is already on record, and the hon. gentleman knows it right well, for he voted for granting \$12,000 per mile for 120 miles of that road in

1875. The amount was \$1,440,000, and there is no necessity for the hon. member to move a motion covering that—if he intended to cover it, as I suppose he did by his interruption—and there is no necessity to bring down any papers in regard to that matter. We know all about it. All we have to do is to refer to the speech of the leader of the Opposition in this House in 1879, for he gives it as one of the items of the expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman wants this House to interfere with the internal management of this railway company. I should like to know if, in the liberality of the Ontario Government, and of the Dominion Government in granting \$12,000 per mile, there was any condition attached in regard to operating the road. There was no condition attached, there was nothing in the Act stating what the company should do. So far as regards running trains, that is a matter of internal economy between the company and the Government. No doubt the hon. gentleman was inconvenienced, but at the same time others have been inconvenienced in like manner. The same thing happened last year, and if I recollect rightly, you, Mr. Speaker, were charged with having compelled the railway company not to wait for the Grand Trunk train, and in consequence a large number of passengers were obliged to wait over and some had to go to Montreal. Nothing was said in this House about that matter; we had no right to say anything. The hon. member for Grey went on to speak about what this Government had done in the way of postal service in his county, and what the late Government did. I understood him to say that there had been a postal service daily on the railway from his place to Wiarton. Am I right in that?

Mr. LANDERKIN. What is the question?

Mr. RYKERT. I understood the hon. gentleman to say yesterday that during the time of the late Government, the fly-on-the-wheel Government, they had a daily postal service on the train from Wiarton.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I did not say so; I said that by the old stage coach we had a regular mail every morning.

Mr. RYKERT. The same all over the Province. The hon. gentleman must have made a discovery. He is not correct in his statement about this fly-on-the-wheel Government. He said, we called it a fly-on-the-wheel Government. There is the father of the statement sitting on the other side of the House—the gallant knight from Cartwright, I mean from Huron. The hon. gentleman was the one who christened the Government the fly-on-the-wheel Government, and we have endeavored to remind the hon. gentleman that he did christen his Government by that name. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Landerkin) will recollect that when the late Minister of Finance made that statement he stood with his arms folded and admitted he could do nothing to remedy the state of affairs prevailing in this country. They were completely paralysed; they had no legislation to ask; they felt it unnecessary to do anything more than they had done, and they thought they had done everything possible. If the hon. gentleman will refer to past history he will find, as I have said, that the name of the fly-on-the-wheel Government came from the Opposition side of the House. I object to the motion now under discussion because it asks for something that this Government cannot furnish; it asks for information from two Governments and also from different municipalities. The hon. mover knows right well that we have not the machinery by which we can procure the information he so much desires. The hon. gentleman confines the motion to that part of the line from Ottawa to Brockville, and the Parliament of Canada had nothing to do with that portion of the road. I object to the motion because it is not in the public interest, and we would have been spared all this trouble had the hon. gentleman gone down to the corner of Sparks

Mr. RYKERT.

street and asked the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for one of their time tables. He would thus have discovered all about the train service which he so much desires; and I do not think it is a matter for this House to consider. The motion should not pass, but if it does pass it should be adopted with the amendment which I have proposed, asking further information in regard to the securities held by the Government and given by the road, and what has become of those securities.

Amendment agreed to; and

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

COST OF HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Statement for the last fiscal year, of the cost connected with the heating of public buildings (including wages as well as fuel) now paid under a lump vote, such statement to show the cost under the same sub-headings as those in which it was formerly included in the Public Accounts before the change in the system.

He said: It will be recollected that some time ago the House adopted, at the instigation of the Government, a change in the mode of charging the cost of heating the public buildings, by which clause they are now paid under a lump vote instead of in the separate sums for each of these buildings. It is important that we should be able to compare these items from year to year by having them brought down in the form in which the amounts were formerly voted. Last Session the House was pleased to make an order similar to that which I now move.

Motion agreed to.

SMALL SAVINGS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and petitions to the Postmaster-General, or any member of the Government, with reference to the adoption in Canada of a system to encourage small savings similar to that brought in by the late Mr. Fawcett in England.

He said: Some time ago the British Government adopted, at the instance of the late Mr. Fawcett, a system which I think it is desirable to encourage in this country, for small savings in connection with the Post Office. The details of that plan were that a slip was handed out to any applicant which contained twelve compartments, and in each of these compartments the depositor was intended, as he made savings enough to buy postage stamps, to put a stamp, and as soon as twelve of these were filled, amounting to a shilling, he was able to deposit that amount, so that he was saved from the temptation, with reference to his small daily savings, of spending them and having them lost, and was permitted at once to buy a stamp, and then when a shilling was reached the nearest Post Office received the list and he was credited with a shilling. I have one of these interesting slips here. Now, it seems to me that if we adopted, with reference to our postage stamp currency, a similar system—perhaps by means of five cent or three cent stamps, and made an arrangement for as many as would make up a quarter, which is our usual small denomination of that kind, it would be extremely useful. I think every effort should be made to encourage a system of saving in those who have the least to save. The importance is not to be measured at all by the amount of the savings. A provident habit is that which is of the last consequence, and that a provident habit should be stimulated amongst those who have but little to save and in early life, is a sure way of inducing habits of thrift and economy which will make better men, better citizens and the country which is inhabited by them more prosperous. I have reason to believe that this system has been suggested for adoption to the Government some time ago, and if not I think it is a matter which should be taken into consideration.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In the absence of the Postmaster-General I may say that this subject has been under the consideration of that gentleman and the Government, but for some reasons which I am about to state it was not considered advisable at that time to deal with it. I may remind the mover of the resolution that under our Post Office Savings Bank system any person can deposit a sum as small as a dollar. While we had the greatest possible anxiety to meet cases such as have been described by the hon. gentleman, the question arose as to the expense of carrying out the plan. I quite admit that the reference to matters of this kind expense may at times be a secondary consideration; but I would point out that for all stamps that are now sold the seller receives 3 per cent. commission, and therefore for a dollar's worth of stamps that might be sold we would pay, in addition to the 4 per cent. interest, 3 per cent. commission to the vendors as well as the cost of printing. Therefore, supposing that a person deposited the money and did not withdraw it all it would cost the Dominion Government about 8 per cent. It would cost more, because we should have the debits and credits on both sides, the deposits and the withdrawals. Therefore, in that view of the case, the Government hesitated at the time to deal with the matter, inasmuch as every boy or every man, no matter how humble his position or small his earnings might be, could place an amount, even to the limited extent of a dollar, to his credit in any of the Postal Savings Banks.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman's calculation is hardly correct. He says, add the prime cost of selling postage stamps, 3 per cent., to the interest of 4 per cent. per annum, and even supposing there was no withdrawal, that would mean a cost of 8 per cent. Well, it would mean a cost of 7 per cent. in the first year; it is hardly an accurate calculation, and I hope his calculations on a larger scale are more accurate. It is quite true that the Government pays a commission on the sale of postage stamps. It is very easy to deal with that as a question of interest. If a loss is incurred in that way, a smaller rate of interest might be given to the depositor. The great object is to encourage the habit of saving; and my opinion is that you could promote the habit of saving by giving 2 per cent. as much as you can by giving 4 per cent. The great point is to facilitate the accumulation of small sums. Of course, I admit that those sums would be constantly going in and coming out; there would be friction of that kind; but it might be possible to make arrangements for a reduction of the commission, or the sale at the post office itself of the stamps for this particular purpose, or other terms. It does seem to me that the financial difficulty the hon. gentleman has suggested might be got over. But even if it could not, it does not follow that the scheme would fail, because he might reduce the minimum, and allow a smaller sum than one dollar to be deposited. For instance, if he allowed 25 cents to be deposited, the whole difficulty would be got rid of, except, of course, the extra keeping of accounts.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That was just one of the points considered, whether the amount might be reduced. The hon. gentleman says that my statement is not accurate, because 4 and 3 make 7, not 8. There is the cost of printing the stamps, amounting to 1 per cent., to be added to the 4 per cent. The hon. member suggests that to meet this special case we might sell the stamps at a lower rate. I would like him to arrange a plan by which the office could distinguish between the stamps sold to a person who wished to use them, and a boy who wished to place them on a card.

Mr. BLAKE. I will give it to you in a moment. He comes with his slip, and gets the stamps put on it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. But he may not have his slip; and the man who wants stamps for other purposes

will come with a slip and get them. There are persons ingenious enough, as we have found in the Customs Department, to do such things; they would say they are for deposits in the Post Office Banks when they might be for other purposes. The Government did not reject entirely the proposition to reduce the amount, in case the necessity arises; but the proposition with reference to the cards was not favorably entertained at that time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is so rarely that I am able to corroborate entirely a statement of the hon. gentleman opposite that I take uncommon pleasure on the present occasion of stating that I believe he made a most correct statement when he estimated the cost to this country of every dollar we borrow through the Savings Banks at 5 per cent. per annum. It certainly is not one farthing less, when we take into account the percentage paid, 4 per cent., next the expenses of management, and next, if prudence is maintained in the Finance Department, the necessity of holding a considerable reserve of money not paying interest to meet such demands as may arise. Indeed, I think the hon. gentleman would be more accurate if he put the cost at more than 5 per cent., and I think he is borrowing \$26,000,000 from the people of this country by means of the Savings Banks.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I entirely differ from the hon. member as to the cost of the money. But if it has been wrong for us to adopt that principle, how much more was it wrong for the hon. gentleman opposite, who paid a higher rate of interest, who allowed on money deposited in the Savings Banks 5 per cent. if it reached \$10,000 and was allowed to remain a certain time, instead of 3 per cent., which we allow for deposits of \$5,000, allowing depositors, if they deposited on the second day of the month, no interest for that month, or if they withdrew on the 29th of the month, no interest for that month. Therefore our system has been much more economical than the system pursued by the hon. gentleman who has risen so cordially, so promptly, and so graciously, to endorse the statement I made. I hope before the Session is over I may have him endorsing many more of my statements. I hope I shall be able to present evidence which he himself cannot resist. But in regard to this matter, I think he or some other hon. member wanted to know last Session how much interest we paid in the Savings Banks, including salaries and all. I think it is $4\frac{1}{2}$ or $4\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. or something of that kind, but if the system is wrong, I think we manage it more economically than the hon. gentleman did.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman has stated correctly enough that following out the system which our predecessors, not ourselves, had introduced, we did nearly ten years ago allow slightly higher rates for a small portion of the money deposited, not for much, than are to-day paid. Since that time—and I state this fact for the special information of the hon. Minister of Finance—all over the civilised world, in every great centre where money is dealt in, the rate of interest has fallen between 30 and 40 per cent.; but our rate of interest paid on the majority of Savings Banks deposits is the same to-day as it was at that period, although the normal rate of interest paid by banks and other institutions was, I believe, in many cases 30, 40 and 50 per cent. higher in Canada than it is to-day.

Motion agreed to.

MAIL ROBBERIES IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH WEST.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and Departmental reports with reference to irregularities, frauds and robberies in connection with the mails in Manitoba and the North-West, and particularly to the transactions in which one Campbell was concerned.

He said: It has been stated in the public press that there have been very serious irregularities in connection with some of the officers concerned in the transport or management of the mails in Manitoba and the North-West, and not long since there was a report that a person named Campbell, who had been in the service of the Department and who seems to have absconded from those regions, had been interviewed. It seems he had been for two days in some sort of durance in a hotel under charge of a Chicago detective, I think it was, that he had been ultimately seen by an official of the Government, and I forget if some portion of the plunder had been procured, but, at any rate, some information was obtained with reference to some other persons in the mail service. It is said the amount lost was a considerable one, \$18,000 has been mentioned as being stolen at one time; and I think we ought to hear the particulars of those transactions in which the blame is laid, according to some of the reports on the United States authorities, while according to others it is laid on some of our authorities.

Motion agreed to.

COLONIZATION COMPANIES.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all petitions and correspondence on the subject of modifications in the agreements made by the Government with the various colonization companies; and a statement of the present position of the Companies, as to the fulfilment of their obligations under their agreements.

He said: Applications, it has been said, have been made to the Government to modify the agreements entered into by the several colonization companies with the Government on the ground that the Government had since adopted another policy with reference to another class of operations in the North-West, namely, those of the companies interested in building lines of railways; that the Government having adopted the policy of making grants instead of selling the lands at \$1 per acre to these companies, it was inequitable that the colonization companies should be called to pay what they had contracted to pay under their agreements, \$2 and \$2.50 per acre for their lands. Representations have been made and petitions presented to the Government by the colonization companies praying that some change should be made in their arrangements; and from various sources of information it would seem as if some of the colonization companies, at any rate, were proposing that the quantity of land which they had contracted for should be reduced to the amount which their present payment would enable them to pay for in full, and that the rate upon that portion should be a reduced rate having regard to the altered policy with reference to the railway companies. It will be also interesting to the House to learn what the present position of the various companies is with relation to the fulfilment of their various obligations under their agreements.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY COMPANIES OUTSIDE MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, petitions and Orders in Council, relating to any application by, or on behalf of, any railway company, elsewhere than in Manitoba or the North-West, for aid or additional aid.

He said: It may be remembered by some hon. members that during the last Session of Parliament the then Minister of Railways laid before the House applications that had been made by various companies, and the great bulk of which had been entertained, informing us, at the same time, that the number and the bulk of the papers embodying applica-

Mr. BLAKE.

tions which he had been unable at all to consider was much greater than the very considerable bulk he had laid on the Table. Those applications we desire to see, and in addition we desire to see what further progress in the zeal of railways in the way of plying the Government for aid may have taken place during the interval since the last prorogation of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LAND GRANT AND LAND GRANT BONDS.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and petitions of railway companies in Manitoba and the North-West, praying for grants of land, or modifications in the condition and extent of the grants of land already conceded to them; and of all Orders in Council or agreements or letters, not already brought down, affecting or in any wise relating to any railway company in Manitoba or the North-West, other than the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

He said: When the Loan Act of last Session was passed in aid of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it will be recollected that statements were laid before the House on behalf of the company and corroborated by hon. Ministers of the Crown, with reference to the then position of the contracted line and to the cost of that line when completed. The object of this motion is to ascertain the present position of the enterprise in so far as it relates to the point to which I have referred, namely, the cost of constructing and equipping the contracted line, which is in two parts, the part between Callander and Port Arthur and the part between Red River and Kamloops. Now, as I say, statements were made to us, and they show these figures, in round numbers: Expended on the main line contracted for, \$23,080,000; expended in rolling stock for that line, \$6,140,000; expended in material on hand, which I assume to be all for that line, although they may be partly applicable to other branches, \$4,025,000, and the proportion of the amount for sheds, tools, and machinery, which I take to be about two-thirds, \$705,000, making a total amount expended of \$33,950,000, and the estimate laid before us to complete the road and equip it was \$27,000,000, thus making the completed cost of the line equipped \$60,950,000. It is public that during last fall, within three or four months from to-day, the vice-president and chief engineer of the road declared in a formal document that the results of the explorations and of the practical work that had been done indicated that there had been an over-estimate of \$4,000,000 in the amount required to complete, and that, instead of \$27,000,000, only \$23,000,000 would be required for that purpose. Reducing the amount to which I have referred, \$61,000,000 in round figures, by the sum of \$4,000,000, you find a cost of \$57,000,000, and that cost is reached after attributing to the contracted line far too large a proportion of the expenditure for equipment made up to the day in which the estimate was made, for no less than seven-eighths of the whole cost for rolling stock, as shown by the statement of the company, is in this statement attributed to the contracted line, while about two-thirds only ought to be attributed to the contracted line, having regard to the branches and extensions which are also being supplied with equipments. Thus an excess of \$1,400,000 is reached under this item. And I take, without questioning them, the stated estimates of expenditure for the prairie country, although they also are of a wholly inordinate and as yet wholly unexplained character as to their amount. But, omitting these considerations, the present indication is that the road is to be completed and equipped for less than \$57,000,000. On the other hand the assets which were available to the company for the work were—the original stock, which by the contract and concession to them they were bound to subscribe for and to pay in full, and which they did accordingly subscribe for and pay in full, \$5,000,000; the subsidy, \$25,000,000;

the loan of last Session, \$22,500,000; the proceeds of the sale of land grant bonds made up to the time of the statement, \$9,200,000; the Winnipeg bonus and other land sales, \$900,000; making an aggregate of \$62,600,000, to which is to be added a sum of about \$1,000,000 of further land grant bonds realized just about the month of January, 1884, making an aggregate of \$62,500,000. You will observe that in this calculation no account has been taken of the receipts from further sales of stock or from further sales of land, because the proposals of last Session were such that it was not expected that any further stock would be put upon the market for a considerable time to come, and that, when it was, it was to be at the disposal of the Government, which was advancing this large sum; and, as to the lands, it was recognized even then that the sale of them also would be slow, and it was provided that the proceeds of such sale should go to the Government in diminution of the mortgage. It was therefore contemplated by the Government, by the company and by the Parliament that these two resources, sales of stock and sales of land, would not be available for completing the construction of the line, and that the resources required for that purpose were to be found otherwise; and found they were, as I have shown, irrespective altogether of the large additional sum raised on other shares of stock which were sold; found they were in the large sums I have mentioned, of aid from the Government absolute, of aid from the Government lent, of land grant bonds sold, and of the original capital stock of \$5,000,000 subscribed and paid up pursuant to the contract; found they were, and not merely found, but, as now appears, to the extent of \$6,000,000 beyond what was required. Under these circumstances, we had good reason to believe what we were told, that we were absolutely assuring the finality of the pecuniary transactions in the way of aid or relief to the company from the public; we had good ground to believe that we were assuring the completion of this enterprise at the early date the company proposed to us to complete it at, and were giving all the money that was required for that purpose; and I am glad to observe, by the report of the Minister of Railways which was laid upon the Table yesterday, that the chief engineer, in the month of October last, confirms that view and declares that, while his information was imperfect and incomplete when he made the estimate of last Session, his further information and the result of his inspection of the line, made late in the summer of last year, has led him to believe that the resources are ample. And yet, notwithstanding that, we find statements made, very generally made, that the company is in straits, and that it is making an application for relief to the Government. It is true that we know that, up to the other day at any rate, there was no formal application for relief. That is not the way that these things arrange themselves. There are conferences and consultations, informal, unofficial, confidential, until a conclusion is arrived at between the two high contracting parties, and, when it is agreed what the Government will give, then the company writes its letter and makes its demand or request, and then the Government says, Yes. That is the way these things get done, as we know by our experience of the past in relation to this very company. Therefore, although no formal application has been made, because the stage of formal agreement has not been reached, no individual in this House, no more than any individual outside of it, doubts that informal applications have been made, and that negotiations are going on, that the situation of the company has been stated to the Government, and that they have been pressing it for relief. I should not perhaps have made that statement as positively as I do except that I observe that, in the Ottawa correspondence of a very important paper, which has received added importance—may I say added lustre?—from a recent change in its proprietorship, that I see in the Ottawa correspondence of a very

important paper, certainly not unfriendly to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by some people—perhaps unjustly—supposed to be to some extent in the confidence of that company, a statement to this effect:

“Although Sir John said there was no present intention to legislate on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it is rumored here that something must be done on their behalf. It is estimated that they have spent during the past year over \$8,000,000, apart from the contract respecting the main line, in furthering the convenience of the farming and trading communities by building elevators, wharves, cattle sheds, termini, etc., and it is felt that an easy and proper way of effecting this would be found in the Government taking back sufficient land in discharge of their debt, and thus enabling the railway company to float their securities and build the branch lines which are demanded.”

Well, of course, if that statement, sent from the centre of official and political information, written of course we know not by whom,—for the veil of anonymity shrouds the sacred mysteries of newspaper correspondence, and I will not venture to guess even who wrote it,—but written we know not by whom, written we know not where, whether in the gallery, whether in a committee room, whether at a member's desk,—I say written we know not by whom and written we know not where, if that statement be at all correct, that of course explains the situation, because, as I have pointed out, during the last Session of Parliament we granted to the company such resources as were adequate, by their calculations, and by the calculation of the Government, and in the view of the Parliament, to carry them through, knowing their stock and their lands were not to be available for the purpose of carrying them through, whatever might be the ultimate result of their stock and of their land operations. Of course, if it be true that over \$8,000,000 has been expended in other objects than those which Parliament had in contemplation and was providing for, it is quite clear that it cannot be the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's money; it must be somebody else's money, because it is quite clear they had not got it to spend and therefore it must be owing. There is in this situation as I stated, room, no doubt, for considerable disquiet. There is room for disquiet here and elsewhere as to the attitude of the company and the Government. For my own part I cannot believe that the company has made an order, formally or informally—what I will call the impudent demand—which this otherwise well-informed correspondent suggests would be the easy and proper way of accomplishing their object, namely, that we should buy back our lands which we have not yet handed over to them and in respect of work which they have not yet done. I think it must be in some other way that the proposal is to be made; but in what form I know not. Yet disquieting as that situation may be, there is a more disquieting rumor still—it is that the Government will not bring down anything to Parliament because there are difficulties in bringing down anything to Parliament; there are promises and provisions with the sound of which these walls yet re-echo, and which would make it a little difficult to bring down something. Besides, something was brought down last Session, and it led to the organisation, to the development in a new form, in a revived form, shall I say, of the *Maison Bleue*. Instead of the *Maison Bleue* we had No. 8, working with equal ardor, with equal ingenuity, with equal determination and resolve, and triumphing, as the *Maison Bleue* triumphed, over its adversary, triumphing, also, over the Government and the Parliament again. I can understand that there should be a natural reluctance on the part of the hon. gentleman who fought so long and fell so utterly at last in that conflict with No. 8, to resume the conflict under the more disadvantageous circumstances under which that conflict would have to be resumed this Session. I can understand that there are great difficulties in the way of the Government proposing anything to Parliament. But, Sir, the most disquieting rumor is that something is not to be done in Parliament, but that some-

thing will be done after Parliament rises by what is called executive action; because it will be easier when things grow cold, and a few months have elapsed, and when, after all, the thing is done, to get us to ratify something disagreeable that is done, than to approve beforehand of something that the Government would desire us to take the responsibility of doing. I hope that course is not to be pursued. We know that it has been pursued in the past. We know that before the last Session of Parliament the Government, by executive action, without legislative authority, determined to give a guarantee to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company involving the public fortunes to the extent of many millions of dollars, and involving a public policy complicating the question as to the relations of the country and the company in an irrevocable manner. We know that we were called upon to ratify, and as good and obedient boys we did ratify, what the Government had done. We know from the report of the hon. Minister that by executive action again, the action of Parliament has been overridden during the last year, and that grades with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway had been assumed to be approved by executive action, which were in excess of those that the contract demanded, and which alone the Government was authorised by Parliament to approve of. The Government was authorised to approve of the location, grades and curves of this line in accordance with the contract, and they have approved of grades, as the hon. Minister's report says, which are in excess of those specified by a reference to the Union Pacific Railway as the maximum grades. So that in each of the last two Sessions we have instances with respect to the Canadian Pacific Railway of executive action in excess of executive authority, and of Parliament being reduced to the humiliating position of being called upon to ratify that which had been done contrary to law by the executive, instead of being asked to decide whether it should be done or no. Now I maintain that upon this occasion the plea of unforeseen emergency cannot be made. It is impossible to hold this matter over until this Parliament rises and then to deal with it and say: We did not know there was any difficulty and that difficulty arose afterwards. I have not that position in this House which would enable me with impunity to do what another hon. gentleman did the other day and say "That would be too thin, Sir." But if I might I would apply that phrase to such a pretence as that. The difficulty is here. It is before us, and there is but one way to meet it. There is but one way in which it can be met without overstraining executive authority and without contemning Parliament itself, and that is to grapple with the question and determine what is to be proposed, and to lay before Parliament for its consideration and approval or rejection, the result of that determination. Hon. gentlemen opposite may have—I do not say they have not—reasons for despising us, but they ought not to show their contempt of this Parliament too plainly, and it would be to show it too plainly altogether to hold this matter over for the Session if it is intended to act afterwards. It is better, Sir, for Government, for the company, for Parliament and for the country, that the whole facts should be known and developed. The mysteries, the concealments, the half-truths, which have been the subject of discussion in the past with reference to the company and its relations to the Government, and particularly, I may say, with reference to the loan or guarantee transaction of the fall before last, have been of the greatest injury; and it is due largely, I believe, to that imperfect state of the information and those rumors which go about and which are published in authentic and credible organs of public opinion, that these difficulties arise; and it is better that we should know what the facts are. We are too deeply interested, Sir, to be kept in ignorance of them. We are entitled to know them, and we are entitled to have

Mr. BLAKE.

laid before us what the condition of the Company is, what its wants are, and what the plan of the Government is for solving those wants and carrying out what the public service in their interest demands. For my part I earnestly hope that the eminent correspondent of that newspaper was in error; I earnestly hope that those rumors are all unfounded; I earnestly hope that no such sum as that which has been mentioned has been expended by the company in excess of its receipts; I earnestly hope that the assurances of last Session as to the financial results of the operation of that Session will be fulfilled in their entirety. We had better know the facts, and I therefore take this opportunity of moving for such information as it appears to me will enable us, in Parliament, at any rate, to grapple with them.

Mr. MITCHELL. I was not in my seat when the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) commenced his remarks on this motion, but I heard him make some reference to the paper which I own and control. I must thank him for some remarks of a flattering character in regard to that paper and his reference to the additional spirit, life and ability thrown into it. I am very much obliged to him for those remarks. I regret that the hon. gentleman's public course in relation to an institution which is a national institution, has not commended itself to that paper as one which would lead to remarks of a flattering character in the columns and correspondence of the paper over which I preside. But I want to say this, not only for the benefit of the hon. gentleman opposite and those who follow him, but for the benefit of this House and the country, and I wish to say it publicly, that, notwithstanding the sneers of the hon. gentleman's chief organ in Toronto and the villainous correspondence it publishes, notwithstanding the manner in which it has villified me, and villified my paper by declaring that it is subservient to some other interest—I say that that paper is an independent paper, that it represents the sentiments of Peter Mitchell, who has shown by his public acts in this House as much independence as, if not more than, most of the people who are listening to me. When the hon. gentleman and those who write paragraphs for his chief organ make such remarks about the *Herald*, I wish to give them a distinct contradiction, and I say the *Herald* is subservient to no one, to no influence, and represents no sentiments but those entertained by the proprietor himself. The hon. gentleman has chosen to refer to the fact that in the columns of the *Herald* there is a reference to a proposal for the relief of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Is a monopoly of dealing with that question to be reserved to the hon. gentleman and his friends behind him, and the organs that represent them throughout the country, especially in Ontario? Are they and their organs alone to represent the views of the Dominion in relation to the greatest public work ever undertaken in Canada, a work which is a credit and honor alike to the country and the Government which initiated it, and to the men who have carried it out? Before any such suggestion appeared in the *Herald*, I find in the columns of the *Globe*, in its correspondence, the very statement in question, there being only a difference in regard to the value of the lands, and it was said that a proposition was under consideration to take back the lands in payment of the public debt. I have found that elsewhere. I found in a paper which I saw a few moments ago in the Library, where I was—not thinking an attack of this kind was to be made—remarks in regard to the *Herald*—and this is a point which it would be well for the Committee of the Library to look to—for it is not the organ of any individual or party in this country. It is independent, and it is a great deal more so than the *Globe*. It is in a position to express opinions which I believe are in the interest of the country, and I have done so. I fancy the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) would have felt more pleased had the *Herald*

in its editorial columns not been so severe as it was in a very recent issue on the conduct of the hon. gentleman in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway. What has been said by the *Herald*? It has made a suggestion in regard to a great public work carried on by a company, who are entitled to credit and honor for the way in which they have carried out the work, and who have been sustained by the Government, which whatever may be its faults, deserves in this particular case full credit for the manner in which it initiated, and the way in which it has sustained the company and carried out this great undertaking. Everyone knows, it is no secret, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company requires additional aid. They have spent \$8,000,000 on elevators, final stations, cattle sheds and subordinate works in connection with the line, which were necessary to complete this great national undertaking. We also know that in the aid the company obtained from Parliament last Session it is provided that they shall only get payment for work actually performed from time to time; and after the road is finished there will be a surplus on the main line, if the estimates and statements, not only of the Government engineers but of the company's engineers, are accurate. Besides, there is 10 per cent. kept back; nevertheless, by making an enormous expenditure this year, they will complete the road nearly five years before the original time agreed on in the contract, and we know it is quite possible the company may require aid—national aid—in order thus to complete the national work with credit alike to the country and the Government which initiated it. Sir, is there anything wonderful in all that? Does the hon. gentleman read the *Globe*? Does he not know that before it appeared in the *Herald* it was pictured and foreshadowed in the *Globe*, that in place of two dollars per acre as suggested in my paper the *Globe* suggested one dollar an acre? I take his estimate of the value of the land. I know nothing of the scheme of the Government—I am not in their confidence; I know nothing of the views of the company—I am not in their confidence on that point. Hon. gentlemen laugh derisively. I am a friend of the company because I believe they have done good by the country, they have carried on a work which is a credit to the country, and I say whatever may be done it is the duty of the country to stand by them in carrying out that work, paying all respect and regard to the public interest. It is not in the interest of Canada that that work should be imperilled, and the reputation and character of the Dominion thereby destroyed. We know what has already been done in that way. We know that the utterances of the hon. gentlemen opposite have been used in England and in the United States in a manner which does no credit to Canada. We know that the press which stands behind him have not confined themselves to vilifying the Government—I do not blame them for that; it is party tactics, and I pitch into them myself when I think they deserve it and will do so again. My honorable friend opposite may make an attack on me, but I am here ready and willing and, what is more, able to defend myself and my paper; and whatever appears in that paper I am responsible for, and nobody else. My hon. friend from West Durham (Mr. Blake) has chosen to step out of his way and drag me into this controversy. I have nothing to do with it. As a public journalist, as a representative man, as representing as independent a constituency as there is in the Dominion of Canada, I have as fearlessly expressed my views as any man in this House; and when I choose to propound a scheme which is at variance with the scheme of the hon. gentleman, when I choose to put forward a means of relieving the company, sustaining the honor of the country and protecting the public interests, I have a just right to do so. The difference between me and the *Globe* in this scheme is, that I put the value of the lands at \$2 per acre while the *Globe* puts it at \$1. I have paid some attention to the country and

to the proceedings of that public corporation, and the action taken by hon. gentlemen opposite in relation to it. At one time we find the lands valued at \$5 per acre. Does the hon. member from West Durham forget that? Of late years the very lowest value which that hon. gentleman has placed on them has been about \$3 an acre. Now, Sir, does not the hon. gentleman know, when he discusses the question of placing the value at \$2 per acre, that he is putting it at 50 per cent. less—more than 50 per cent. less—than the lowest valuation he individually ever placed on them. I am quite in my place and province, both as a public journalist and a representative, in giving my opinion from an independent standpoint as to what I believe are the interests of the country in relation to this matter, and so far from looking with the dread which the hon. gentleman seems to entertain in regard to a proposition of that kind, I look upon it, that one of the best things the country could do would be to resume possession of those lands, which ought never to have passed out of its hands, which ought always to have been retained by the Government, and, if necessary, to give a value to them so as to develop and open up that country. I know that this railway when built will not give that accommodation which it should give with reference to branches. We know that it is necessary to open up that country. It is stated that the people are likely to go out of the country unless they get the Southern Manitoba branch, and we know that other branches are required there. Is it unreasonable—is it not my duty, individually, and the duty of every honorable and independent man here, if he thinks the means can be provided to carry out this work, to state his opinion openly and above board? I think it is my duty to do so—of my own motion, uninspired by any man, echoing my own sentiments, and I wish my hon. friend to understand that in doing what I have done I have given expression to my own idea of what the duty of the Government is; and I repeat that I am neither inspired by the Government, by the Canadian Pacific Railway, nor even by the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But for one reason I should not have noticed the rather irregular remarks of the hon. member who proposed this motion, because I think it is unnecessary for the Government to reply to such expressions of fear, or to discuss the anticipations which have been expressed by the hon. gentleman. I do not say that the hon. gentleman's remarks were unparliamentary, for they were not, but I do say that they were irregular. Rumors and articles in newspapers may be mentioned when discussing a question which is fairly before Parliament, but I think it was hardly fair that the hon. gentleman should have taken such rumors and have made them the subject of a speech in this House and an attack on the Government, when no information, no measure, was before him—nothing, in fact, which would justify him in making the remarks which he has made. But even to that extent I would have allowed the hon. gentleman to go without answering him a word, but he tried to throw some aspersions upon a section of the party which supports this Government, and these I cannot leave unanswered. There was nothing wrong in the hon. gentleman showing his recollection of the events of last Session, by saying that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had said that, after spending \$33,000,000 in the work they had undertaken, they had estimated that \$27,000,000 further was necessary to complete the road, and that that made little short of \$60,000,000 which was required. Every hon. gentleman can remember that as well as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). The hon. gentleman went further, and he said that during the course of last year the vice-president or manager of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had stated or had written something in the newspapers to the effect that he thought the work had been conducted with such care, and that the

facilities in the construction were such that they led him to think that out of the \$27,000,000, which had been estimated as the value of the work to be performed in order to execute the contract between the Government and the company, two millions —

Mr. BLAKE. More.

Mr. CHAPLEAU—or more might not be spent. He said that he had read that the chief engineer of the Government in a report made early last fall had corroborated to a certain extent the estimates of the vice-president of the company, and had said that really the difficulties which were expected to be encountered in the mountain regions were such that probably a large amount of money might be saved in the estimate of \$27,000,000. The hon. gentleman has allowed his imagination to have full play, and we know how fertile it is, and he has told us that, calculating as he did calculate, it would not only be two millions of dollars, as Mr. Schreiber estimated, or between three and four millions as the vice-president of the company estimated, that the contract would be short in the expenditure, but that perhaps six millions would be the difference in the cost and the money which is to be available to the company and the subsidy which was to be given to them. All that, Mr. Speaker, was perhaps no reason for the hon. gentleman to have expressed such fears. Is it an expectation or a hope that he has, or is it a fear? Whether it is a hope or a fear that will be realised we know not, but we know one thing—thank God, we know the Government are not going to lose one dollar of the liberal advance which Parliament made last year for the prompt execution of the contract between the country and Canadian Pacific Railway Company; and if we are to be mistaken, it will be on the right side of the sheet. Well, Mr. Speaker, so far so good. But the part of the remarks of the hon. gentleman I object to is this. He appeared from his remarks to think that the Government were concealing the truth from the House and the country—that the Government was perhaps frightened to bring before this House the truth as to what the company would be obliged to ask, lest some other concession would be forced upon them as it happened last Session. Such an aspersion is unjustifiable. The hon. gentleman knows that the Government never have been concealing anything from this House, but that their policy has been candidly, freely and openly explained, and not only the necessary but the unnecessary information asked for by every one of the members on the other side of the House has been given. Such was the course followed by the Government last Session and the Session before last; the same thing shall be done by the Government during this Session. The hon. gentleman has attempted to show that the Government are afraid. Afraid of what? And he has brought up recollections that he, especially, should not have brought before this House. The hon. gentleman has suggested that the Government are afraid of the domination of what he calls the *Maison Bleue*. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we are to speak of that, my hon. friend should know one thing. I wish the late member for Chateauguay was still alive and in his seat. I would state before him, feeling sure of not being contradicted, that the principle which the *Maison Bleue* in those days vindicated before this country and the world was a principle which has been supported by the highest constitutional authorities in England, a principle dear to every true lover of the liberties of his country. The *Maison Bleue*, as the hon. gentleman wishes to call it—and there is no shame in the name—existed to support the principle of responsible Government against the tyranny of a despot at the head of a Government. And what was fought for by the party with whom the hon. gentleman wishes to identify the *Maison Bleue*? The fight which then took place was one which did, and always will do,

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

honor to the nation, to the party, and to the section of the party to whom the hon. gentleman has alluded. My hon. friend said that last year we had in what he calls No. 8 a kind of repetition of the domination of the *Maison Bleue*. My hon. friend had last year a bitter experience of the mode of proceeding of the two *Maisons*, the *Maison Bleue* and the *Maison Rouge*. He tried to build a little *Maison Rouge* out of No. 8, and he knows how the disjointed planks of that little building were thrown about his head before the end of the Session. It was not for my hon. friend to speak of No. 8 after his experience of last year. What is the triumph which the hon. gentleman says was achieved by those whom he designates by the name of No. 8? The hon. gentleman ought to know; if the rumor is true, he was endeavoring to profit by that triumph. The hon. gentleman will not say that those demands were unconstitutional or excessive. The vote of the House was taken on those demands, Mr. Speaker; and what was the consequence? My hon. friend was so much ashamed of the position his *Maison Rouge* placed him in at the time they left him, in such an insignificant minority, that he dared not take his seat again at the end of the Session. No. 8, Mr. Speaker, was loyal, was constitutional, and No. 8 succeeded because it was both constitutional and loyal; and my hon. friend should never have mentioned the occurrence before this House, because whatever was asked at the time was supported by more than half the solemn votes of his own friends. This, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say, because this is not the first time that the hon. gentleman or his organs have tried to cast this aspersion on the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec, and I thought it was my duty to repudiate that unmerited aspersion.

Mr. LAURIER. It is not my intention to take any part in this discussion, but there is one statement of the hon. gentleman which I cannot allow to go unchallenged. The hon. gentleman has attempted to cover the most contemptible action of the late *Maison Bleue* with the revered name of the late Mr. Holton. Sir, everybody knows that Mr. Holton never in any way sanctioned what took place in the *Maison Bleue* of 1879. I do not know myself whether the inuendoes as to what Mr. Holton's views were with regard to the action of Mr. Letellier in dismissing his Ministers are true or not; for Mr. Holton never, on the floor of this House, at all events, expressed an opinion which could warrant the hon. gentleman in claiming that Mr. Holton ever condemned the action of Mr. Letellier. But we know, from the action of Mr. Holton in this House, that he deprecated the course of this Government in attempting to punish Mr. Letellier for an act for which he was amenable to the Local Legislature of the Province of Quebec; and I say this, that at that time the *Maison Bleue*, the great Conservative party of the Province of Quebec, attempted to tyrannise over their countrymen by forcing the Government to dismiss Mr. Letellier. We know that the hon. gentleman was not in the House at the time; he was in another House; but if he had been here, he would have seen the Government cowering under the pressure of the *Maison Bleue*, and he would have seen the Government coming down on its knees at last to the *Maison Bleue*, not for any honorable act, but for the most dishonorable act; for the Conservative party of Quebec are responsible for introducing the principle that the Local Legislature is not independent from the Government of the Dominion. This I say is dishonorable; and when the hon. gentleman attempts to cover such a contemptible and dishonorable action with the revered name of Mr. Holton, he must understand that such an attempt will not go unchallenged.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I never intended my hon. friend to understand, nor did I say, that Mr. Holton went to the

Maison Bleue. What I meant to say was, that Mr. Holton disapproved the conduct of Mr. Letellier, and this is evident from the fact that he would never give his vote against the condemnation of Mr. Letellier by the House.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not dispute that; I do not know what Mr. Holton's views were on that question, but what I said was, that Mr. Holton never sanctioned the action of the Conservative party in forcing the Government to dismiss Mr. Letellier for an act for which he was amenable to the Local Legislature of Quebec.

Mr. OUMET. I really think the hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier) and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) have done us too much honor. I never thought that we deserved so much credit for what we have done. The members for Lower Canada who formed part of what has been termed the *Maison Bleue* and what has been called No. 8, only tried to obtain justice for their Province, and the best compliment that could be paid to them is the endorsement which the Liberal members of Quebec have been obliged to give their conduct. We have only obtained what we are entitled to have. We have done not only good service to our Province but we have done good service to the Government; we have done good service to our party; we have done good service to our country. If we had some influence in bringing the Government to do what they did, I say it is a great compliment to be told so by the hon. members of the Opposition. I say that these gentlemen coming from Lower Canada, who had been pressing these claims for Quebec for so many years, and who had been always kept back, who had been always going a begging from the then Liberal Government for what we obtained afterwards—I say this is their condemnation; this is the avowal by themselves that they had no influence, that they were able to do nothing for their Province or their party in the Province of Quebec; and that was the verdict that was passed against them in 1878 as well as in 1882. This was told them by one of the principal members of their party in their own organ, the *Événement*, who said: "What has killed our party in the Province of Quebec is the fact that our members have never been able to show that they had any influence in the Government of this country; they were always on their knees before the great spirits of the Grit party in Ontario." If we deserve some compliment from our country or from our Province, it is because we are able to say that even against the pretended opposition, the alleged opposition of the Government to do justice to the claims of the Province of Quebec, we have stood up instead of going on our knees. We have stood up like men, we have pressed our claims and we have succeeded. I thank the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) for the compliment he has paid to us all from the Province of Quebec for what we have done, because he cannot say himself that by obtaining that which we have obtained we have not done good service for our Province. He himself has been good enough to let us know that it was due to our influence, to our courage, to our loyalty, to our fidelity to the interests of our Province and our country; and this will not be forgotten by the people of Quebec. When I hear the hon. gentleman taunting us for what he pretends to be our disloyalty, I cannot help referring to the fact that he every day taunts us with being the slaves of the Government. It, therefore, comes with bad grace from his mouth to say we are acting disloyally the moment we are putting some claims before the Government and pressing them. How would we act on this side of the House if we were to follow the advice of my hon. friend? We would be here for nothing, because when we vote for the Government he says we are slaves, and when we threaten to vote against the Government he calls us disloyal. If my hon. friend were in power the position, I suppose, he would like us to

occupy, would be the humiliating position that was occupied for five years by our friends sitting behind him, and representing, or pretending to represent, the interests of the Province of Quebec.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not intend to say many words on this question, and in doing so, will embrace in my remarks some of the observations of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet). The hon. gentleman began by saying that we did him too much honor, attributed too much importance to the efforts of No. 8.

Mr. OUMET. We did only our duty.

Mr. BLAKE. In these days I honor highly a public man who can say of himself that he does his duty.

Mr. OUMET. We believe it our duty.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, the hon. gentleman, I say, having deprecated the compliment, as he called it, which my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Laurier) and myself paid to No. 8, by giving it too much importance, amply justified any allusion that might have been made to that institution, for such I understand it to be, that institution in the parliamentary government of this country, by what he said. He said for a long period the affairs of the Province had not been working correctly, because, as I understand it, there was a considerable period after the change to which he attributes so much good fortune, which took place in 1878, before any marked change in the conduct of affairs with reference to Quebec took place. Some five years elapsed before the justice he speaks of was to be done, and it was not possible to obtain it by the ordinary methods. The hon. gentleman announced just now that they had to resort to threats. "We threatened to vote against the Government," he said, "and you denounce us for disloyalty; we vote for the Government and you denounce us as slaves."

Mr. OUMET. I never said so.

Mr. BLAKE. I use the hon. gentleman's own language, for I took down his words.

Mr. OUMET. I was supposing a case.

Mr. BLAKE. "If we threaten to vote against the Government," he said, "you call it disloyal; if we vote for them you call us slaves." Well, I quite agree the hon. gentleman has the right to threaten or to vote against the Government if he thought the Government were bringing down a wrong measure, but the difficulty, is he threatened to vote against the Government unless they would add something more to their own measure. The will to vote for it is one thing and the voting for it is another kind of business. So the Secretary of State declared that No. 8 succeeded, and he was delighted to know that they had succeeded. Against whom did they succeed? Who were the adversaries with whom they waged this internecine war? Who were those whom they triumphed over? What were the successes which the Secretary of State flaunted in our faces to-day? Was it in our faces that those successes should have been flaunted? Is it not one of those attacks upon the flank to which the hon. the Secretary of State is supposed to have given some attention when he flaunts the successes of No. 8? Do we not know where the difficulty was? Was it with the weak, and as he chooses to say, with the disunited band who share my fortunes here, that the difficulty was? Was it to overcome them that the arrangements in No. 8 went on? Not so, Sir; it was the gentlemen with whom the hon. gentleman is associated by ties more or less strong, with whom he is combined by intimacies more or less cordial, with whom he has relations more or less confidential, with whom he entertains and concerts as to measures more or less in the common party interest—I say it was with these that the hon. gentleman was contending. My opinion is, that it was a remarkable scene in

the history of Canada, not fully developed; it was not in the face of day, it was not in this chamber, it was not with an audience in the gallery, it was not with the reporters of the press to hear what was said; it was not by arguments addressed to the reason and the conscience of the public.

Mr. OUIMET. How do you know?

Mr. BLAKE. How do I know? Because I know it was in secret.

Mr. OUIMET. You do not know, then.

Mr. BLAKE. Because I know that rumors came in the correspondence of the hon. gentleman's own party papers. I cannot remember the names of all of them, but I will name some of them. I saw the columns of the *Canadien*, I saw the columns of the *Monde*, I saw the columns of other papers, identified not with me but with hon. gentlemen opposite, from time to time letting a little lurid light upon the scenes that were going on in this private chamber. That is how I know and that is all I know, and the hon. gentleman knows that that is how I know and that is all I know.

Mr. OUIMET. You do not know much.

Mr. BLAKE. But I say that the public was interested in knowing the various phases of this controversy, this battle, this long-continued series of engagements, in which, following out the principles of General Grant, the leaders of that band decided that they would fight it out on that line all Session, or else they would not allow the debate to proceed. Do we not remember when there was a motion to take the debate from day to day? Do we not remember that the motion to take the debate from day to day was put off from day to day? Do we not know why it was put off from day to day? Do we not know the whole range of events, such as they appear to us from the outside? But I admit we did not know all the inside. I would like to know it. But there was a triumph. The hon. the Secretary of State says No. 8 succeeded. I say, again, those over whom No. 8 succeeded were the allies of the hon. gentleman and not his opponents. Just one word more. He says I tried to build a little house out of No. 8. In form and substance, in sense and spirit, that statement is absolutely without foundation. Whatever he may intend to infer or to imply, it is absolutely and entirely without foundation. I had nothing to do with his cabal. I had nothing to do with his intrigue. I had nothing to do with his negotiations. I had to do neither with his struggles, nor with his compromises, nor with his arrangements. I never hoped to profit by them, and it is not by such means I hope to advance my cause.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNTY TO FISHING VESSELS.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) for Mr. Weldon, moved for:

Statement showing name, tonnage and owner or owners of each vessel that received bounty during the year 1884, under the Act appropriating \$150,000 "to aid in the development of the sea fisheries," the amount paid to each vessel; also, the name, tonnage, owner or owners of vessels applying for the same, and refused, and the grounds for refusal.

Mr. McLELAN. I would say to the hon. gentleman that all this information will be in the Fisheries Report, which will be laid on the Table in a day or two. I think he had better let it stand over, and if anything should be wanting in that report he can move for it.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury). Very well.

CASE OF D. J. HUGHES.

Mr. WILSON moved for:

Copies of all papers and correspondence between the Government and D. J. Hughes, County Judge of Elgin, or any other person or Mr. BLAKE.

persons, relating to charges preferred by certain petitioners of said county, asking for a commission of enquiry into the official conduct of said judge.

He said: I regret exceedingly to have learned from the hon. the First Minister, yesterday, that the Government had decided not to appoint a commission to examine into the charges preferred against Judge Hughes. These charges were made specifically, and the petitioners, among whom was Mr. Stanton, the County Crown Attorney, declared their ability to substantiate every charge. When I asked that the matter should be enquired into and the charges investigated, I had hope that there would be such an investigation, at least, as would lead to the appointment of a commission which would have substantiated the truth of the charges or exonerated the judge charged. There were grave and serious charges against the conduct of Judge Hughes when on the bench. Now, Sir, I do not wish to say one word which is hard or unjust against the bench. I look upon it, and have looked upon it, with that degree of respect which I think it is entitled to. But there were charges made against that gentleman which, if they were really true, ought to have caused the Government to have taken action to remove him from the bench; and, if they were untrue, I say he should have had an opportunity of showing that they were untrue. Sir, I am perfectly well aware that the wheels of justice, to a certain extent, in the County of Elgin, have been clogged for a number of years by retaining Judge Hughes as County Judge. It is notorious to every person who has had anything to do with him, that he is arbitrary, that he is very prejudiced against those with whom he is not on friendly terms, and that it is almost an impossibility for any person who is in personal disfavor with him to get justice at his hands. It is well known in the county that when a barrister is under the displeasure of the judge, there is no use in a client applying to that barrister with any hope of obtaining a verdict, let his case be ever so just to take before him. Knowing all these facts, and acting in the interests of the judge, as well as in the interests of justice, and in order to give security and satisfaction to the people of that locality, I think that a commission of enquiry ought to have been granted. I, therefore, move for these papers, and hope that they will be brought down, and that when they come down we will be able to see that the Government were justified in the course which they thought proper to pursue in the matter, and thereby give no just cause of complaint to the citizens of the county and city.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the House will understand, from the statement made by the hon. gentleman in respect to this motion, how very vague and unsatisfactory the charges are that are brought against this County Judge. He says it is well understood that the judge is partial, and that unless counsel or parties are familiar with him they cannot obtain full consideration for their cases. Charges are sometimes made against a county court judge by unsuccessful litigants. In order to attack a judge there should be some weighty and specific charges, which are sufficient to show Parliament that the judge was really unfit to perform his duties. The hon. gentleman knows, and indeed admits, it should be so. The independence of the judges is one of the chief protections for justice in any country, and it is the bounden duty of Parliament, and of every member of Parliament, to put down any insinuation or attack on any judge, unless it is based on specific charges, showing that the judge is unfit to hold his position, and that it is contrary to the public interest he should do so; and the member who takes the responsibility of making that charge should state his belief that, from the respectability of the parties, or other circumstances, he has reason to believe there is a basis and foundation for the charges. The hon. gentleman now makes this motion as a sort of censure on the Government for not

proceeding with the investigation. The hon. gentleman has been told that the Minister of Justice stated, and the Government on his report stated, that they do not believe there are any sufficient grounds for proceeding against this judge. This is an appeal from that decision, and it is only in the nature of an appeal from that decision we consent to bring down the papers. We will bring them down.

Mr. BLAKE. We have it already on record, in answer to the hon. gentleman's question the other day, that certain charges against this County Judge, of which I know nothing, were so specific that the Minister of Justice considered they required an answer from him, and he pointed out which of them required an answer, and he obtained an answer to them. Therefore, the proposition of the hon. gentleman, that we are to understand from the hon. member's statement that the charges were of a very vague character and not such as in that respect proper to be considered, does not seem to be consistent with the statement made by the First Minister the other day. I understood from it that the charges had been sent to the judge, that he had returned them, saying he thought they were so vague as not to require an answer. Thereupon, the Minister of Justice went over them, and pointed out to him such of them as to which he, the Minister, required an answer, and thereupon the judge did answer those charges. There has been a finding by that member of the Government to which this matter specially belongs, that certain of these charges were sufficiently specific and sufficiently grave to require an answer. They may be entirely untrue, but they are so grave and specific in their character that the Government have themselves decided that as regards some of the charges they come within the rule.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is in error in his statement that the Minister of Justice considered they were specific charges which required a specific answer. There was a long, and I was going to say, a rambling statement, a series of charges or insinuations, as to the conduct of this judge. Some were obviously so vague and uncertain that the Minister of Justice set them aside altogether; but, as to the others, there was sufficient ground to induce the Minister of Justice, in justice to the judge himself, to send the petition to him, because a judge ought to know when charges, at all affecting his position, honor and integrity, are filed, so that he may consider them. But there is no statement on the part of the Minister of Justice or of the Department that the allegations were sufficiently specific to cause the County Judge to be put on trial. The papers will be brought down.

Mr. CASEY. I have not *Hansard* at hand at this moment, so I cannot refer to the exact words used by the right hon. gentleman; but he will remember that he told this House, in answer to the question asked by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Wilson) that, whether the charges were specific enough and grave enough to lead him to order an investigation or not, the Minister of Justice had certainly directed the attention of the judge to some of those charges, and had required an answer from him; that the judge had answered, and had requested that his answer should be brought down to the House with the other papers. So it was evidently understood by the hon. gentleman himself, by the judge and by the Minister of Justice, that certain of the charges were sufficiently grave to require an answer, and they were of sufficient importance to lead the judge to ask that the answer might be brought down to the House, together with the other papers. *Hansard* of yesterday has just been put into my hand, and I will read what the right hon. gentleman said in reply to the question asked by the hon. member for Elgin. His remarks are thus reported:

"As to the third branch of the question, a copy of the charges was sent to the judge, and he replied they were too general to answer. The Minister eliminated those charges in respect of which he did not think

it necessary to ask an explanation. The other charges were then sent to the judge, who replied. The petitioner (Stanton) asked for a copy of this reply. On enquiry of the judge whether he had any objection, he replied that he preferred that his answer should be sent down to the House, with the charges which had been made against him."

So there certainly has been something in connection with the matter, requiring at least this amount of investigation, and it will be for the House to decide, when the papers are brought down, whether it requires further investigation or not.

Mr. MILLS. The views enunciated by the hon. gentleman to-day are not those enunciated by him on a former occasion, with respect to the independent action of judges, and their being subject to adverse criticism. The hon. gentleman said it was not only his own view, but he believed the view of every member of the House, that a judge ought not to be attacked in this way, and subjected to adverse criticism. I remember, on one occasion, when two or three of his supporters made a violent attack upon a judge who was at that time a member of a court of Canada, the hon. gentleman said it was very important that the House should subject the action of the judges to criticism.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What judge was that?

Mr. MILLS. If the hon. gentleman will look at *The Debates*, he will see I am not misrepresenting his statement on that occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On what occasion?

Mr. MILLS. On the occasion to which I refer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What occasion was that?

Mr. MILLS. When the hon. member sitting near him, the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert), and the hon. member who at that time represented Prince Edward, attacked one of the judges.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who was the judge?

Mr. MILLS. When they attacked one of the judges of the Court of Chancery, the hon. gentleman thought it was quite proper for members of the House to subject the judges to adverse criticism, although there had been no petition against the judge. On the present occasion the hon. gentleman enunciated different views, and the views he expresses to-day are perhaps, on the whole, much sounder than those he expressed on that occasion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not propose to discuss a previous debate to which the hon. gentleman has referred; but if he wishes the question reopened, I am prepared to meet him.

Mr. WILSON. The First Minister states that the charge should be specific, and sufficient to show Parliament that the judge was unable properly to perform his duties. All I have to say with reference to the matter is this, that I think Mr. Stanton's statement that every charge against D. J. Hughes has been proven is sufficient. Mr. Stanton is the County Crown Attorney, and it is his duty to see that justice is administered in that section. He states over his own signature, and I have his letter in my hand, that he can prove every one of those charges, and yet the First Minister and the Government say to-day that the charges are not sufficiently strong as to demand this investigation. I really think that the proper officer there ought to be the proper judge as to whether the charges are established sufficiently to require investigation. If he is not competent to do so, then he is certainly not competent for the office of Crown Attorney, or to conduct the criminal business of the county.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—TRESTLES AND BRIDGES.

Mr. EDGAR moved for :

A statement showing :—(1.) The total number of timber trestles and the total number of wooden bridges constructed, or under contract for construction, upon the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Sudbury Junction and Nepigon River; (2.) The length in feet and the maximum height of each of said trestles and of each of said bridges. Such statement to identify the trestles and bridges by numbering them consecutively from Sudbury westward, and also to classify them under the sections in charge of separate engineers, and to distinguish the trestles or bridges which are only temporary works, to be filled in by the Canadian Pacific Railway before approval of the work by the Government engineer.

He said: I need only say that the information sought for by this motion is very important, and that I think it should be laid before the House. I may add that if the information is in the office of the engineer, it is such that I think it could be supplied in a day or two.

Mr. McLELAN. I have to suggest that the motion be amended by inserting after the words "number of" the word "permanent," and by striking out all the words after the words "Sudbury westward," in the last sentence; the effect being that all the works of a permanent character will be returned.

Mr. EDGAR. I certainly think that the additional information which it is proposed to give by the amendment would be very valuable, but I would be sorry if the information which I seek should be delayed in order to get this additional information. Perhaps the hon. gentleman who is acting for the Acting Minister of Railways will be good enough to allow the motion to stand, and a further motion may be moved, calling for the additional information; otherwise I should be inclined to feel—if not that the object of the amendment is to delay—that it certainly would be productive of delay.

Mr. McLELAN. I understand from the Acting Minister that there will be no delay, but that he is desirous of giving full information on the point.

On the amendment being put,

Mr. EDGAR. I think that the effect of the amendment will be quite different from what the hon. member has suggested. He first suggested to extend the motion so as to cover the whole line which would be very desirable if it did not take too long. Otherwise than that, I hope he does not intend to alter the motion.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will see that where the main line is under construction, where the work is going on by the day, a great deal of temporary work is used—work that is used for a short time and then removed.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not want the resolution altered or emasculated in that way. I think that the motion as it stood originally provides exactly for the information desired, as it will show the temporary work separately from the other.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. How about the temporary work that is to be taken away, and not filled in?

Mr. EDGAR. If the hon. gentleman will read the motion, he will see that it distinguishes the trestles or bridges which are only temporary works. I shall certainly object as strenuously as I can to have the motion emasculated in that way.

Mr. VAIL. I quite understand the object of the hon. gentleman who is acting for the Minister of Railways, in seeking to amend this motion. I remember a meeting that took place once at Truro, in Nova Scotia, at which the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries undertook to convince the people that Mr. Mackenzie was building a very inferior road, because he was building wooden trestle bridges. And that accounted for the progress that was

Mr. WILSON.

being made. Now, my hon. friend wants to make out that the rest of the road is not of an inferior character, notwithstanding that the same kind of bridges are used, and that is his reason for wishing to encumber this motion with the amendment he has made.

Mr. CASEY. I do not see what objection there can be to including all the structures, so long as they are carefully distinguished.

Mr. MULLOCK moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all Orders in Council, memorials and representations on the subject of the bounty on manufactures of iron, not already brought down, together with all letters, accounts and vouchers in respect of claims made for such bounty; and statement in detail of all sums paid or allowed in respect thereof.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statements showing :—(1.) The expenditure by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company upon its main line of railway, between Callander and Port Arthur and between Selkirk and Kamloops, since the expenditure of \$23,078,950, shown by the letter of Mr. Stephen to the Minister of Railways and Canals, of the 15th January, 1884. (2.) The materials on hand in respect of the described main line of railway. (3.) The receipts by the company since the account given in the said letter in respect of (a.) Cash subsidy; (b.) Government loan; (c.) Land grant bonds or land sales, or from the pledging of land grant bonds. (4.) The amount, if any, due by the company in respect of construction of the described main line. (5.) Estimates of the cost of the work of construction remaining to be done on the described main line, showing whether the materials on hand are taken into account in such estimate or not. (6.) An estimate of the whole cost of construction of the described main line when completed. (7.) Statement of the cost of equipment of the described main line at the date of the account in Mr. Stephen's letter. (8.) Statement of the cost of equipment of the described main line since that date. (9.) Estimate of the further cost of equipment of the described main line when completed. (10.) Estimate of the complete cost of equipping the described main line. All such statements and estimates being separate for each of the described divisions, viz: (a) That between Callander and Port Arthur and (b) that between Selkirk and Kamloops.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement in detail of the present position of land grant and the land grant bonds of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, showing, by the number of the section, the township and range or other description, the lots granted to the company; also, the lots sold by the company; also, the amount of land grant bonds in the hands of the Government; the amount in the hands of the company; the amount in the hands of the public; the amount pledged by the company for loans or otherwise, with details; and the amount cancelled; showing, also, the sum received by the company for lands sold in each calendar year and in the course of the present year; and the amount now due to the company in respect of lands sold, with a separate statement, showing the amount received by the company from sales in town sites, and the amount now due on such sales, distinguishing between the receipts and debts on account of town sites comprised in the land grant, or in any arrangement with the Government, and the receipts and debts on account of other town sites.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, instructions to and correspondence with the commissioners under the commission issued in connection with the claims arising out of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, and a statement of the matters referred to them, and of the moneys paid to them and to the secretary, and of the number of days during which the commissioners sat, all subsequent to the period covered by the return to the Address of last Session.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury, for Mr. Weldon.)

Statement of the receipts of the post office at St. Stephen's, N. B., for the calendar year 1884; also, a statement of the value of postage stamps sold at the said office.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury.)

Return of the casualties to trains on the Intercolonial Railway, arising from collision, broken rails, or otherwise, for the calendar year 1884; the respective causes and dates; the amount of damage (if any) in each case to property; the amount of compensation paid to owners of property destroyed or damaged, as well as amount of claims for loss or damage to property (if any) unsettled.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury, for Mr. Weldon.)

Return of all claims presented for drawback on materials used for shipbuilding, for the year ending 30th June, 1884; also, for the six months ending 31st December, 1884; giving the name of the applicant, the name and tonnage of the vessel, the amount claimed, and the amount paid.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury, for Mr. Weldon.)

Return giving a full statement of all coal entered ex-warehouse, free or for exportation, during the year ending 30th June, 1884; showing the quantity so entered at each port, the names of persons having entered, the quantities ex-warehoused by each person, and, if exported, the name of the vessel or railroad by which exported, the place to which exported, and copies of all the cancelling certificates, showing that such coal had been landed in the ports to which exported.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury, for Mr. Weldon.)

Return showing the quantity of rolling stock purchased for the Intercolonial Railway during each six months of the year ending 31st December, 1884, giving each kind of rolling stock, and whether purchased under contract or otherwise, the parties from whom bought, and the cost of each kind. Also, a statement showing what has been built during the year in the Government workshops, giving each kind.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury, for Mr. Weldon.)

Statement of the revenue and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway, accrued for the six months of the year ending 31st December, 1884, under the several divisions, similar to annual statement B, Intercolonial Railway, in the Public Accounts.—(Mr. Burpee, Sunbury, for Mr. Weldon.)

Statement showing the names and places of residence of all militiamen of 1812 who received their pension during the last fiscal year, and the amount paid to each of them.—(Mr. Bourassa.)

Copy of the charges against Lieut.-Colonel O'Malley, of the 25th Battalion, Ontario; date of O'Malley's suspension; date of the court of enquiry into the charges; also, a copy of the evidence taken before said court of enquiry, together with the report of said court to the Major-General commanding the militia.—(Mr. Wilson.)

All correspondence had with the Government, or any member thereof, in relation to any proposed alteration or relaxation of the provisions of the present Prohibitory Liquor Law of the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Foster.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. WELLS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 30) to amend and consolidate "The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879," and the Acts amending it.

Mr. POPE. Will the hon. gentleman explain what the amendments are?

Mr. WELLS. The amendments are very numerous indeed, and it will be impossible to explain them fully at this stage. The old Railway Act of 1861 was evidently framed by unprofessional men, and contained a great many inaccuracies and inconsistencies, many of which found their way into the Consolidated Railway Acts of 1868 and 1879. Amendments have been made from time to time, and I think the time has now arrived when the whole mass should be remodelled and consolidated. I have done my best in that direction, but, of course, in view of the important character of the Bill, I shall be guided by the action of the Government in this matter. I hope that we shall have an opportunity of going over it carefully so as to arrive at such a conclusion as will satisfy both the railway companies and the public.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. I asked a question the other day of the First Minister in regard to when I was likely to obtain the return ordered by the House on 28th of March last, in the following words:—

"Statement showing the names of all stockholders in the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, with the amounts of stock held by each of said stockholders at the close of the first year after the charter was granted or operations commenced. Also the names of all stockholders in said company, and the amounts of stock held by each on the first day of the current year."

I should like to ask the right hon. gentleman when we are likely to obtain this information.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am afraid that I am unable to give the hon. gentleman a satisfactory answer. I do not know why the Grand Trunk Railway Company have delayed, if they have delayed, furnishing this information. I will make enquiry with a view to having the return brought down, as the hon. gentleman is so persistent in the matter.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do not delay too long.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ero long.

CANADA CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 31) to amend and consolidate the Canada Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884. He said: This is a Bill for the consolidation of the different Acts in regard to matters of detail. After copies have been printed, the Bill will be distributed among the members.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENCY.

Mr. BILLY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 32) respecting Insolvency.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. BILLY (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I do not think it will be necessary to give lengthy explanations on this Bill to-day, and I believe it would be proper to wait until the Bill is printed and distributed. This Bill contains a great number of clauses, and its object is to regulate the distribution of insolvents' estates and to discharge the insolvent debtor from his liabilities.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RETURNS.

Mr. McCRAVEY. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to certain facts with respect to a return asked for last Session in regard to the cost and maintenance of Rideau Hall. Part of the information asked for was brought down on 17th April, but the return is not complete. I desire to ask the Minister if he will see that the return is brought down in a complete form. I wish also to ask the Minister in regard to a return ordered at the same time with respect to the cost and maintenance of the Welland Canal, as well as a similar return in regard to the St. Lawrence Canals. Will the hon. Minister see that these returns are brought down?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As regards the St. Lawrence Canals, the matter referred to comes within the Department of the Minister of Railways and Canals. I could not catch the first portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks; but if he will kindly send me over a memorandum of what he wants I will take care that the papers are brought down, if they have not already been brought down.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented a Message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANDSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons copies of all petitions, resolutions, correspondence and memorials, on the matter of bankruptcy, which have been submitted to His Excellency in Council for consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 12th February, 1885.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I desire to move, without notice, that the Message be referred to the Special Committee on Insolvency; also that the committee have full power to consider the whole question of bankruptcy and

insolvency, and to report by Bill or otherwise. I also desire that the committee be given power to report from time to time; and, with the consent of the House, I will add some names to the Committee. I beg to move:

That the Message of His Excellency the Governor General, transmitted this day, be referred to the Special Committee appointed to take into consideration and report upon the alleged necessity that exists for adopting some system of bankruptcy and insolvency; that the said committee have power to report from time to time, by Bill or otherwise, on the whole subject of bankruptcy and insolvency; and that Messrs. Auger, Bergeron, Bernier, Desjardins and Robertson (West Hastings) be added to the said committee.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to so much of the motion as proposes to refer to the committee the papers which have just been brought down in so unusually formal a manner, I do not think there is any objection, nor do I object to the addition of the names. But the other part of the hon. gentleman's proposal is of a very serious character. It seems to indicate that the hon. gentleman had not fully considered what the proper reference to this committee should be. The other day we were invited on the responsibility of the Government to assent to a particular reference to the committee. The committee has hardly commenced its labors—I believe it had but one brief session—and now the hon. gentleman proposes a very large increase of the powers of the committee, including the power to report a Bill. I think it would have been more satisfactory, if the hon. gentleman felt it necessary at so early a day to vary and enlarge the reference, to have done so in the usual way, upon a notice, but I suppose the result would have been the same as to-day. The reasons which I gave from my point of view for objecting to the mode of procedure which the hon. gentleman adopts in this case, apply with added force the greater the enlargement of the reference, and therefore I cannot assent to this motion, otherwise than on a division, though I do not take the formal objection.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will recollect that when I moved the committee, I stated that probably the committee would or might apply, not for extended powers but for power to report by Bill or otherwise, or to report from time to time. They had not made a formal report, but I am informed that it is the desire of the committee, and therefore I make the motion.

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to this additional statement of the right hon. gentleman I think there is a very grave inconvenience in recognising such a mode of procedure, as indicating the sense or the wishes of the committee. There is a recognised mode of indicating the wishes of the committee to this House; and it is the proper mode. But, as I understand, the hon. gentleman when he is moving now, is moving on the volition and responsibility of the Government, for I do not think we can recognise any other method of acting on the wishes of the committee than upon a report from the committee, which is a report placed on the Table.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The committee can only make one report unless the reference empowers them to report from time to time. Of course, this motion is made on the responsibility of the Government, in accordance with the desire of the chairman of the committee.

Motion agreed to, on a division.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 17, intitled: "An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum of money to the Province of British Columbia for the construction of a graving dock at Esquimalt, and for other purposes."

Mr. BLAKE. Immediately after the hon. gentleman made the announcement of this measure, on a motion for Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

leave to introduce the Bill, I put a notice on the paper at the earliest possible moment for correspondence and this order was granted. I explained that it was with reference to this particular matter, and I did not think the hon. gentleman would propose the measure until that correspondence was brought down. It is of little use to bring it down at all, after the Bill has passed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I thought perhaps we might take the second reading to day, and not take the third reading until after the correspondence comes down.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will not move the Bill to Committee until the correspondence comes down.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Very well.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

On the order, second reading Bill (No. 3) to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Stand.

Mr. BLAKE. I would suggest that it would be to the convenience of the House, as this order is here and seems to be getting into a standing condition, that the hon. gentleman should intimate when he intends to take the second reading. It is very interesting, but we should not be kept in a state of expectancy about it all the Session.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). Next Thursday.

CARRIERS BY LAND.

Mr. COUGHLIN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 5) respecting the liabilities of carriers by land.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would ask the hon. gentleman to allow this motion to stand over. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has a Bill on the same subject, and there will most likely arise the question of jurisdiction, the question of the competency of Parliament to deal with that subject. It would be well that the whole question should be thoroughly discussed on the two measures, when the promoter of the other Bill is here. The member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will be here in a few days, and then the two Bills may be discussed together.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the same arrangement might be made as to this Bill—that we should get 24 hours' notice, at any rate, as to the time it will come on.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Certainly.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—TRESTLES AND BRIDGES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Edgar for statement showing total number of timber trestles and wooden bridges upon the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the motion of Mr. McLelan in amendment thereto.

Mr. MULLOCK. When the consideration of this question was adjourned last evening, I believe an amendment was proposed by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the effect of which would be to enlarge the enquiry beyond what might be considered reasonable bounds. The simple question that we have now to determine is, whether the object of the hon. member to obtain the information in a reasonable time, and probably for practical use during the present Session, would not be defeated by an amendment of this character. I think the proposition made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), was a most reasonable one. He stated

that if the hon. Minister desired the House to be informed on the matters aimed at by the amendment, the hon. Minister should ask the House to pass a motion dealing with that particular branch of the case, but that his particular object should not be defeated by the motion being weighted down by a much greater enquiry and which could not possibly be answered within a reasonable time. I think that is the simple proposition before us, and if the Government insist on this amendment, there can be only one inference, and that is that the Government do not desire the House to be put in possession of the particular information asked for by the mover of this motion. I have no knowledge myself as to what is sought for by it; I do not know whether the motion is likely to bring out any information injurious to any individual, corporation, or party. I think it is simply important to know whether, when an hon. member moves in this House for certain information, it is to be in the power of the Government, or is a proper exercise of their power here, indirectly to kill that application by postponing compliance with it to an indefinite period. Now, the effect of this amendment must necessarily be to postpone for an indefinite period the return to the House of this necessary information. The original motion asked that the House should be informed of the character of certain work over a distance somewhere within 500 miles. It is proposed by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. McLelan) that the enquiry should not be so limited, but should relate to the whole distance from Sudbury Junction to the Pacific Ocean. Why not come out and vote down the motion, and say you will not give the information, instead of indirectly defeating the object of the mover by an amendment of this character? I have nothing to say as to the merits of the motion. If it is a proper motion to be granted along with the amendment proposed, it is a proper motion to be granted by itself, and I can see no reason for refusing the proposition made by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar), namely, to grant his motion, and let the Minister of Marine and Fisheries present an independent motion for the information which he thinks the House should be possessed of. In that way, if the House should be possessed of the whole information, it will have it. What does it matter whether two parcels of papers are brought down, or only one? We know that if they are to come down together they cannot come down in time to be of any practical use.

Mr. POPE. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman who has just sat down is as desirous as any man in the House to have all the information he can possibly obtain; but I think it is a very curious way to get information to be afraid of getting too much. I think no hon. member in this House will feel that my hon. friend, in moving the amendment, did it with any other object than to give the greatest possible information about the road to this House and the country. I do not think my hon. friend opposite should be accused of being disingenuous; I do not say he is trying to place this portion of the road in a false position before this House and the country; but I say the effect of the motion would be to give a wrong impression of the character of the road from this temporary trestle work, which is part of the construction; it would give an impression to the country and the world which would be not only false, but injurious to the company, and I know that my hon. friend (Mr. Edgar) would not like to do anything to injure this company. I believe hon. gentlemen opposite, and every patriotic man in this country, whether on one side or the other, must wish that any information given of this road should be such as to convey a proper impression of the condition of the road just as it stands. That is one objection I have to the hon. gentleman's motion. What possible good could come of a return showing the quantity of temporary trestle work used for purposes of construction, which is soon to be removed

altogether? What possible good could be done by sending a return of that kind to the other side of the Atlantic or to the United States? We know that the competitors of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the United States will take advantage of every word and every syllable that can be used against it. Therefore I say, if you are going to give them any information, give them all the information. I have not seen my hon. friend's amendment, but I have an idea of what it is. It will show everything; it will show the number of trestles built that are permanent on the whole line. Why should we give any information as to these temporary trestles which are to be removed—information which would convey to the world the false idea that the road had been debased and its standard lowered. I object to the motion of my hon. friend opposite. I hope he will accept the amendment, and get the whole information concerning the road from one end to the other. There will be no more delay in bringing that down than there would be in bringing what he asks for. I do not know how long it will take to have the return brought down; but I say to every hon. member of this House that we shall get the information as soon as we can. But I will fight this battle as long as I can before I will consent to be a party to any attempt to spread before the country information false in character, as it must be, before the road is completed, and injurious both to the company who are building the road and to the Government whose duty it is to see that the road is built according to the contract.

Mr. CHARLTON. The hon. Minister of Railways says that the friends of the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) are afraid of getting too much information. Sir, we are not afraid of getting too much information, but we complain that we are not allowed to get the information we desire in regard to the Canadian Pacific road. What we want is simply to get the information we ask for. The colleague of the hon. gentleman who moved the amendment informs us that it is his sincere desire to lay before this country full information. I doubt it. I believe the sincere desire of this Government is to conceal from the public the actual condition of affairs in regard to that road.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman has no right to doubt what I have stated as a fact in this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. member will accept the statement which has just been made.

Mr. CHARLTON. I will accept with mental reservation the statement made by the hon. gentleman with regard to the temporary trestle work. The hon. gentleman talks of giving a false impression. Sir, to give the present condition of that road is not to give a false impression. What we require is a correct impression, what we require is to know its exact condition; and to conceal its exact condition is to give a false impression. If the hon. gentleman desires to conceal the actual condition of the work, it is he who desires to give a false impression and not the hon. gentleman who asks for the return. He says, in an ironical tone, he knows we would do nothing to injure this company. Certainly we would not; we do not desire to injure this company; we have no contention with this company. This company, we believe, has made this Government its tool; it has used this Government for its purposes. Our quarrel is not with it, but we stand here, as guardians of the people's rights, to condemn the Government that has surrendered these rights to this company. The hon. gentleman acknowledges that he has not seen the motion, so that he does not even know what he is talking about with regard to this motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. POPE. I had not seen the amendment.

Mr. CHARLTON. We will see what the amendment is, as well as the motion, and thus see what has been expunged and what added :

"Mr. Edgar moved for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General for a statement showing:—(1.) The total number of timber trestles and the total number of wooden bridges constructed, or under contract for construction, upon the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Sudbury Junction and Nepigon River ; (2.) The length in feet and the maximum height of each of said trestles and of each of said bridges. Such statement to identify the trestles and bridges by numbering them consecutively from Sudbury westward, and also to classify them under the sections in charge of separate engineers, and to distinguish the trestles or bridges which are only temporary works to be filled in by the Canadian Pacific Railway before approval of the work by the Government engineer."

That is the motion of my hon. friend. Now, what is the amendment? It is to make the motion read as follows:—

"(1.) The total number of permanent timber trestles and the total number of wooden bridges constructed, or under contract for construction, upon the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ; (2.) The length in feet and the maximum height of each of said trestles and of each of said bridges. Such statement to identify the trestles and bridges by numbering them consecutively from Sudbury westward."

Or, in other words, Sir, to prevent my hon. friend obtaining the very information he is seeking for,—the information as to the number of temporary trestles upon that road. It is intended, Sir, by this amendment, to give no information whatever upon that point, to refuse to give to this House any information except the information pertaining to the number of permanent timber trestles on that road. How are we to know, if this information is not given, whether the Government are not transcending their powers with regard to the payment of subsidies to the road, whether they are not paying subsidies, perchance, in anticipation of the time when the road will be completed and the company entitled to those subsidies? Now, an hon. member of this House, I hold, has a right to demand information upon any subject of political or public importance. If any hon. member of this House desires to know anything with regard to the progress of the work upon the Canadian Pacific road, that member has a right to know it. The public has a right to know it. This company has been subvented by millions of dollars of public money, it is being constructed with the public money, it is being constructed at the cost of taxpayers of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. It is likely to cost the taxpayers of this country as much again as it ought to cost, and I maintain the taxpayers of Canada and their representatives have the right to insist upon the fullest information being given with regard to the construction of this road. The stand taken by my hon. friend in attempting to refuse this information looks suspicious; it looks as if there was something to conceal; it looks as if there was a desire to lead the public astray in their opinions and calculations as to the progress and condition of this road. Why do the Government wish to withhold this information? Is there anything in this motion that is calculated to incriminate them? Is there anything in it calculated to make them stand in a worse light even than that in which they now stand before the public? It would seem impossible that there should, but it is to be apprehended that the Government does fear that the information asked for in this motion would put them in a worse position before the people of Canada than that which they now occupy, bad as that position is. Sir, the construction of the Pacific Railway is a dark mystery. I venture to say that never before has a work of this magnitude been undertaken and subvented, or aided by the Government and the people, who had to pay the cost, not being permitted to know its condition and progress. There are things about it we do not understand. We have reason to believe the route of the line was changed merely to cast discredit on an hon. gentleman

Mr. CHARLTON.

on this side of the House; we have reason to believe that, in order to make this change, this country will be subjected to a loss of millions of dollars. We know this thing is hidden from the public gaze; we know it is shrouded in mystery; we know that the people are not permitted to know anything with regard to the affairs of the road; we know that the demands of hon. gentlemen on this side are not complied with when they ask for requisite information; we know that when this company applied for a loan only a year ago, the reasonable demand that a committee should be struck to look into the condition of the affairs of this company was made, and this demand was refused. There are a good many things connected with this subject that naturally are calculated to arouse suspicion on this side of the House. When we look back to the circumstances to which I am about to refer very briefly, we cannot fail to have our suspicions aroused as to the relations that exist between the Government and the syndicate. Sir, what was the origin of this contract? Was it made in compliance with the requirements of the law of this country—a law which distinctly exacts, both in the Public Works Act and the Act of 1874, that no Government contract shall be entered into without public tenders being first asked for. Was that law complied with? No; this contract was made in secret; it was made under suspicious circumstances, and the suspicions connected with it grow thicker and darker day by day, and year by year. That contract was made in violation of the law, and it had not been laid three or four weeks before this House before a circumstance transpired which convinced every hon. gentleman open to conviction that the Government had acted hastily, that they had not taken the precautions they should have taken in this matter in the public interest. What was this circumstance? It was that we had another offer to build this road.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hear sneers on the other side and ironical laughter. Sir, we had another offer from another company of higher character and possessed of greater resources than the present, and an offer more favorable in the interests of this country than that of the present company. It was an offer that no hon. gentleman opposite has a right to say was not *bond fide*, because the company that made it paid into the hands of the Government \$600,000 more than was required to be deposited by the syndicate as a guarantee of their good faith and ability to execute the contract. We have no right then to say that this was not a *bond fide* offer. What was the offer? It was one that would have cost the country \$3,000,000 less and 3,000,000 acres less than the contract entered into with the syndicate. It asked for no monopoly; it asked for no exemption from taxation; it secured Canadian control by providing that the majority of the Board of Directors should be British subjects. Stock books in connection with it were to be opened in every Province of the Dominion, and the Government was to have the right at any time to buy back the road. If the Government at that time did not believe that offer to be a *bond fide* one, they, at least, under the circumstances, were bound to retrace their steps and advertise for tenders in order to see how much could be saved in the public interest. No doubt, Sir, millions of dollars could have been saved, but they refused to do it, and what are the subsequent developments in regard to this road? They proposed to secure the public rights against excessive charges by a 10 per cent. limit as to dividends, they limited the stock to \$25,000,000; and without the knowledge of this House, without the knowledge of the country, they permitted that company to increase their stock from \$25,000,000 to \$100,000,000. They were parties to that, and then they permitted a most scandalous system of stock-watering which, if it had been

allowed, would have placed that company in a position to have taken dividends of 10 per cent. upon a nominal stock of \$100,000,000 which had cost them scarcely more than \$30,000,000. Then they were privy to construction rings of the most scandalous character. They upheld the company in these things, and, when this company applied to this House for a loan, they refused to allow the country to know the state of the affairs of the company, they refused to grant a committee of enquiry. Here was a demand being made for \$30,000,000. It was supposed that the company had been already subvented beyond its needs, and surely the people of this country had a right to demand and to receive from the right hon. gentleman a commission of enquiry to place before the country a definite statement of the affairs of the company before a further loan was made to it. And, when they might have secured that boon for the people, they refused to remove the monopoly clause. It was subsequently discovered what the condition of the company was when this application for a loan was made. It was subsequently discovered that this company had shamefully wasted its resources.

Mr. MITCHELL. Oh.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, shamefully wasted its resources. This company had a contract with the people of Canada. What was that contract? It was a contract to build the main line from Lake Nipissing to the Pacific Ocean. The people of Canada had nothing to do with the affairs of this company so far as the acquiring of other lines, or the building of branch lines, or the advancing of the fortunes of the directors and officers of the road were concerned. The contract of the people of Canada with the syndicate was to build the main line of the Pacific road, and they made them certain grants to enable them to perform that contract. What was the condition of the road when the company came here and asked for this loan? They had spent, according to Sir Charles Tupper's statement last Session, upon the main line, at that time, \$29,209,541 on construction and equipment, and that included a quantity of stores on hand. What had they received? They had received at that time, against that expenditure, \$54,000,000, in Government subsidy, in the proceeds of stocks sold, in lands sold, and from other sources. They had received \$25,037,000 more than they had spent upon their contract, and the Government knew it, and yet they came here with an application for \$30,000,000 more, and their application was granted. Now, if they had confined themselves to the construction of the road that they contracted to construct, if they had confined themselves to their contract with the Government, they would have had a surplus at that moment of \$25,000,000. They were to earn \$12,710,000 in subsidies as the work progressed. Their estimate of the cost of completing was \$27,000,000, and if they had confined themselves to their contract with the Government, when the road was completed they would have had a surplus of \$10,747,000; and yet they were in extremities, and asked for a further loan. Why? Because they had spent millions of dollars in the United States, because they had acquired nearly a thousand miles of railway, not connected with their contract, because they had built lines of steamers, and it was reported that large sums of money had been taken out of their resources for private purposes. By a course of extravagance and folly, they had placed themselves in such a position, and the Government was a party to it. The Government had chartered the company in defiance of the law. They had carried it on in disregard of the interests of the people of this country, and they are to-day seeking to conceal the real condition of the works upon this road. We are demanding that we shall know the true condition of affairs. We have a right to know it, and, if this motion is refused, if this amendment is carried, it is an admission on the part of the Government that they are acting in excess of

their authority and not in the interests of the people, that they are paying subsidies to a company which has not earned them, that they are afraid to let the people know what the condition of the road is. If the Government denies this enquiry, it will justify us in saying that the syndicate comes first and the Government comes second, and, as a body, is the tail of the syndicate kite. I hope the Government will not be guilty of the outrage upon the rights of a free people, which it will be guilty of if it refuses a free enquiry into the condition of this road.

Mr. EDGAR. As a very new member, I was evidently under a mistaken impression. I had supposed that members of this House were entitled to fair and reasonable returns which they moved for on matters of very great public interest and moment. I was strengthened in that impression by the language of the hon. the Secretary of State yesterday, who, in discussing the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, said the Government had not only brought down all the returns of information which had been asked for, but a great deal more than had been asked for. I really do think that, if there is any subject which can come before this House upon which full information should be given, it is this very question of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. I should have supposed that, when the Government of the country are mortgagees of a railway, when they have lent vast sums of money upon the security of a line of road they would be just as much entitled as an ordinary holder of a mortgage security is to have the most full and complete information as to the nature of the security. I should also have thought that, when the Government of this country are proposing to pay, and are bound to pay, and from day to day are paying upon this very eastern section of the railway over \$15,000 in cash, and granting over 9,000 acres of land per mile, that gave the House and the country some claim to full and fair information on these points. I should also have thought that when this country has paid and is to pay 3 per cent. upon the capital stock of that company for a number of years, that would also entitle us to some consideration in this matter. Sir, I should still further have thought, that when the Government of the day has not yet told this House whether the company is going to receive further assistance or not, that fact also should entitle us to make full enquiries. As to the particular enquiry which is the subject of the motion, everybody connected with railways at all—and nearly everybody in this country at this day has more or less information about railways—knows that when the work is being rushed through, when railways are being rapidly built—and it is the boast of this company that this railway is being more rapidly built than any railway was ever built before—I say that when all this is being done, there is a great temptation to put up temporary trestle work in the place of solid filling in of ravines and gullies, which is done to save time. We know that it is very often necessary in constructing a road, and very properly necessary, to put up temporary trestle works to carry the track on further in order that the work may be continued more vigorously and more successfully. That is a very proper thing for every railway to do, and I have no doubt that this railway is doing it. But, Sir, the motion which I placed before the House is in order to enable that company in making this Return, to show what is temporary and what is not. The hon. member who is acting for the non-existent Minister of Railways, spoke about not having read the motion; he explained afterwards that he meant he had not read the amendment. I am prepared to say, after having listened to his speech, that if he had read the motion he did not understand it—I hope that is parliamentary—because the motion most distinctly and positively makes a direction that the return shall show and distinguish the temporary from the permanent work, and that is just what the hon. member

spoke in favor of doing in his speech. I do not want to throw aspersions upon the solidity of the line, which would be uncalled for on my part, but that would be done by this return if it was made in accordance with the amendment. The motion is explicit and contains the words:

"And also to classify them—

That is the trestles—

"Under the sections in charge of separate engineers, and to distinguish the trestles or bridges which are only temporary works to be filled in by the Canadian Pacific Railway before approval by the Government engineers."

So that every single syllable of the hon. gentleman's elaborate argument against the motion falls to the ground entirely. Now, I want to show, Mr. Speaker, why the Return as proposed to be amended would be absolutely useless. The proposal is to show only the permanent trestles. Now, why do we want to know where the temporary trestles are? I think the Government, who are so watchful of the interests of the company, should be more anxious than I am to know where these trestles are. I think it would be a great pity and a great misfortune for the Government as well as for the country, when this road is being rushed through, and when the company is particularly anxious to get all the money that is owing to them, I believe, at present—when the company make demands upon the Government to be paid this \$15,000 per mile, it would be a great pity, I say, if the Government should happen to pay over to them that \$15,000 a mile before the permanent road was constructed, and when only temporary trestles were on the ground. That is why I think the Government as well as the country ought to have this information. Now, by striking out the clause at the end of the motion which I read a few minutes ago, as to the classification of the work, the amendment entirely prevents anyone from deriving the information I have suggested from that return. Of course, if the permanent trestles were only shown, and if the sections where they are located were classified and designated, even then we would possibly be able, with a good deal of difficulty, to find out where the temporary trestles were situated. In that case every hon. member would have to take that return in his hand, if he wanted to find out the information, and go up to the section and look for the permanent trestles, and then he would know that those that were not mentioned in the return as permanent, would be temporary. But I would like to know why that return cannot be brought down, and why the members of this House cannot have an opportunity of getting that information. The return asked for related to a small portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Sudbury to Nepigon. It is that portion of the road which is being pushed forward very vigorously at present, and, of course, that is the reason why I want the information about the temporary trestle work. The hon. gentleman proposes to extend it to the whole Canadian Pacific Railway instead of some 300 miles. He wants to give us information on 3,000 miles, and then only as to the permanent structures. Now that might be very interesting historical information to engineers, but it would be just as valuable five years hence as it is to-day. It would be utterly useless for any practical purpose, and I shall not thank the hon. gentleman for giving that information at all. Now as to the character of these trestles about which I wish to learn. Everybody knows that it is an exceedingly serious thing to construct a railway largely on trestle work instead of on permanent filling. If the hon. Minister of Railways does not know that from his experience of railways in the Eastern Townships, he might have learned it from a letter which Mr. Van Horne wrote in 1883. He was not writing upon this subject, I admit, but upon another portion of this same Pacific Railway, and on the 3rd of July, 1883, he wrote to me then, as now, Acting Minister of Railways in reference

Mr. EDGAR.

to portions of sections on the Port Arthur and Red River portion of the railway, which was to be given to the company by the Government, and he said:

"Upon this portion of the track which had been laid, 6 or 8 years, all the timber structures, and a large portion of the ties required renewal at an earlier date."

That showed what Mr. Van Horne's opinion was of this kind of timber trestle work, and I think the people ought to have an opportunity of forming the same opinion themselves. Now, surely I must assume, Mr. Speaker, that it is the Canadian Pacific Railway Company who are objecting to make this return to the Government. The return will have to be made by them to the Government before the Government can lay it before the House. I cannot believe that the Government are objecting of their own motion, because they cannot have forgotten that this same Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when taking over the portions of the line from Port Arthur to Red River that are to be given them completed, as part of the consideration for constructing the railway—the Government cannot have forgotten how strictly they insisted upon the Government finishing that road completely and making it permanent and having no timber trestles upon it, before they took it over.

An hon. MEMBER. No. No.

Mr. EDGAR. An hon. member says No. No. Why, Sir, at this moment I have a letter in my hand dated the 17th of May, 1883, written by Mr. Drinkwater, and addressed to Mr. Bradley, Secretary of Railways and Canals, in which Mr. Drinkwater emphasises the company's view on that question. It is dated at the office of the Secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal, and in reference to taking over that portion of the road he said:

"In order, therefore, to prevent any misconstruction hereafter as to the position of the company in assuming possession of this portion of the railway, I am instructed to say that it will be taken over by the company under express reserve of the right of the company to have it completed in all respects in conformity with the contract, to the same extent, as if the company were not now undertaking its operation."

He goes on to say:

"In addition to the point suggested in that letter and without relinquishing any right of the company in respect of any matter not designated here, I would indicate various timber trestles across water stretches, which in the opinion of the company would require to be filled in whole or in part, to conform with the spirit of the contract."

I should like to know if, when the Government is taking over from the Canadian Pacific Railway 20 miles of the road at a time for the purpose of paying them \$15,000 a mile, they have not as much right to insist on this sort of completion as the Canadian Pacific Railway has when they took the line over from the Government. It surely cannot be, I cannot imagine it, that the Government are trying to shield the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of course, they will not do that. It surely cannot be that they are trying to shield themselves. Can it be possible that the Government have paid over to the Canadian Pacific Railway portions of the \$15,000 a mile upon the work between Sudbury and Nepigon on the road which has only been completed with temporary timber trestles, about which the hon. gentleman will not give any information to the public? I am very much afraid the public will infer that such is the case. I am very much afraid, if it is not the case, that everybody will believe it is the case; and the only way in which the Government can clear themselves of that suspicion and show the world it is not the case, is to bring down the return asked for, which will hurt no one but which will show the public that there is nothing wrong. If the Government still refuse to bring down this return, I propose not to accept the amendment suggested, but to let the Government take the full responsibility before the House and the country of refusing to bring it down; and what is more, I propose to let the followers of the Government share in that responsibility by voting down this motion.

Mr. McLELAN. It has been intimated that this amendment is moved by me for the purpose of—

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman spoke on the amendment.

Mr. McLELAN. I just moved the amendment and did not speak on it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has no right to speak again.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The leader of the Opposition spoke twice yesterday on a motion.

Mr. BLAKE. I made a motion and spoke in reply, as I was entitled to do.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. Minister did not speak to the amendment. I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. McLELAN. I have been charged with submitting to the House an amendment in order to suppress information. It was with the very opposite intention I prepared and submitted the amendment, my object being to give the fullest information in regard to the character and condition of the works on the Canadian Pacific Railway. The hon. gentleman opposite says he is suspicious, that he is full of suspicion; the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) also says they have suspicions respecting the condition of that work. Why, it seems that suspicion and imagination are the two things that govern hon. gentlemen opposite in dealing with this whole work. The Government have been desirous from the outset, from the laying of this contract on the Table of the House, that the country and the House should have the fullest information upon every point affecting the contract and affecting the public interest. For weeks and months when the contract was lying here it was discussed on the floor of this House and the Government were able to satisfy a majority of hon. members that the contract was in the interest of the Dominion, and it was sustained by a majority of the House; and when the question was submitted to the country in 1882, the people endorsed the action of the Government on this, as upon all other questions. It is with the desire and intention of giving the House and the country correct and full information that I moved the amendment. The hon. gentleman who moved the original motion has killed his own argument, and has sustained the amendment which I moved. He says that in the construction, especially in the hasty construction of railways, temporary trestle work is placed across gullies in order to facilitate the construction and opening of the road. We know that is the case in the construction of every railway—that the contractors place temporary trestle work across ravines and carry engines and cars over in order to obtain material to fill up that very ravine across which they placed the trestle work. No doubt in many cases in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway such temporary trestle work has been placed, and the ravines in question are being filled up rapidly. The hon. gentleman is afraid he will not get the number of all the temporary trestles constructed by the contractors before they are embedded and put out of sight in the gravel with which the ravines are being, day by day, filled up. He does not seem to understand the position of the work and the contract. The company are not paid \$15,000 a mile and 9,000 acres a mile. They are paid by the yard for every yard they do, and therefore a temporary trestle is not paid for by the mile. The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) said we wanted to shield the Canadian Pacific Railway. There is no desire on the part of the Government to shield the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other railway; but it is in the interest of the Government that the company should have fair play in this House and

the country. When they have undertaken so great a work and manifested so much energy in carrying it forward, they deserve at the hands of this House and the country the fullest fair play, and it would be manifestly unfair to the company if we return all those temporary trestles which they are now pulling down, and which were erected merely for construction purposes in order to carry cars and engines across ravines to procure material with which to fill up those ravines. The hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says he would classify the return. But we want to save the hon. gentleman and his party from themselves; we want to save them from the temptation of omitting that classification and publishing to the world that there are so many wooden trestles (leaving the word temporary) on those 100 miles, and give that as a specimen of the whole work. Perhaps, indeed, the hon. gentleman has ascertained that upon those 100 miles, which they are rushing, as he says, there is more than an average number of temporary trestles; and his desire is to get the whole number of trestles upon that part of the road, and then say that that is a sample of the whole Canadian Pacific Railway. We desire that the House shall have, and in the quickest possible time, the whole number of permanent wooden structures upon the entire Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to make a statement with respect to a remark made by him through misapprehension—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Order.

Mr. McLELAN. We desire to give you the whole information, and I claim that we can do it in less time than we can make a return to the Order as originally moved by the hon. gentleman. The engineers who are now in the office know where there are wooden trestles and wooden bridges as permanent structures, but under the Order as originally moved, they would have to go along the line and enquire of the contractors where there were temporary trestles. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Drinkwater drew attention to some temporary trestles on the line between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, and these, he said, must have been removed. He does not say under what contract, or under what Government these trestles were put in. I assume they were temporary trestles on section B, put in in order to expedite the opening of that road, and the connection of the two lines which were under contract by the previous Government. Now, the hon. member from Digby (Mr. Vail) says that he heard me on one occasion condemn trestle work. Well, I did not exactly condemn the use of trestle work on those roads for the purpose of getting rapid construction and facilities through that country. The hon. gentleman will remember that was not what I condemned. I condemned the fact that the then leader of the Government had announced to the House that he was constructing 22½ miles of road west of Port Arthur at one half the cost per mile of the Intercolonial Railway. That was what I condemned. When that announcement was made to the House in 1877 it was not questioned. He declared he was constructing this 22½ miles of railway westward of Port Arthur, or had it under contract, and that it would only cost one half as much as the Intercolonial Railway, per mile, and was as good a road. The hon. gentleman came to my own county and made the same statement on the platform there, but I thought it my duty to correct his statement in some respects, from the connection I had with the Intercolonial Railway, and to say that it was not at all of the character of the Intercolonial Railway, that it was largely built of trestles, that the contract had been made for trestle work over the ravines, wooden trestles and with wooden abutments. It was not that I disapproved of wooden trestles or bridges, but I disapproved of the statement being made

and the impression conveyed to the country, that he by his skill and economy was able to construct the road at one half the cost of the Intercolonial Railway. I have nothing more to say than that it is for the purpose of doing justice to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and of facilitating the return to the motion made by the hon. gentleman, that I have moved the amendment to give the permanent structures on the whole line.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I do not understand why there should be this extraordinary fuss by gentlemen on the other side about this very small question. It appears to me to be a very plain, simple, and ordinary proceeding in Parliament. My hon. friend from West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) has asked by a motion for a return of certain papers that one would naturally imagine would not for a moment be refused. We are mistaken, however. First, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries comes to the rescue of the Government and then the Deputy Minister of Railways comes to their rescue. Why, Sir, it takes two Ministers on the other side of the House to fill the place of the late Minister of Railways, and then they do not succeed in doing it. Now what is the fuss about? Why do hon. gentlemen refuse the information? Why does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, acting as Deputy of the Deputy Minister of Railways, refuse the information? Is there anything to be concealed? He says no. Is there anything to hide? He says, no. Anything to keep from the public? He says, no. Then, why refuse the information to the House and to the country? The hon. gentleman makes an extraordinary statement. He says that if the amendment is carried we will get the papers more quickly than if the motion is carried. He asks us to believe the extraordinary statement that you can give precisely the same information for 300 miles as for 3,000 miles, and it will not take an hour longer for the one than for the other. The hon. gentleman must know that this is too thin—that it is not correct. He must know that the information for which the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar) asks can be brought down in a short time, whereas information extending for over nearly 3,000 miles cannot be brought down for a considerable time. He says, further, that they have nothing to conceal—that they want to submit everything to Parliament. He says, they are prepared to give the fullest information, to conceal nothing. Pray let me ask the hon. gentleman if he has read the amendment to-day and compared it with the motion. I am quite sure that if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries had read the amendment to-day with any degree of care—I am glad to see that he is reading it now—he would have at once come to the conclusion that his statement was wholly unjustified by the facts. If he reads the third clause of the motion he will find that he has emasculated it, destroyed it; that he has eliminated three-fourths of the resolution. He strikes out all after the word "westward;" he has taken the marrow out of it, the substance out of it, and has left nothing but the bare shell, which would be of little use to the hon. member for Ontario or to the House.

Mr. McLELAN. I left all the permanent structures in.

Mr. CAMERON. Why take the temporary structures out? What was the object? Was it for the purpose, as already suggested, of concealing the true facts? The hon. gentleman tells the House that he made the amendment in order that we, on this side of the House, and the country, would not be misled. Does he think the people are so blind, so ignorant, as not to distinguish between temporary and permanent structures? That is not the reason the hon. gentleman has refused the information. Was the reason, as suggested by the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Edgar), that the Government are paying for temporary structures the same price as for permanent? I hope this is not the case, but the conduct of the Minister of Marine

Mr. McLELAN,

would rather indicate that it is. They tell us they are willing to give us every information, and still when we ask for information the first particle is not given with respect to this road. From the first day they had to deal with the Canadian Pacific Railway on the floors of Parliament down to to-day, every particle of information that would throw light on the dealings of the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Government, or the dealings of the Government with the Canadian Pacific Railway, has been persistently, consistently and uniformly refused by hon. gentlemen opposite. We have been allowed to vote millions of money and vote it in the dark. I recollect not long ago when we were subventing this company with an addition of \$30,000,000, my hon. friend before me moved a resolution asking for further information before we made the grant. But it was voted down by the Government and their supporters, and among the names of those who voted it down I find the name of the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), who not long ago declared that the Government had nothing to conceal. I find, Sir, that on the same occasion I moved an amendment to the proposition of the Government granting this aid, asking that for the purpose of acquiring additional information:

"A Select Committee be appointed to make full enquiry and searching into the condition and affairs of the company, and particularly as to its operations in stock, and in respect of construction contracts—the real cost of the works done—and the proper estimate of costs of the works remaining."

Was that amendment granted? No, Sir. We were forced to the vote on the question without that information, and the Government by their numerical majority in this House, assisted by the Secretary of State, voted it down, and we took the leap in the dark. We are asked to take another leap now. If the Government refuses information which we are fairly entitled to ask for, we can only remain under the impression that it is refused for some improper purpose. I cannot see why the Government should place this House in an awkward, a discreditable and disreputable position, by refusing an hon. member of this House such information as he asks for. I agree with my hon. friend. I suppose this motion will be voted down, as every motion in the House seeking for information in respect to the contract of the Canadian Pacific Railway is voted down. The information the Government is willing to give amounts to nothing; it will be of no public service either to the House or in the country, and therefore my hon. friend should abandon the motion altogether, and not put the Department to the expense of preparing a return at all. Why, we had the hon. First Minister the other night complaining of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) for moving for a large number of returns, and entailing heavy expense on the country. Now, when an hon. member moves for information in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Government moves an amendment which will entail ten times the expense of those the hon. gentleman complained of. Sir, I see no reason why this motion should not be granted. I shall not be surprised if it is defeated, but I shall be surprised if the right thinking people of this country will be satisfied with the course the Government are taking on this question.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar) in the closing words he used, seems to me to have given the House and the country the only motive for the motion he has presented. He declared that we could not know, if the amendment presented on this side of the House is carried, whether the Government have been paying portions of the subsidy, or portions of the loan granted last Session, upon temporary structures. Now, I submit that there is nothing in this motion for papers which would secure that information. The return would show the number of temporary trestles used in the construction; and we know from the past how ready the

hon. gentleman's friends outside of this House—it would not be parliamentary to speak of his friends in the House—would be to assume—because there was nothing in the Return to give any different information—that they had been paid for as parts of the railway itself, and in that way mislead the public in regard to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What have been the facts in regard to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? My hon. friend from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) undertook to give us a revival of the old discussions on this subject. He even went back to the discussions arising out of the letting of the original contract. The hon. gentleman ought at least to have paid the people of this country the respect of crediting them with sufficient knowledge to justify them in what they have done on this question. Notwithstanding all the speeches of the hon. gentleman on the stump and in Parliament, in various parts of the Province of Ontario especially, in which he gave them all the information he could give them on this subject; yet, with all that information, when the elections came, and before the people had an opportunity of realizing what has since been realized from this contract, we find them sending back to this House as large a majority as that which supported the contract when it was first submitted. Now, it does seem to me, under these circumstances, that it is reflecting on the intelligence of the people of Canada as well as upon the action of Parliament for that hon. gentleman to use the language he used to-day in characterising that contract. What have been the results since? During the recess since last Session a number of bye elections have taken place in this country; that hon. gentleman has taken part in many of them, and has had an opportunity of making precisely the same statements to the people as he has made here; he had an opportunity of telling them that this was a scandalous contract, and gave up franchises to the company which never should have been given; and yet we stand in this Parliament as strong as the day when the result of the general elections was made known. In all these bye elections we have been able so to commend the policy of the Government in reference to the Pacific Railway that we have succeeded in retaining as large a support for it as we had at that time. I go further: I have had something to do with some of the elections that have taken place, and I say that nothing, not even the National Policy itself, has more highly commended this Government to the confidence and generous sympathy of the people of this country than their policy in relation to this Canadian Pacific Railway, which has developed our magnificent North-West as never could have been developed under the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and which is certain to result, in the near future, in enormous advantage to this country. Now, what is the particular charge of the hon. gentleman? He tells us that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have wantonly expended money on other works than the fulfilment of their contract; that they have received \$54,000,000, and have expended on their contract only \$29,000,000. He talks of the fleets of steamers and of other works in which the company have engaged. I know what the sentiment of the people in one portion, at any rate, of the Province of Ontario is, in regard to that fleet of steamers, and I tell him that any one who has travelled over that line and has seen the great advantage of carrying immigrants to the North-West through our own territory, instead of subjecting them, as was formerly the case, to the interference of agents of American lines of railway, will say that the country owes a debt of gratitude to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for expending money on these other works. Without them, what would be the advantage of a railway running west of Callander? Surely the railway, to be of any advantage, must be a railway which will have connection with the great commercial

centres of the country, in order to secure, not only for the railway itself, but for the people of this country, those advantages which would otherwise be lost.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does the hon. gentleman justify the use of the magnificent water stretches?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Yes, I do; but the magnificent water stretches to which the hon. gentleman committed himself when he was at the head of the Government were not the great Lake Superior—

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). But they were the St. Francis locks and the water stretches of the Lake of the Woods and other water stretches between Thunder Bay and Winnipeg; and the St. Francis locks stand to-day a monument to the utter folly of the policy of that hon. gentleman. Water stretches, Mr. Speaker! Who ever heard of the term water stretches being applied to Lake Superior? No, but what the Canadian Pacific Railway have done is this: they have put into operation a system which gives the people a magnificent line, by which they can have water and railway alternately, if they think proper, or by which, at the same time, they can have an all-rail route over that part of the line which was the special antipathy of hon. gentlemen opposite and in relation to which they want to get information to-day, which, instead of being to the advantage of the country or the company, would, if possible, be used by them or their friends in order to embarrass the company and to create the impression that they were degrading the road. Degrading the road! Why if this company can stand well before the country on any one ground more than another, it is in the fact that they have built a railway far in excess of the requirements of the contract. I appeal to the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to say whether the railway over which he travelled last summer, and with reference to which he honored himself by congratulating the president of the railway company in a telegram, when he got to the end of the line, on the character of the work—I appeal to him to say whether that railway is not far in excess of the requirements of the contract. What do hon. gentlemen want to-day, in the face of the experience we have had, that these men have carried out their contract in a manner which does them credit and is advantageous to the country, which gives, in the very character of the road, the best possible assurance and earnest that they intend honestly to work that railway; that they were building it, not to hand over, as was predicted would be the case by hon. gentlemen opposite, to the Government, but to work it themselves and to make their money out of it. We have in that fact a reason which should protect them against motions for returns of papers, the only effect of which would be giving unnecessary prominence, open to misconstruction, to mere temporary works, necessitated both in the public interest as well as in the interest of the company, and which, in accordance with the contract, will be removed and permanent works substituted, by which alone the line of the company can be judged. The hon. gentleman throws on this side of the House the responsibility of refusing this amendment. Honorable members on this side of the House are not afraid to take that responsibility. I tell the hon. gentleman that we are not going to be afraid to take the responsibility of any policy which may be necessary to secure the completion of that railway and the obtaining of all the advantages that are going to flow from it; and I tell him further, that judging the people of this country in the future, as we have found them in the past, in relation to this great enterprise, we can trust to their intelligence, at any rate, to vindicate by their support a policy which tends to complete this great Pacific Railway and by its completion develop the important interests of this great Dominion.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down is evidently in a less confident frame of mind than that in which he would lead us to believe he is. When people talk most boldly about what they are not afraid to do, and what they are willing to do and dare, we are prone to suspect that is the very time when their heart is beginning to fail them. And I noticed, when the hon. gentleman broke forth in a rolling sentence, with the statement that his side of the House had not been afraid of anything they were asked to vote for and would not be afraid in the future, there was only one solitary cheer to greet his flowing period. By this his last appeal, it is quite clear—for the hon. gentleman is, I believe, high in the councils of his party—that the Government are going to ask for something else for the railway company, and it is also quite clear that the courage of the party is beginning to fail. Otherwise the hon. gentleman would have had no need to make the unusually emphatic speech he has just made, in order to arouse the hearts of his supporters. The word "supporters" escaped me involuntarily; nor is that to be wondered at, since it is understood that the hon. gentleman may possibly be shortly in a position to call those hon. gentlemen his supporters, and he appears to anticipate that time by giving them the hint what to do, by taking off his hat and asking them to cheer. I will do them the credit of saying that they voted manfully in the past, whether afraid or not. How far the encouraging words of the hon. member for Cardwell will encourage them to vote the next time, I cannot say; but it is quite clear that we will have soon an opportunity of seeing with what courage they will come to the breach on the next occasion. Well, the hon. gentleman said the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have been so generous, so noble, so free in their expenditure of the public money, that it was the duty of this House to protect them—from what? From having a statement of the present condition of the line made public. What is the condition of the line? According to the hon. gentleman it is greatly in excess of the requirements of the contract and what had been expected of the company. They had done, he said, so nobly, they had built this line so much better than they could be expected to build it, that we are bound to protect them from having the actual condition of the splendidly built line made known to the public! I believe the contention of the Acting Minister of Railways was more logical. He said: "For goodness sake, do not let us tell the public what the condition of the line is, because the Yankees might get hold of it, and make fun of us, say it is a pretty poor line, and tell people not to come to the country!" His position was, at least, more logical than that of the hon. member for Cardwell, who says we must not let the people know what a magnificent line the Canadian Pacific Railway have built. Another reason he gave for not letting the people know the condition of this line was, that these miserable Grits—he says he does not include the Grits in the House—but these miserable Grits and Grit organs outside, might, if they once could get hold of a number of temporary trestles on that line, tell lies about their permanency. The hon. gentleman seems to have a low opinion of party organs. He appears to have some idea of what party exigencies may compel a party organ to state. I have even seen the statement myself, in a journal published in Montreal, which the hon. gentleman might sometimes have read, that on occasion it was not only permissible but the duty of public organs was to slightly twist and modify the truth, when compelled to do so by "party exigencies." It may have been the experience of the course pursued by that journal that leads him to suspect the base uses to which the Grit organs might be put throughout the country. I take it for granted that he knows nothing, or very little at least, of the financial affairs of that journal at present. That same party organ is still continuing to write in

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

such strain as the "party exigencies" may require, and it is not forgotten by its friends. It is now receiving something in the neighborhood of \$10,000 a year, in the way of extra printing for the Government; and, strange to say, it continues to tell the people that everything the Government does is right, and everything on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway is glorious and good. The hon. gentleman went into the general question of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This I do not intend to go into, but will only refer to one point. If for nothing else, he said, except to save immigrants from being stolen from us by United States agents, the Canadian Pacific Railway was worth all the money and trouble expended on it. But the strange fact stares us in the face, that fewer immigrants have gone into Manitoba this year through Canadian territory than went in 1881 and 1882, over the American roads. I do not know where the leakage has taken place. Perhaps they stopped on the way to admire Fort Francis locks or to work on some of the railway contracts. But I must get back to some of the contentions of my hon. friend the Acting Ministers of Railways. I say "my friends the Acting Ministers," because though they appear to be two separate bodies, there appears to be only one mind between them. I do not mean to say that either of those gentlemen lacks his proper share, or even fails to possess a prominent share of intelligence; but, on the statement made by the first Acting Minister of Railways himself, their mind is exactly the same on this question. The hon. the Minister (Mr. Pope) who has been acting as Acting Minister in place of the absent Minister of Railways—it is hard to describe him exactly—told us he had not read the amendment moved by his friend, the assistant Acting Minister of Railways (Mr. McLellan), but he thought he knew what was in it. If such sympathy, if such mesmeric sympathy exists between them, I think we must dub them the Siamese Twins. They not only have two hearts that beat as one, but two minds that think as one, and two minds that think instead of the one that used to think and used to be sufficient for the purpose. It is clear that these two gentlemen, between them, have not, at all events, the same amount of pluck as their predecessor had. The late Minister of Railways, Sir Charles Tupper, did not, on a question like this, condescend to refuse information to the House.

Mr. FARROW. Oh!

Mr. CASEY. No, he did not, although my hon. friend from North Huron laughs at the idea. He had the courage of his opinions and the courage of his acts, and he brought down the information to the House and told the House what he had done, and took the consequences like a man. Whatever else may be said about him, he was, at all events, pretty plucky. But these two gentlemen together cannot venture to bring down the information to show us how many temporary trestles there are on this railway, although it is to be distinctly stated that they are but temporary. The assistant Acting Minister of Railways told us the word "temporary" was left out in the motion of my hon. friend from Ontario. It was put in the motion of my hon. friend, but the hon. gentleman proposes to strike it out. The trestles were to be classified as temporary and permanent, and as it is well understood that all railways must have temporary structures, I cannot see what harm is to be done by the Yankees or the people of this country knowing how many of these structures are temporary. We want to know what has been done. This work is being performed by authority of Parliament, but not under contract, in the way such work is ordinarily done. The hon. Minister said it was being paid for at so much a yard as it went on. He is slightly mistaken in his interpretation of the facts. There is no contract between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, as far as I can dis-

cover from the papers brought down late last Session, as to how much is to be paid per yard for the work, or as to how fast it is to be done. I find that the Auditor General asked the secretary of the Railway Department under what agreement a certain certificate for \$150,000 was issued to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the work on this section. The secretary referred to the Order in Council of the 9th July, and Mr. VanHorne's letter of a few days before, as constituting the agreement. On reference to these papers, which I may have occasion to quote more fully in a subsequent debate, I find that Mr. VanHorne proposed not only to take in hand the work which was left undone by the contractors on Section B, but also the work in finishing up in a first-class manner, as he terms it, the road from Port Arthur to Winnipeg, as well as the building of a few station houses and putting in a few sidings here and there, and all for a lump sum of \$940,000, which, with an additional sum of 15 per cent. to the contractors, came to a total of \$981,000. This offer was accepted by Order in Council for \$926,000. How this discrepancy occurs I will ask the Minister to explain in a subsequent debate, but not now. But the work is let to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company without tender, without a contract being drawn up, without anything, so far as it appears, but the letters from Mr. VanHorne and the Order in Council, and on that informal, vague, peculiar sort of agreement, the payments are being made, and have already been made to the extent of \$266,000. I think it is peculiarly right and proper, under these circumstances, with such a peculiar form of agreement between the Government and the company, with payments going on spasmodically, that we should know exactly what the present condition of the work is. It is a sort of information which has never been refused us in regard to any other kind of work; it is monstrous, and I believe it is unconstitutional, to refuse it to this House, in regard to any work which is being carried on with the public money. It has been contained from time to time in the reports of chief engineers. We have been told from year to year, "there is a temporary trestle here and another there, but they will be taken away." There was no secret about it. There was apparently no shame about it. But now there seems to be some reason for shame. That which is concealed, there must be some reason for being ashamed of. I cannot conclude better than by telling the hon. gentleman of a circumstance which this reminds me of, and which occurred in my school days. One boy was suspected of having stolen another boy's jack-knife. He put on a great air of innocence and said, "Come on, boys, and search me, and see if you can find it," and so they searched his pockets. They looked in the permanent trestle pocket, and they looked in the embankment pocket, but at last they came to a pocket which he said they must not look in. "No," he said, "boys, you must not look there!" "Why not," they asked. "Because the jack-knife is in there!" Mr. Speaker, that poor boy was more than half an imbecile. He did not see that he was convicting himself by his refusal to have that pocket searched. He did not see that the fact that the knife was in that pocket followed inevitably from his refusal to have it searched. But it did; and I hope the ministry will see, as the public will see, that their refusal to have this particular pocket searched is an absolutely certain indication that there is a jack-knife in there which belongs to someone else.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wish to say to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), though he is not now in his place, that his statement respecting the water stretches is wholly inaccurate. You will find repeatedly in my speeches in the years 1875, 1876 and 1877, express reference to it. I saw no necessity for building the road north of Lake Superior

for many years to come, and my policy, as was well understood, was to connect with the railway system at the west end of Lake Superior and continue from that point westward. I intended to use the interior water stretches as well. All this was well known, and I am astonished that the hon. gentleman had the hardihood to deny it to-day because, connected as he has been with the press and with the House, it is almost impossible that he could have been ignorant of such a well known fact. But, Sir, I am not surprised to hear an hon. gentleman say that, who last year raised an objection to my policy because we began at the two ends, at Red River and Lake Superior, instead of beginning in the middle—as if that were possible; and the gentleman who could be so wanting in intelligence as to suppose that possible, would very likely be wanting in the honesty and fair play which would have prevented him making the statement he did. With regard to the motion itself, I felt disposed to sympathize with the amendment when I heard it first read, supposing that the sole object was to obtain information as to the temporary or permanent structures separately. I find, however, in looking at the motion, that the Government, or the company, or both, shall designate that which is intended to be temporary, against that which is intended to be permanent. That being the case, I cannot conceive what object there can be in refusing the return. It seems a very simple matter, and one upon which information could be got, at any rate. The public cannot be denied that information. I may say there is no kind of trestle work that can be compared in badness with that put up by the Government opposite, on Section B. Anything worse than that could hardly have been constructed. I am quite certain that on the new part of the road there will be no trestle work found equal in badness to that which they have built themselves.

Mr. HESSON. I just wish to say a word or two on this matter. The remarks made by the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) may have been very interesting to himself, but any school-boy could have enlightened the House equally as well. A motion has been asked for, that the hon. gentlemen opposite fancy would contain a great deal of information for the country. Now, I have no doubt, for my part, that all the information desired will be contained in the report of the Minister of Railways; and I think it will be very interesting reading to the hon. gentlemen opposite, and they might well spend some time over that portion of it where temporary trestle works are referred to. To show the absurdity of proposing such a motion as this to the serious consideration of the House, I would only refer to the experience of those hon. gentlemen in this House who have travelled over that road from end to end. I have myself gone over the road twice and ought to know something about its construction. I was surprised to see that what was temporary to-day became permanent, I might say, to-morrow, so rapidly did the company push forward the work of completing a solid road-bed. I cannot conceive the necessity of asking for such information, from the fact that these temporary structures, that are confessed to be desirable and necessary in the construction of all railways, but necessary for a time only, are very soon to be replaced by more solid structure. What object is it to this House to know whether this work will be covered up to-morrow or next day with a permanent embankment, or some more solid structure than trestle work? We do know for a fact that that portion of the road that was completed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been admitted, by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), in a very generous spirit, and a very able manner, to be even in excess of the requirements of the contract; and we have reason to believe, from the experience

we have had of the construction of that road, that upon its completion the whole road will be of such a character that not only this House but the country will be thoroughly satisfied that we gave such a contract to that company. I am not here to justify the Government in withholding needed information, but I cannot see any good reason why this information should not be withheld, and for the reason I have stated, namely, that the temporary structures which the engineer sees when he goes over the road to-day, may, to-morrow or next day, when he makes his report, all have been replaced by more substantial work. I contend, also, that the experience of this Session, and of past Sessions, has indicated most clearly to every intelligent mind that the Government have been, on all occasions, willing to bring down such information—all information, in fact; and before this Session closes, if I am spared, I propose to put a motion on the paper, enquiring what number of returns have been granted to the House, and, if possible, the number of returns granted in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway and its construction, from the beginning up to the present. I would like to see the number that have been refused by this Government, and with these results I would ask the country to test the value of the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite, as to whether it is the desire of the supporters of the Government that the Government should withhold information valuable to the public. Sir, I am quite prepared to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways.

Mr. COCKBURN. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech, but only to show that the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has obscured the idea that the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) intended to utilise the water stretches and the great lakes. One has only to point out the Georgian Bay Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway project of the hon. member for East York to refute the hon. member for Cardwell's assertion. I have frequently heard supporters of the Government hurl the charge against the Mackenzie Government, that the construction of the Fort Francis locks was one of the most atrocious and corrupt acts that could have been committed. Now, I would ask the hon. member for Cardwell to look at what was done by the previous Administration. Did they not spend hundreds of thousands of dollars upon the Dawson route? The Fort Francis locks were merely improving the navigation for steamers which were already placed there by the present member for Algoma (Mr. Dawson) on behalf of the present Government during the first Parliament of the Dominion. I merely mention this to show the fallacy of the charge of corruption against the Mackenzie Government, made by the hon. gentleman opposite. By the building of the Fort Francis locks the lake may be utilised very much by the present Government. As regards the question before the House, it seems to me so plain as not to require any argument at all, that there can be no reasonable objection to bringing down the information asked for by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar).

Amendment (Mr. White, East Hastings) to adjourn the House withdrawn.

Amendment (Mr. McLelan) agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Gault,	O'Brien,
Baker (Victoria),	Gigault,	Orton,
Barnard,	Girouard,	Onimet,
Belleau,	Gordon,	Paint,
Benson,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Pope,
Bergin,	Hackett,	Reid,
Billy,	Hall,	Riopel,

Mr. HESSON.

Blondeau,	Hay,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Bowell,	Hesson,	Robertson (Hastings),
Burns,	Hickey,	Royal,
Cameron (Inverness),	Billiard,	Scott,
Campbell (Victoria),	Homer,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Hurteau,	Small,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Sproule,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Kilvert,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Kinney,	Taylor,
Colby,	Kranz,	Temple,
Oostigan,	Landry (Kent),	Tilley,
Coughlin,	Landry (Montmagny),	Townshend,
Coursol,	Langevin,	Tupper,
Curran,	Lesage,	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	Vanasse,
Dickinson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wallace (Albert),
Dodd,	Mackintosh,	Wallace (York),
Dugas,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	White (Cardwell),
Dundas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	White (Hastings),
Dupont,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wigle,
Farrow,	McDougall (J. Breton),	Williams,
Ferguson (Welland),	McLelan,	Wood (Brockville),
Fortin,	McNeill,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Foster,	Massue,	Wright.—101.
Gagné,	Montplaisir,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Fleming,	Mills,
Auger,	Geoffrion,	Mulock,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Paterson (Brant),
Bécharé,	Gunn,	Platt,
Blake,	Harley,	Ray,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Innes,	Rinfret,
Cameron (Huron),	Irvine,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Cartwright,	King,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Kirk,	Springer,
Casgrain,	Landerkin,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Catudal,	Laurier,	Thompson,
Charlton,	Lister,	Trow,
Cockburn,	Livingstone,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Mackenzie,	Watson,
Edgar,	McOraney,	Wilson,
Fairbank,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—54.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to.

BANK OF UPPER CANADA.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire to ask the Finance Minister when he will bring down statements respecting the Bank of Upper Canada. The hon. gentleman will remember that in the Session of 1870 an Act was passed which required returns to be made within fifteen days of the opening of each Session, and another Bill was passed in the following year containing the same provision.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My attention has not been called to this matter. The return will be laid on the Table, probably in a day or two.

LIGHTHOUSE AT THE NARROWS.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect a lighthouse on the island near the entrance to the Narrows, on the River St. Lawrence, west of Brockville.

Mr. McLELAN. This matter is under the consideration of the Department of Marine.

SECTION B ARBITRATION.

Mr. CASEY asked, Will the Government lay on the Table, at an early day, the evidence taken before the Section B arbitration.

Mr. POPE. If the hon. gentleman will move for the evidence, I will consider the propriety of laying it on the Table, although it is very voluminous.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 6 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 16th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that the Clerk had received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election of J. W. Bain, for the Electoral District of Soulanges.

Mr. BAIN was introduced by Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Chapleau, and took his seat.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1884.—(Mr. McLelan.)

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 33) for the equitable distribution of Insolvents' Estates.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 34) for the discharge of past Insolvents.—(Mr. Beaty.)

Bill (No. 35) further to amend "The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879."—(Mr. Bergeron.)

RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways to the fact that the plans and maps which are mentioned in the return made pursuant to a resolution in the House of Commons with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway, have not been brought down, although they are referred to in the sheets. The hon. gentleman will observe that the estimates and payments on all the sections are given for no later than November, when we should have them for December and January. The resolution states that the returns are to be brought down to the latest practicable date, which would embrace the January estimate, for as a rule the actual payments take place on the 10th or 12th of the month.

Mr. POPE. I can only tell the hon. gentleman that for the month of January not half the payments have been made.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps not all of them.

Mr. POPE. Not half of them.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps not, but the remaining third or quarter is what we want.

Mr. POPE. Whatever I can get, I will bring down.

Mr. MITCHELL. It will be remembered that at the last Session of Parliament an address was moved by me, and ordered by the House, for a list of the stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, and I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman when that will be brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I really cannot inform my hon. friend. I have no doubt that the resolution of last Session was transmitted to the offices of the Grand Trunk Railway, but I have lost sight of it, and I do not know whether they have sent the return or not. However, I will cause a letter to be written to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, calling on them to make the return, and then if they do not send it down, it will be for my hon. friend to take such steps as he sees fit.

Mr. MITCHELL. I give my right hon. friend notice of the step I intend to take, and it is this: To bring Mr. Hickson before the bar of this House.

Mr. BLAKE. Without saying that I will resort to such extreme measures, I will say across the floor that I could hand my hon. friend a list of twenty-two motions for returns which have met the same fate as the one to which he refers.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNNE.

I acknowledge with thanks the Address adopted in answer to the Speech with which I opened the Session. I rely with confidence on the assurance that the important measures submitted to you will receive your careful and full consideration.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 16th February, 1885.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 15) to continue an Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. McDougald.)

Bill (No. 23) to amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 28) to incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.—(Mr. Dickinson.)

BANK ADVANCES TO THE GOVERNMENT.

Mr. BLAKE (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, 1. What is the total amount of moneys temporarily advanced to Government by banks or other parties in England, Canada or elsewhere, up to date of enquiry? 2. By whom has the said sum been advanced? 3. At what rate of interest in each case?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. On the Order of the House, returns of all moneys loaned from banks or from agents in London down to the 1st of February, have been laid on the Table of the House. Since that time a loan of \$2,000,000 from the Bank of Montreal has been made. As the rates of interest paid to the different parties are not exactly the same, the hon. gentleman will see that it would not be in the public interest at this time to give the details.

SETTLERS IN THE DOMINION.

Mr. BLAKE, in the absence of Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, asked, What is the total number of settlers supposed to have settled in the Dominion of Canada during the calendar year 1884?

Mr. POPE. The total number of immigrants supposed to have settled in the country in 1884 is 103,824.

SETTLERS IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE, in the absence of Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, asked, How many immigrants are supposed to have settled in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, independently of settlers from the older Provinces?

Mr. POPE. The number of immigrants reported to have settled in Manitoba and the North-West, irrespective of those from the older Provinces, is 20,779, and from the older Provinces, 9,486. The countries from which they came are as follows: From Great Britain, 6,920; from Germany,

643; from Europe generally, 559; from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, 540; from Quebec, 1,468; from Ontario, 7,473; and from the United States, 9,728. The number of laborers is 2,929.

Mr. BLAKE. They came from nowhere, I suppose.

Mr. POPE. Well, they went somewhere; that is the great point with us.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—SECTION B.

Mr. EDGAR asked, To what account or accounts has the receipt of the sum of \$34,179.17 awarded to the Government on their counter claim against the contractors of Section B, been credited, and where do such credits appear in the Public Accounts of last year, which contain, on page 276, the entry of the payment to the contractors of the full amount of their claim of \$78,451.59, without any deduction for the counter claim?

Mr. POPE. It would have been very much better if this information had been asked for in an address, as it is difficult to carry the figures in one's mind to answer questions like this. This \$34,090 or \$39,000 is incidental to the winding up of several Government contracts. Certain materials and furnishings were left, and were sold to different parties for sums aggregating \$39,000. I do not mention the odd dollars. Of this property, \$14,000 worth belonged to Mr. Whitehead, being rolling stock, etc., and the \$14,000 was paid to Mr. Whitehead or his representative at Kingston. The other \$24,000, the hon. gentleman will find by the Public Accounts, has been returned to the Consolidated Revenue of Canada.

Mr. EDGAR. Does it appear in the Public Accounts?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

COMMUNICATION—PORT MULGRAVE, GUYSBORO, CANSO, AND ARICHAT.

Mr. KIRK asked, Has it been represented to the Government that the steamer *Rimouski* has successfully kept up regular communication between the railway terminus at Port Mulgrave and Guysboro', Canso and Arichat, up to the present time? And by whom? Is it the intention of the Government, in view of these representations, to grant a subsidy in aid of said service, and if so, what amount?

Mr. McLELAN. It has been represented to the Government that the steamer *Rimouski* has been running for some time. The hon. gentleman who asks the question, the hon. member for Richmond, the hon. member for Halifax, the Speaker of the Senate, the owner of the steamer, and a number of others, have brought the matter to the notice of the Government. It is now under the consideration of the Government whether a subsidy shall be granted or not.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EARNINGS AND EXPENSES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for each month of the fiscal year 1882-83, as returned by the Moncton Office to the Department of Railways and Canals?

Mr. POPE. The remarks I made before will apply to this question, that it would be much easier for me to bring down a return than to carry these figures in my head. However, I am so anxious to accommodate the hon. gentleman that I am going to try to answer his question.

Mr. POPE.

	1882	Earnings.	Working Expenses.
July.....		\$203,620 09	\$190,541 41
August.....		184,324 93	201,834 71
September.....		193,359 75	222,881 83
October.....		219,773 98	243,158 78
November.....		215,814 57	225,132 55
December.....		189,388 79	190,563 92

	1883		
January.....		160,579 56	174,098 38
February.....		164,115 88	189,749 39
March.....		206,168 19	219,298 92
April.....		233,797 93	158,935 31
May.....		227,979 71	171,629 18
June.....		171,993 32	172,550 89

I may say that the hon. gentleman and this House may possibly have conceived a wrong idea of what has been going on this year. There has been an extraordinary expenditure this year. The hon. gentleman will remember that the buildings were burnt at Moncton and we have had other heavy expenditure up to this time, making a larger expenditure this year compared to the earnings, but which I hope to make up before the year closes.

RAILWAY COMMISSIONERS AND DOMINION ARBITRATORS.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, Whether the Government have engaged at present a Board of Railway Commissioners or Dominion Arbitrators; if so, their names and date of their appointment, salary or allowance, and travelling and other expenses, the amount paid to each from 1st of January, 1884, to 1st of January, 1885. At what date were the service of the Board of Railway Commissioners dispensed with? What sum or sums of money have been paid them since the 1st of January, 1884?

Mr. POPE. This is another of these things which make me bring down a hatful of papers. The Railway Commission is a Committee of the Privy Council, and there is also a Board of Arbitrators composed of Mr. Cowan, Mr. Millward, Mr. Compton and Mr. Simard. Mr. Cowan was appointed the 24th of May, 1869. His salary is \$1,000 a year, and his travelling expenses amounted to \$914.50. Mr. William Compton appointed 16th November, 1878, salary \$1,000, travelling expenses \$1,076. Mr. Joseph Simard, appointed 13th December, 1879, salary \$1,000, travelling expenses, \$758. I do not put in the cents but I hope there is some sense in what I am saying. Mr. Henry Millward, appointed 1st October, 1883, salary \$750, travelling expenses \$1,466.

DOMINION GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Mr. HALL asked, Whether any, and if so, what changes have been made in the system under which the Geological Survey of the Dominion is conducted, in accordance with the recommendation to that effect of the Special Committee on that subject appointed by this House at its last Session, and if not, if any such changes are in contemplation?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The report of the Geological Survey will be brought down in a few days. It will give my hon. friend a good deal of information. As to the intention of the Government with respect to that Department, I will go into that when the Estimates come up.

TIMBER LIMITS IN THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether the Government has granted any timber limits within the Territories awarded the Province of Ontario by the report of the Judicial Committee, since that report was sanctioned by Her Majesty? Whether the Government claim the lands, the timber and mines, as the property of Canada?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would answer that no timber limits have been granted since the report was sanctioned by Her Majesty, but vouchers have been issued as to previous grants and correspondence has been going on since. With respect to lands and timber and mines, I would say that, excluding the lands under the Robertson Treaty, about which, of course, there is no question, Canada by the treaty acquired for pecuniary consideration—money and money's worth—the rights of the Indians whatever they may be. The Dominion Government hold that they have the rights of the Indians whatever those rights are.

ONTARIO BOUNDARY.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether the Government accept the boundary of Ontario on the north and west as defined by Her Majesty's Order in Council and the report of the Judicial Committee? Whether they are ready to accept or have accepted the Albany River from the eastern point of the northern boundary, as defined in the Imperial Order in Council, eastward to Hudson's Bay and thence eastward along the shore of the bay until it reaches the line drawn due north from Lake Temiscamingue to Hudson's Bay?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The answer to that question is this: That the reference was as to the western boundary of Ontario and the eastern boundary of Manitoba. So far as the judgment or decision of the Judicial Committee is concerned, it concerned the boundary between Manitoba and Ontario; of course, we have no objection to accept that, we cannot help ourselves, there it is. With respect to that portion of the report of the Judicial Committee, if any, which was not referred to them in the reference, as the Government do not consent, they have not the power to deal with that subject, but must come to Parliament to deal with it.

Mr. MILLS. There is part of the question not answered—that is from where the report of the Judicial Committee left off eastward to the Hudson's Bay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We consider that Parliament deals with that and not the Government, as an act of administration.

PERMISSION TO CUT TIMBER IN ONTARIO.

Mr. MILLS asked, Whether any permission, in any form or manner, has been given to any person or persons to cut timber in any part of the territory declared by the Order of the Queen in Council to be within the Province of Ontario? If so, the name or names of the person or persons obtaining such permission; the extent of territory embraced, the amount received by the Government and the amount, if any, still unpaid by the party or parties for such permission?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. If the hon. gentleman will, without notice, convert that into a motion for a return I will bring the return down at once.

Mr. MILLS moved for:

Return showing what licenses the Commissioners have given to cut timber in any part of the territory declared by the Order of the Queen in Council to be within the Province of Ontario. If so, the name or names of the person or persons obtaining such permission; the extent of territory embraced, the amount received by the Government, and the amount, if any, still unpaid by the party or parties for such permission.

Motion agreed to.

BANKING FACILITIES TO AGRICULTURISTS.

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

That it is expedient to bring in a Bill to extend better banking facilities to the agriculturists and other persons in the Dominion of Canada.

He said: In reference to the objects of this motion I wish to make a few remarks. It is my intention to intro-

duce a Bill on this resolution to advance the prosperity of Canada by affording easier financial facilities to our farmers. It is unnecessary for me to say that the material prosperity of all Canada depends more or less on the success of our agricultural interests, which is generally looked upon as the mainstay of our national prosperity. How important it is, then, that this industry should be placed in the easiest possible way to obtain the necessary financial facilities to carry it on successfully. We all know how essential it is to the prosperity of trade, commerce, and the various other industries in this country that easy financial facilities should be obtained. How much more is it necessary, then, that the industry from which they sprang, from which, I may say, they have their being, should have similar financial facilities. It is generally considered by all civilized nations that it is the duty of every good and paternal Government to do equal justice to all classes of the people. I ask the House to consider for a moment whether the agriculturists in Canada occupy the same position that other classes do in this particular, and I think there is not a member in this House who considers the question for a moment who will answer yes. While every trader, merchant or manufacturer, any of those engaged in the other industries of this country, even the pronounced speculators, can go to any bank in the country and with a good endorser, obtain hundreds and thousands of dollars to carry on his enterprise, what has the farmer to do? We know that the banks do not like to give accommodation to farmers. We know that, if, after exerting themselves in their industry, farmers have a crop ready to take off and require some financial assistance, and go to any bank in our country and ask for it in nine cases out of ten that aid is refused, and they are compelled to go round among the moneyed men of the locality, or to go to the private banks, which charge farmers for small loans of that character from 10 to 12 per cent., and obtain their funds from the ordinary banks of the country; and in this roundabout way the farmer is compelled to pay more than is absolutely necessary for the little sum he requires to enable him to take off his crop. This also frequently occurs when he is putting his crop into the ground. This condition of affairs should not exist if any remedy can be found, as all will acknowledge. Why is money cheaper in England than it is in Canada? The answer, I suppose, is that England has an accumulation of money which we have not, but, while we have not accumulated wealth in gold, we have wealth in land; we have resources in Canada which far outstrip those of the United Kingdom, and I think some means can be found by which that wealth in land and those resources can be utilised, in order to afford our people a circulating medium, and money, upon a sound basis, to enable them to carry on their industries. In Germany, land credit banks have been established, and they have done immense service to the European countries, to Germany, France, and even Russia. To-day the very serfs of Russia are being liberated, are being freed from serfdom through the operation of these land credit banks. By the operation of these banks the peasants of Russia are enabled to purchase the land themselves, and are becoming independent farmers, such as we have in Canada. This goes to show at any rate that through a system of that kind a great good can be accomplished. I ask that this House shall seriously consider this question and afford that benefit to the struggling farmers of Canada. The Act which, perhaps in my simplicity, I propose, I will endeavor to explain to the House. It provides that farmers who are out of debt may become stockholders in farmers' banks by giving mortgages upon their land without interest, and that any body of men may, upon receiving these mortgages upon land and other securities, go to the Government and ask from them legal tender notes to loan out to those farmers who require to borrow. It also provides that the mortgages given by those farmers

who desire to borrow may be converted into negotiable bonds, and that those bonds, based upon the interest-bearing mortgages given by the borrowers of money, shall be guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada, and shall bear interest at the rate of 4 per cent. It also provides that the banks shall loan money to the farmers on mortgages at 5 per cent. per annum on half the assessed value of their lands, or any other limit which may be thought wise. It also provides that county councils may establish farmers' banks in their respective counties, and that the warden and the county treasurer and the county clerk shall in that case be the managing directors of such banks, and that every member of the county council shall be a director in such bank, and that they may, in order to cheapen the cost of carrying on these banks, collect interest on the mortgages held by the banks in the ordinary way in which taxes are collected by the tax collector, so as to ensure punctuality and also safety to the counties which carry on these banks. There is also a provision by which the mortgages which are given for money borrowed may be released at any time by substituting other mortgages of equal value, and placing them in the hands of the Government as a guarantee for the bonds which they have guaranteed. These are some of the provisions of the Bill which I propose to introduce. I think there is nothing startling or unusual in the proposition. We all know that the national banks of the United States afforded their people a national currency, and all they had to do to establish those banks was to pay up United States Government bonds, apart from the interest bearing bonds, and deposit them with the Government, and they received national currency. They actually had a monopoly of the circulation of the national currency. This Bill does not propose any such monopoly; it does not propose that the Government of the country should pay any interest to the banks, but simply that they afford these banks the credit of our Government, the credit of landed security, which is the best in this country. Sir, there is also a provision that I did not mention which I think of very great importance, and that is, the provision by which these banks may loan to the settlers upon Dominion lands money to enable them successfully to carry out their projects. We all know that in the North-West the great difficulty is that there are not enough men possessing capital to settle that country rapidly, and it is essential to the prosperity of this country, to the prosperity of our great national railway, indeed, I may say, to every interest, that every possible facility should be afforded by the Government for the settlement of that country. Now, Sir, I maintain that a settler coming from Great Britain to the North-West with, say, \$600 or a \$1,000 in his pocket, seldom finds that sum sufficient. Now, in order to supplement that, I propose that these banks shall be allowed to afford these settlers an equivalent to the money which they bring out and spend in improvements on their land, and that their land shall be the first lien for these loans. In connection with this question I think it will strike everybody in this House who has thought upon the subject at all, that the Torrens system of land conveyance should be introduced as soon as possible, and I think that the operation of this Bill will very much facilitate the introduction of that much to be desired measure. In the North-West I think the Government are certainly not doing what they should do in this matter. I think it is in the interests of the country, where the Crown is giving titles, that there should be no longer delay in adopting that system of transferring land, in order that the cheapest possible facility may be afforded, not only for the transfer of land, but for the borrowing of money by the settlers in that new country in order to carry on the operation of farming. Sir, I believe to-day that if we had such a system in this country it would be one of the greatest inducements that we could possibly offer to English and

Mr. ORTON.

European immigrants, and would largely lead them to come to Canada instead of going to the States, by the assistance that would be afforded them from the operation of these banks, aided by the Government of Canada. I need not refer to the general benefits it would produce to all classes. We all know that depressions are brought about periodically through the failure of crops and the consequent inability of farmers to pay their tradesmen's accounts, and to pay the manufacturers for the agricultural implements they require. Now, Sir, if we could enable the farmers to borrow money at a reasonable rate of interest, to borrow only what they want and for a short period, they would be able to pay their store accounts and the manufacturers, and these periods of depression would be less frequent than they are now. Indeed our railways, our steamboat navigation, and every other interest in this country, would be materially benefited by the operation of such a banking system. And, Sir, it would relieve a great deal of the capital which is now loaned out by the capitalists of our own country to the farmers at exorbitant rates of interest, and wealthy men would then divert their capital to the development of our great natural resources in forests and mineral lands and fisheries. Well, Sir, it may be said that this would be unfair to our present banking institutions and to the traders who have gone into those institutions, and that it would be unfair towards the loan societies, I have been frequently told outside this House that it would be utterly impossible to get such a Bill passed through the Parliament of Canada from the fact that the influence of these great loan societies upon this House was so great. Now, Sir, I do not at all believe that such is the case. I believe we have to-day a very large number of independent members in this House;—indeed I do not think there is one hon. gentleman in this House who, if he could see clearly the way by which this great benefit could be secured, would not assist in passing this measure. I ask the House to give it earnest consideration, and I think that the fact that the operation of these banks elsewhere has been a success is a guarantee that if the question is only undertaken by us fairly and with a determination to bring about the same good result, we shall be able to formulate a Bill that will secure, in a large degree, the objects sought for by the Bill which I intend to introduce, based upon this motion. With reference to our banks and its effect upon them, I see nothing to prevent them establishing branches, or farmers' banks, in connection with the parent institutions, which would equally promote trade and commerce. It is not intended to injure these banks, but I believe on the other hand that the measure would have a beneficial effect upon them, and would make their operation much safer than it is to-day, that we would have fewer failures, and fewer losses to regret in connection with our great banking institutions. As to the loan societies I think that the enormous rates of interest they charge are unfair and unjust. I do not think it is right or honest that legislation should be entirely in the interest of one class of our people. We all know that these loan societies have been declaring dividends, for a number of years past, of 10 and 12 per cent.; they have increased their stock and become immensely wealthy. That wealth, Sir, has been extorted from the industrious population of this country, from the men who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, and I think the time has arrived when a more equitable system should prevail. I do not think this objection can for a moment be urged with any justice or fair play. We know, Sir, that these loan societies themselves borrow money at 4 per cent. We know that those land societies borrow money at 4 per cent., and that the credit banks in Europe are able with 1 per cent. to carry on their operations and pay all their expenses, including good salaries to managers and officials, and lay by one-half per cent. to redeem the bonds issued on those land debentures. They are paid off in a

certain number of years by means of a sinking fund, and one-half per cent. enables the amount to be paid in 66 years. When such facilities can be offered elsewhere, there is no reason why the Government should not endeavor to afford similar facilities to the people of this country. There is one little difficulty, to which I desire to refer. So long as the banks of Canada are allowed to use their own circulation, difficulty will certainly arise, simply from the fact that the banks will accumulate Dominion of Canada notes and call upon the Government to redeem them. But notwithstanding the circumstances that those banks have the privilege extended to them for ten years, I think the people of the Dominion could well afford to pay them, if necessary, what is fair and proper for their relinquishment of that privilege, and thereby bring about a system of banking under which all the circulation would be by Dominion bank notes. We know the inconvenience and difficulty experienced owing to bills of banks in different Provinces being in circulation and the loss that is sustained by it. Only the other day I had occasion to use a \$50 note of the Bank of British Columbia. I was advised that before I could get that bill cashed, I would have to pay 5 per cent. We should not be compelled to suffer such loss, and men in business must suffer loss almost every day in consequence of the various banks issuing their own circulation. I wish to draw the attention of the Government to this matter, and I hope it will receive serious and careful consideration.

Mr. McMULLEN. I cannot very well understand why the hon. gentleman should have brought forward a motion of this kind at this particular period of the Session. It appears to me that as the hon. gentleman sits so close to the First Minister, he must have taken a hint from him that a general election is drawing nigh. He is taking a step in order to lay out his course when he goes before his constituents. The hon. member is very anxious evidently to do something in the interests of the agriculturists. So far as I am concerned, I am quite willing to second any effort in the way of providing greater facilities for farmers to borrow money and assist in carrying on the farming industry. I must, however, express my opinion that I do not very well understand how the system proposed can be successfully inaugurated. I am afraid that very few farmers would be found willing to place a first mortgage on their farms in order to become stockholders of a bank. That bank would no doubt lend out money, and risks would have to be undertaken and losses would be made, and those farmers who were the back-bone of the institution would inevitably be called on to make up a certain percentage of the losses. I do not think the hon. gentleman would be able to secure the confidence of the farming community in favor of such an institution as he proposes. If it can be established, and if it will give farmers money at reduced rates, I make no objection. I was glad to hear the hon. gentleman admit that the farming industry is after all, the principal industry of this Dominion. He admitted that when we have bad crops and low prices we have poor times. I was very glad to hear that expression of opinion and I hope it expressed the entire sentiment of hon. gentlemen opposite. We know that a short time ago a great effort was made to build up, encourage and carry on manufactures, and that the farming interest was largely overlooked. It was not considered when the National Policy was inaugurated that the farmers would have to pay largely increased prices for what they purchased. They have realised that they have been paying more, and they do not now stand in as good a financial position as they did some years ago. I think the facilities possessed by farmers for borrowing money have been perhaps too great. I believe the credit system of the Dominion has done more to pauperise the farming community and the laboring classes generally than any system that could

possibly be inaugurated, and if thirty or forty years ago we had passed a very stringent Homestead Act and Usury Law, as was suggested by William Lyon Mackenzie, I believe this country would have been in a better financial position than it occupies to day. The hon. gentleman stated that the banks generally are not anxious to lend money to farmers. Such is not the fact. Endorsements sought after are especially those of farmers. We generally find that if a good responsible farmer wants to borrow money and his neighbor wants a little money at the same time, they can get accommodation, and at reasonable rates; I believe quite as reasonable as those for commercial purposes. I know there are banks almost exclusively engaged in banking operations with farmers. I am satisfied that a farmer can borrow money at present on good farm paper at 7 or perhaps $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The hon. gentleman has stated that if his system were inaugurated they would be able to borrow money at 5 per cent. I frankly admit that I would like to see the rate of money reduced; but in my opinion a step in the direction of providing cheaper money for farmers and also for business men generally would be secured if the hon. member would induce the Government to reduce the interest paid on money at the savings banks, rather than by any other course. The Government pay 4 per cent. on deposits in Dominion Savings Banks, and it costs even more, as I understand from the accounts that the Government pay a certain commission. If instead of 4 per cent. the rate were made 3 per cent., a very large sum of money at present held by the Government would pass into the hands of the banks; they would lend it to farmers, whereas at the present time the Government use all the money they get from that source. I understand they have from \$24,000,000 to \$26,000,000 in their hands as deposits in the Dominion Savings Banks, and it is all used. The banks have it not, and consequently they cannot extend accommodation and reduce the rate of interest to the extent they otherwise would do. The Government have been practically competing with the banks, and they are largely responsible for keeping up the rate of interest. I repeat that if the Government would reduce the interest on savings by 1 per cent., they would reduce the interest charged by banks to farmers, merchants and manufacturers. This is a desirable end to secure, and I should be glad to see the hon. member use his influence with the Government in that direction. He would thus accomplish something for the farmers and for the manufacturers in the direction of securing for them cheaper money. I should like to see the Bill. Last year the hon. gentleman made a motion in the direction of introducing this Bill, but it never came before a Committee. I hope it will reach Committee this Session, and if it secures justice, and there is a probability of its being carried, I trust it will become law. I should be glad to see any plan by which the rate of interest could be reduced to farmers, but I am much afraid that the matter is introduced at the present time just in order to give the hon. gentleman a chance of airing his sympathies for the farmers in the section of country from which he hails, and that this year it will meet with the same fate that it did last year. It will accomplish this much at any rate, that he will be able to return to his constituents and say to them: Gentlemen, do you see what I have been trying to do for you; I have been trying to reduce the rate of interest, but I could not get my Bill through. If the hon. gentleman will turn his attention in another direction, and try to get the interest reduced on Government deposits, and thus reduce the rate of interest in the other banks, it seems to me that he will accomplish a great deal more than by his present course.

Mr. HESSON. As I represent an agricultural county in this House I may be permitted a few words in reply to my

hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). I quite sympathise with the spirit and purpose of the resolution, as I presume every hon. gentleman will, if he is honestly in sympathy, as he should be, with the agricultural community of Canada. The hon. member who has just taken his seat has asserted that he is in favor of some movement whereby the rate of interest may be reduced to farmers, and I presume to others as well. He has certainly gone a good way round to secure that end when he says that the best movement would be one to reduce the rate of interest paid by the Government for Post Office and Savings Banks deposits. Let every banker, let every hon. gentleman take home with him this reflection, that the depositors in these savings banks, and in the Post Office Savings Banks especially, are all the working men of Canada, and that these institutions are especially adapted for the use of the laboring classes and poor people of the country. My hon. friend would begin his reduction in the first instance by a plan by which the poor man would receive only 3 per cent. for his deposits instead of 4. That does not appear to me to be a good plan to set out with, if the hon. gentleman is honestly and sincerely desirous of seeing the rate of interest reduced to the farmer. The poor men who deposit in these savings banks earn their wages perhaps during the summer time, and they deposit a portion regularly, from day to day, as a provision for a rainy day or the coming winter, and yet the hon. gentleman would withdraw that privilege from the laboring man and compel him to receive 3 per cent. for his deposits. I am rather surprised that an hon. gentleman, who, like myself, has the pleasure and honor of representing an agricultural constituency, should suggest such a plan; but I believe he is more fortunate than some hon. members representing country constituencies, inasmuch as I am credibly informed that he occupies the position of a lender and not a borrower. Coming more particularly to the resolution before the House, I am sure it is one which should have the sympathy of all those who are desirous of seeing the farming interests of the country in a prosperous condition. There are times and seasons, as we all know, when we have distress, and we know also that the security which banks are accustomed to take is not the kind which farmers are in a position to give, and the result is that the accommodation which is given to business men, to merchants and traders, is not afforded to them, for the reason that the banks do not like to give these straight loans at long dates as the farmer usually requires them. The merchant, if he wants relief, borrows for a short period to meet his bills as they come due, whereas the farmer usually wants his money until his harvest comes in, and if his harvest fails then he may require it until the next harvest comes in. I say that if it is in the power of the House to consider and devise any means whereby this difficulty may be grappled with, and the farmer placed in a more easy position with reference to obtaining loans, it is surely the interests of this House and within the wisdom of this House, that a Committee should be appointed for the purpose of seeing if there is any possibility of devising a plan to meet this emergency. I do not know exactly what the Bill may be which the hon. gentleman may propose, but I know that there must be sufficient wisdom and intelligence in this House to devise a plan by which the farmer, who possesses the best security in the country, may be enabled to get his money at as good a rate of interest as any business man. I know that farmers have been refused such accommodation, and cases have frequently come within my own experience in which these men, because they could not get the accommodation at the banks, have been obliged to go elsewhere, perhaps to shaving institutions as they are called, and pay a large rate of interest because they cannot get the straight loans for long periods as they require. I feel keenly in this matter, because, although it may not be possible that we can devise a scheme when de-

Mr. HESSON.

bating the resolution in this manner, yet if it were referred to a Special Committee I think they might be able to report a plan whereby that class of securities might be offered and a circulation provided by the Government which might be placed in the hands of reliable managers, who would take collateral security for loans and thus provide a relief for the agricultural community in this direction. I apprehend the difficulty which the Finance Minister will have to meet to provide for that circulation. I understand the difficulty he has with the present circulation, but I say here, sincerely and candidly, that I believe it is in the interests of the country to-day, whether it would be in the interests of the chartered banks or not, that the whole banking circulation of the country should be gradually but surely withdrawn, and substituted by Dominion notes. By the large opportunities and facilities which are afforded to the banks of circulating their own paper to an amount which now stands at \$31,935,000, they are able to gather up the Dominion circulation coming into their hands, and come to the Finance Minister and demand specie every day in the week. This will go on increasing until the Government withhold from the banks the privilege of issuing their own circulation. I have pointed this out before, and I point it out again, as I believe it is the only true course to meet the difficulty, and remove the inconvenience and loss which arises from handling and making use of the different varieties of circulation. We should have only one issue, and that issue should be unexceptionable, well established and well endorsed by the Government. I am unwilling at this stage to take up the time of the House, but I hope the resolution will meet with fair play, and will be honestly considered by hon. gentlemen. There is not a word of it which should not meet with approbation on the floor of the House, and I think the proper plan is, in order to meet the requirements of the farmers and the people generally, to refer the matter to a committee where it may receive a fair and honest consideration. Should this Bill be introduced, of course I am prepared to support it if the provisions are such as will warrant its receiving the fair consideration of the House generally; but until I have the privilege of reading the Bill, I do not desire to go further.

Mr. ORTON. I was a little surprised at the manner in which my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) alluded to me. He certainly did not show that kindly spirit which one would expect from a fellow countyman. He stated that my sole object in proposing this Bill was to gain popularity amongst my constituents. He certainly must feel, at any rate, that the step I have taken is one in the right direction, and a popular one; and if it should be the means of securing my election as a supporter of my right hon. friend, the Premier, at the next election, I shall feel all the prouder, because it will be the best thing that could happen to this country to have that right hon. gentleman again returned to power. I shall not ascribe motives to the hon. gentleman (Mr. McMullen), though I might, perhaps, be believed if I said that when he declared that the farmers of this country had already too great facilities for borrowing money, I thought that possibly he had in view some of the loans contracted in the County of Wellington. I believe what he says, and I shall not make such an assertion. I believe he wants the farmers to have money at 5 per cent, and I am satisfied that when he goes home, after expressing himself so eloquently, he will give the farmers of his neighborhood all the money they want at 5 per cent. interest. He is not very anxious that the laboring classes of this country should receive the just awards of their labor, and proposes to reduce interest in their savings. He does not seem quite so anxious to have the interest of capitalists reduced; but when men have worked hard and saved a few dollars to put in the savings banks of our country, he must urge on the Government to reduce the small

rate of interest they are obtaining. I regret that such a suggestion should come from any gentleman from my county, which I believe is populated by a generous class of people, who desire to see all classes prosper.

Mr. CASEY. I think it would be quite out of place, as the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has just remarked, to discuss this Bill until we know what it is to be. As I understand, the only resolution we are now asked to concur in is that it is expedient to introduce some Bill on this subject, and the hon. gentleman who proposes that resolution supports his proposal by pointing out that the farmers are struggling, are hard up, and need further banking accommodation than they now get. Well, I have perhaps not quite so poor an opinion of the condition of the farmers as the hon. gentleman appears to have, but I consider it is a very strong admission to come from the father of the National Policy, so far as the farmers are concerned, that that policy is already such a failure in regard to the agricultural community that they must come to this House and ask the Government to lend them money at less than the ordinary rates; for that, Sir, so far as I understand it, is the meaning of this Bill. I do not think the country is in such a bad condition financially, that interest is so far above the rate it should be, that it is necessary for the Government to enter into the money lending business at all. But perhaps the hon. member will be able to prove to us that the country is in that wretched condition when we get into committee. However, there was one hint thrown out by the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) in regard to the motives of the hon. member who proposes this Bill, from which I deem it my duty to defend him. He appears to think that the hon. member intends to go home to his constituents covered with glory for having proposed this resolution. Well, I do not think he will go home to his constituents. He seems to have got out of the habit of going home to his constituents of late. He may go back to the Rocky Mountains in his position as medical officer of the Canadian Pacific Railway, covered with glory on account of this measure; but he will not go back to his constituents at present for that purpose. I hope the hon. gentleman is not gauging the condition of the farmers of Wellington, their needs and requirements, by what he has seen during his sojourn in the far west; and I hope when he does visit his constituents he will find them better off than he imagines them to be.

Mr. ORTON. I may state that the hon. gentleman is as far off as he was when he shot the cow instead of the barn door.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I do not pretend to understand the involved proposition submitted by the mover of this resolution, but I do say that there is a good deal in the question viewed from a common sense standpoint. As the representative of an agricultural constituency, knowing what their wants are, I am well aware that the difficulties a farmer experiences in many instances in approaching a chartered bank when it becomes necessary for him to do so are very great indeed. That the propositions laid down by the hon. gentleman in speaking to his motion, are a cure for this, I do not believe, and I think something of a much simpler character would meet the requirements of the farming community. It is my opinion that the securing of better facilities for establishing local banks throughout different sections of the country, where financial backing could be readily secured, is something that the Government or the Finance Minister might very well, in the interest of a very large number of the ratepayers of this country, give attention to. Within recent years the farming community have to an increased extent engaged in the production of cattle in preference to grain, the result of which has been that they require a much larger capital than was the case when

they were largely grain producers; and if they stock their farms to the extent necessary, it follows in many cases that they have at some period of the year at least to go somewhere to borrow money. The chartered banks almost invariably refuse to give them the needed accommodation, and the result is that they are forced to find accommodation second-hand at rates that are necessarily high. Now, it seems to me, that if by any such simple means as I suggest, the establishment of local banks, and these afforded them that Government protection that would prevent the larger banks wiping them out after they are established, we should be granting the farmers that facility for obtaining the requisite money that is now denied. I do not know whether the experience of other sections of the country is the same as that of the section I represent; but I am well aware that there a farmer who owns 200 acres of land, representing a value of \$10,000, may take a friend with him to obtain money on their joint endorsement, and the bank refuses it. In such cases and they are the rule rather than the exception, because the banks as is well known have a prejudice—a wrong and unwise prejudice, I believe, but still a prejudice—the farmer is ultimately driven to borrow the money from a neighbor or find it elsewhere at such rates as the lenders choose to exact. But the result almost invariably is that he is obliged to borrow that money at a much higher rate of interest than the bank professedly charges. If that is the experience, as it is to a very general extent, I hold that the subject of this resolution is one that deserves some consideration from this House. The Trade and Navigation Returns establish the fact that our cattle producing industry is a largely increasing one, and that last year it was the largest, as far as the value of exports went, in this country. Now we find that the policy of the Government has been, ostensibly, at any rate, to encourage the industries which tend to enrich this country. I would like to know whether there is any industry in Canada deserving of greater favor from the Government than the stock raising industry when properly attended to. My view of it is that every movement made heretofore has had the effect of hampering that industry and that our banking policy has increased that effect. We find that the manufacturing industries can obtain from the banks the capital necessary to carry on their enterprises; we find that the importers are largely aided by the opportunities offered them through the banks, and we find further that the present banking system is established on a principle under which the farmer is unable to borrow scarcely a dollar from these institutions. Such being the case, there is undoubtedly some reason for the resolution, and while I have no sympathy whatever with the involved remedy suggested by the hon. gentleman, a remedy which would be worse than the disease, because, as I understand it, every farmer who participates in the advantages of his scheme would be practically an endorser for every borrower. I believe that a measure which would afford facilities for the establishment of local banks under carefully considered provisions, and with such protection as would prevent their absorption by the larger banks, would confer a great deal of benefit indeed on one of our largest industries, and the one on which, after all, we have most to lean whenever additional revenue is required for the country. From my own local experience I know it to be the fact that in one of the two branch banks in the county in which I live the deposits amount to four times the discounts, and in the other the local deposits are more than sufficient to carry on the business of the institution. That being the case, it shows to my mind that there is no involved principle such as that suggested by the mover of this resolution required in order to find the means necessary to meet the wants of the farmers, who only require those facilities in our banking laws necessary to enable them to carry on their operations in the least burdensome way possible. I am satisfied if such be given, the interest charged to the farming community will

be reduced below the rates they have now to pay, and that the cattle producing industry which is yearly increasing in importance in a large section of the Province of Ontario, at any rate, will be greatly fostered.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is refreshing to hear the speech of the hon. gentleman who spoke last. He addressed himself to the resolution before the House, but this cannot be said of the hon. gentleman who preceded him, one of whom told my hon. friend (Mr. Orton) in a rather unparliamentary way that his resolution was mere buncombe to deceive his constituents, another gentleman threw up to him the charge that he was going to leave his constituents to settle in the North-West and had therefore no more interest in them. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) with arguments such as these opposes the resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He got up to throw ridicule upon him, said it was buncombe, that there was no necessity for it, that there were too great facilities already; or in other words that the farmers would be much better off if they had decreased facilities to get money. But he forgot that in the next sentence, and said that the true way to help the farmers would be for the Government to reduce the rate of interest in the savings banks and that money then would be more plentiful in the banks to lend. Which way does the hon. gentleman wish to have it? Does he wish money to be made easier by the Government robbing the servants and laboring men of 1 per cent. of their little savings? Or does he wish the farmers to have no greater facilities for borrowing, they being, according to his first statement, much better off without any additional facilities? The hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Cameron) stated what everybody knows that although by the banks the name of a farmer in good standing is considered good security, yet we all know the present banks are commercial institutions rather than mere lenders of money on real estate security or to persons who have only real estate to offer as security. The farmers are therefore driven to other means such as investment companies, loan and building societies, and so forth, rather than the banks as at present constituted. It seems to me my hon. friend (Mr. Orton) is taking a very proper course, as he tried to do last Session, in bringing this subject before Parliament. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said he would like to see the Bill, but if we oppose the resolution we cannot see the Bill. We must get the resolution first, and then we will have the Bill. We will then see if it will give reasonable protection to the public, to those who invest in agricultural banks as shareholders, and be able to judge whether it is not liable to the objections which have been taken by sound financiers to other measures dealing with similar subjects. If not, of course it ought to be encouraged. I shall vote for the resolution myself, and I have no doubt we will have an opportunity then of discussing the various theories propounded as well as the merits of the Bill itself. The hon. gentleman who last spoke proposed a system which has its merits, namely, to have local banks with small capitals. That would be one means of helping the different localities; there may be other means which we will have an opportunity of discussing when the measure is submitted to us. In the meantime I will support the resolution.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not say I opposed the Bill. I said I will gladly support any Bill giving facilities to secure money at a cheaper rate by the farmers of this country, but I said that I was afraid this resolution was only buncombe and would result as fruitlessly as last year's. With regard to the reduction of interest my object in making this suggestion was that if the Government would reduce the

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex).

interest, the money would naturally flow into the banks, and the banks be able to lend at a lower rate.

Resolution considered in Committee, reported, and concurred in.

Mr. ORTON introduced Bill (No. 36) to provide banking and loan facilities for those engaged in agricultural pursuits.

Bill read the first time.

MAIL SERVICE ON THE CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. WIGLE moved for:

Return showing the nature of the mail service on the Canada Southern Railway between Essex Centre and Amherstburg; also the annual amount paid to the Canada Southern Railway for mail service.

He said: The town of Amherstburg gave a bonus of \$75,000 to the Canada Southern Railway when it was first built, with the understanding that the mail train was to cross at Amherstburg. Of late, however, these trains go off at Essex Centre and now there is only one train a day each way passing through Amherstburg, which is very inconvenient for the mail service in that town. This motion is made in order to draw the attention of the Government, and more especially of the Postmaster General, to the matter, in order that the town of Amherstburg may get more accommodation for its mail service.

Mr. CARLING. There is no objection to this return, and I can assure the hon. gentleman that every exertion will be made to secure the mail facilities between Essex Centre and Amherstburg which he desires.

Motion agreed to.

PAYMENTS TO H. J. MORGAN.

Mr. McCRAVEY moved for:

Statement of the various amounts of money paid by the Government of Canada, or any of the Public Departments since 1882 to Henry J. Morgan for services of any kind or for copies of a certain book called the "Annual Register," together with copies of the certificate of each public official to whom such books have been delivered.

He said: My object in asking for this return is to bring to the attention of the Government the question whether employes of the Government receiving large salaries and supposed to devote their whole time to the public service should be allowed to engage in publishing or any other business. It is well known to this House that it has been charged by the press of our country that the party named in this motion has, with other parties, received payment for books that were unnecessary, if they were delivered to the Government at all. I hope that, when the Civil Service Bill is brought down, the Government will provide that civil servants shall not engage in outside undertakings especially with the Government as their principal customer.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the motion, but I take exception to the line adopted by the hon. gentleman who moves it, because he intimates a desire that no civil servant shall be employed in any useful work, whether scientific or literary, but he must adhere to his office work only. I think it would be a very unfortunate thing for the status of our service if it were understood that no officer of the Government should devote himself to science or literature in his spare time, instead of amusing himself or doing nothing after office hours; that he should go home at four o'clock, eat his dinner, take his pipe, and smoke it. One of the books which has been a credit to Canada and has been immensely useful to the Parliament of Canada, and in fact to all the Colonial Parliaments, and has been quoted in the Parliament of England, is the work of our late Librarian, Dr. Todd, on

Parliamentary Government. Then, consider the very valuable work prepared by our present Clerk, Mr. Bourinot, on the Practice of Parliament. Consider the great book on the Practice of Parliament, of which I do not know how many editions have been published, the last I think in 1883, by Sir Erskine May, the Clerk of the Commons in England, the great authority on matters of practice. Consider, also, the various works that have been prepared and published by a man who is a great philosopher, Mr. Gregg, who is at the head of the stationery office in England, and whose books, both for style and for clearness and value, are very noteworthy. He has left a standing reputation behind him. He is one of the great officers of England, and introduced a very economical mode of managing that large department, the stationery office. We cannot expect those gentlemen to employ themselves in that way and to publish their works at their own expense. If they publish valuable works, and if the head of their department is satisfied that the officer, whoever he may be, fully performs his duty like other officers, they should be encouraged in applying themselves to useful employment rather than to idleness or self-gratification.

Mr. McCRAANEY. I may say that I understand that the gentleman referred to does not write the books himself but he employs others to do it for him, and makes a speculation out of it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then there can be no objection. If he employs others he does not do the work himself.

Motion agreed to.

VOTING ON THE CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878.

Mr. FISHER moved for :

Statement from the records of all the voting held in various counties and cities under the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act, 1878, showing by electoral districts and the various sub-divisions thereof, the total number of names on the electoral lists, the number of votes polled for the adoption of the Act, and the number of votes polled against the adoption of the Act, with the number of the population of each such electoral district at the time of the taking of the census preceding the vote in such electoral district.

He said: in consequence of having had my attention drawn to it, I would ask leave of the House to amend this notice by inserting after the figures "1878" the words "since the 1st of July, 1882." I trust this will tend to facilitate the bringing down of this return, and if the return is made up from that date to the present time, it will practically supply all the information we desire.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I hope the hon. gentleman will not amend his motion. I see it reads in French since 1878, and in English it will be since 1882. I think we ought to have the returns from the first. It will not take much longer to do it, and I think we had better know exactly upon what vote the Scott Act has been adopted since it first passed this Parliament.

Mr. FISHER. My only object in making the amendment was to get the return more quickly. I thought that as regards the elections which took place between 1878 and 1882, the census returns would be so very far from the date of the election that we could not arrive at the actual percentage of population who voted, nor could we satisfactorily ascertain the relation of the number of voters to the whole population.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The census has really less to do with it than the number of voters, and the number of voters is not given in the census at all. We could get the number of voters by the returns of 1878 just about as well. If we leave it at 1878 there will be no difficulty in getting the returns.

Mr. FISHER. If the House prefers that the whole returns should be made, I have not the slightest objection. I only wished to get them sooner.

Motion, as originally proposed, agreed to.

TIMBER LICENSES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. CHARLTON moved for :

1. The total number of licenses or permits granted since March 15th, 1883, up to February 1st, 1885, to cut timber, saw logs, telegraph poles, railroad ties and cordwood, within the territory lately in dispute between the Provinces of Manitoba and Ontario, and also within the territory in dispute between Ontario and the Dominion of Canada.
2. The name and residence of each grantee, the term over which the license of grant extends; whether the license or permit is for cutting and removing timber, saw logs, telegraph poles, railroad ties, or cordwood, and date of the license or permit.
3. The geographical location of the area covered by each license or permit issued, and the number of square miles embraced in each.
4. The amount of bonuses or premiums received upon each, and the aggregate amount of the same.
5. Full particulars as to the Crown dues or stumpage charged or chargeable upon each license or permit issued, as to whether by percentage of value or specific charges, and the aggregate amount of revenue derived from the same.
6. A statement or case of each license or permit issued, as to whether the Government had caused a survey to be made of the same, and was in possession of estimates made by its own surveyors, woodsmen or bushrangers, as to the kinds, the quantity and the quality of timber upon each area covered by such license or permit.
7. Whether in each case where a license or permit was granted, the berth was put up at public auction after due public notice was given inviting tenders, and was sold to the highest bidder, or whether granted upon application or tender from the the grantee without inviting public competition.
8. In case of application by two or more parties for the same berth, and competition between them for the purchase of the same, the name and residence of each applicant and the particulars of the tender made by each.
9. Copies of all claims, petitions, remonstrances or communications made to the Government respecting such permits or licenses and the action of the Government thereon; also, a copy of all maps and plans showing the location and areas of such licenses or permits.
10. A minute of all assignments of such licenses or permits recorded with the Government, with the names and residence of the assignor and the assignee, and the consideration in each case paid.

I may say to the First Minister, with respect to this motion, that an order has already been granted by the House covering the whole of the area over which timber licenses have been issued. This is for the disputed territory, and the present motion is necessary.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—SECTION B.

Mr. CASEY moved for :

Copy of the report of the engineers appointed to re-measure and re-classify the work on section B Canadian Pacific Railway, in connection with the claim of the contractors for said section for increased remuneration for such work, and for damages.

Also, all reports of the engineers in charge of said section, or of the Engineer-in-Chief, or any other Government engineer, in reference to the questions of measurement, classification or damages, at issue between the Government and the contractors.

As to my reasons for making this motion, I may say that we were informed by Sir Charles Tupper last Session that the contractors for this work had been making constant complaints as to the manner in which they were treated by the Government engineer in charge of the contract. It was asserted—I believe it is a fact—that that engineer had been promised by Order in Council a bonus of a certain percentage on any saving he might effect in the cost of that contract below the contract price, and the contractors used this as an argument to show that he had reason for treating them unfairly, and that he had treated them unfairly. I believe that accusation to have been ill-founded as against the engineer in question. I have the authority of Sir Charles Tupper himself for saying it was ill-founded, for he tells us that Mr. Jennings had at all times his confidence and that of the Engineer-in-Chief. He repeated that statement on several

occasions, and gave further evidence of his sincerity in making it by recommending Mr. Jennings as a trustworthy and able engineer to his friend Mr. Onderdonk, who has a large contract on another part of the railway in British Columbia. Yet in the face of all those facts, Mr. Manning, one of the contractors, wrote to the *Globe* and *Mail*, asserting that they had demanded the removal of Mr. Jennings from that work because he was treating them unfairly, and that the Government had removed him in consequence of their demand and sent him to British Columbia. I asked Sir Charles Tupper last Session whether he could authoritatively deny that statement. He replied that he had been perfectly satisfied with Mr. Jennings, and told us of the subsequent recommendation to which I have already alluded; but he said he could not give a definite denial on this point, because Mr. Jennings' removal took place in his absence, and when the Minister now in charge was Acting Minister of Railways. I now ask from the Minister himself, who is conversant with all the facts, no doubt, whether he can give an authoritative denial to that statement. It is a very grave charge, to be made public, that the Government dismissed an engineer on the demand of contractors. As Sir Charles Tupper said last Session, he generally found engineers like Mr. Jennings were not those who got along smoothly with contractors—those were his own words—that engineers like Mr. Jennings who honestly and faithfully discharged their duties towards the Government do not get along smoothly with contractors. Mr. Jennings did not get along smoothly with these contractors. It is quite certain that his removal was demanded; it is quite certain his removal took place; but whether it took place in consequence of the demand, it is for the Minister to say. I hope the hon. gentleman will be able to clear the Department from the reproach which has hung over it for over a year and a-half, of having removed an engineer because he was too honest to suit the contractors. Subsequent to the removal of Mr. Jennings, two other engineers, Messrs. Donkin and Bell, were sent to section B, to re-measure and re-classify the work done by the contractors. I may remind the House that the question at issue was more one of classification than of measurement. The contractors claimed that certain excavation done by them should be classed as loose rock instead of earth, and that other work should be classified as rock instead of loose rock, and so on; and unfortunately the terms of the contract were not such as to afford definite means of deciding between the claims of the contractors and those of the engineer in charge. The contract did not specify with sufficient distinctness how certain work was to be classified, and the classification was made from time to time by the engineer in charge, under directions received from his superior, the Engineer-in-Chief at Ottawa, and was made in opposition to the claims of the contractors that the work should be classified otherwise. Whether the engineer or the contractor was right, one thing is certain that the occurrence of this dispute between the Government and the contractors was due to blameable looseness in the original framing of the contract and to the carelessness of the Minister controlling the Railway Department in 1879, when the contract was let, in not seeing that more definite specifications were inserted and strictly adhered to. As this question of classification was referred to the arbitration which subsequently took place, the report of the engineers, Messrs. Donkin and Bell, is necessary that we may see how far it agrees with the conclusions ultimately reached by the arbitrators. I ask for all reports of the engineers in charge of said section or of the Engineer-in-Chief or any other Government engineer, in reference to the questions at issue between the Government and the contractors. The question of the damages referred to is a very loose one, which I will say more about on a subsequent motion; but it is interesting, important and necessary to know what the engineers have advised the

Mr. CASEY.

Government from time to time in reference to this matter, in order that we may be able to judge as to the course pursued by the Government in regard to the arbitration.

Mr. POPE. There is not the slightest objection to bringing down all the reports of the engineer, excepting such as are confidential, and the report of the Engineer-in-Chief will, of course, be brought down. One word with respect to Mr. Jennings. I believe he always had the confidence of the Chief Engineer and of the Minister, and it was only when the work was nearly completed, when there was little for him to do here, when the services of an able man were required in British Columbia, that we made arrangements by which the work should be handed over to another engineer, and Mr. Jennings was sent to British Columbia, where there was a large amount of work to be done and where they had every confidence that he would do it. That is the reason for the change. I will get the returns, so far as they can be got, excepting those which are confidential.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman consider the report of Mr. Donkin and Mr. Bell confidential?

Mr. POPE. Any report is confidential which is got for the purpose of informing the Minister, and it would be a great mistake for the Department to give such reports as are understood, when they are sent in, to be only for the purposes of the Department and the information of the Chief Engineer. Beyond that they will be brought down.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman is not answering my question. I asked him definitely if the report of Mr. Donkin and Mr. Bell is one of those which he would consider confidential.

Mr. POPE. I will look it up and see.

Mr. CASEY. There are many things which the hon. gentleman will have to look up and see. He has gone quite astray in one explanation he gave to-day, as to the reasons for Mr. Jennings' removal, and he has neglected to give an authoritative denial when I asked him if it was for certain reasons. I ask him if it was at the demand of Mr. Manning that—

Mr. POPE. It was not.

Mr. CASEY. We have at last got that information out of the hon. gentleman, after a long struggle. I struggled with Sir Charles Tupper part of one evening last Session, and with the hon. gentleman for part of one evening, and at last he has given the answer, in a faint and half-hearted fashion. The explanation does not, however, accord with the facts, and I must conclude that his memory has failed him in that respect. He says that Mr. Jennings was removed because his services were particularly required in British Columbia, whereas Sir Charles Tupper told us it was because the work on section B was so small that another could take charge of them.

Mr. POPE. I have just said so.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Jennings was sent out in the autumn of 1882—September, I believe—to British Columbia, to do this important work, and he remained there till about Christmas, or in all about three months. He came home on account of illness in his family, and he was not required after that time, and though for months he kept asking to be sent back to British Columbia, they found no work for him to do there. The hon. gentleman will have to look into that explanation again before he concludes that he has been correctly informed. As to the withholding of confidential reports, or as to what reports should be considered confidential, I am not sufficiently versed in the ways of the Department of Railways to say what has been the custom, but I am inclined to think that the hon. Minister is disposed, from his conduct the other night, to construe that class of

reports rather too widely. I fear that in this case he will eliminate everything which is interesting to the House and the country, those things for the purpose of getting which I have moved the resolution—those very things which the House has a right to get and which are required to enable one to judge as to whether the conduct of the Government with regard to this arbitration has been judicious and proper.

Mr. MACKENZIE. What position did Mr. Jennings receive in British Columbia?

Mr. POPE. He was removed to one of the engineers in Mr. Onderdonk's contract. It was a very important position, the duties of which were just beginning when his work here was nearly done.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was he in charge of an under contract?

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Was his position subordinate?

Mr. POPE. He was under Mr. Smith.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course; they were all under him.

Mr. POPE. He had charge under Mr. Smith.

Mr. MACKENZIE. He was next to Mr. Smith?

Mr. POPE. That was the intention. The hon. gentleman will understand that I cannot speak by the book as to any particular position he occupied, because he was sent there by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. CASEY. Sir Charles Tupper says he was sent there by the hon. gentleman.

Mr. POPE. He says no such thing. But I will get the information.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Of course there is no use asking any further questions. If the hon. gentleman does not know we need not ask. With regard, however, to confidential reports, I hope the hon. gentleman will not consider reports with regard to measurements and classification of material as confidential reports.

Mr. BLAKE. It seems to me that a report which states the facts for the information of the Minister, and not opinions as to the character and conduct of persons—reports of investigations which the engineers are instructed to make, as to the facts of the case, the classification of materials, &c., cannot be regarded as confidential. With reference to the circumstances under which Mr. Jennings went to British Columbia, we are in great mystery. If my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Casey), be correct, the Minister of Railways stated last Session that he could not tell, because it was the Acting Minister who sent him there during his absence. To-day, when the Acting Minister, in the absence of Sir Charles Tupper, is Acting Minister in the absence of any Minister at all, he tells us that Sir Charles Tupper sent him. Sir Charles Tupper could not speak by the book last Session because the hon. gentleman had sent Mr. Jennings to British Columbia; now, the hon. gentleman cannot speak by the book because, he says, he was sent by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. POPE. I do speak by the book, so far as leaving here was concerned. His work here was nearly completed, it could be done without him, and it did not require his services. It was understood, while I was acting, that he would go to British Columbia and take an important position there on an important work. What instructions he had after that Sir Charles Tupper gave him, and I am not prepared to say what they were, because I do not carry these things in my book; but I will ascertain and let the hon. gentleman know.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CONSTRUCTION BETWEEN PORT ARTHUR AND WINNIPEG.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Statement of sums paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, up to date, for construction on those portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, the contract for which has been transferred to them from the original contractors, with dates of payment; also copies of estimates on which such payments have been made, showing quantities and rates.

He said: I have to urge that there is a very particular reason for asking for a detailed statement of these payments. I find that on September 28th, 1883, Auditor General McDougall wrote Mr Bradley, of the Railway Department, asking for a copy of the agreement under which a certain certificate for \$136,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway was made out. Mr. Bradley referred him to the Order in Council of July 9th previous, and a letter from Mr. Van Horne, as constituting together the only agreement under which this money was to be paid. I propose to call your attention to the vague nature of that agreement. On October 4th, he wanted further a statement showing that the work remaining undone on the line would cost at least \$926,000, the sum stated on the agreement, and pointed out that it was specially necessary to get that Order in Council, because it was not work done under contract in the usual way. He said:

"I should be glad to have a statement showing that the work left undone on the line would cost at least \$926,000. I think it important to get this information, as the work was given without tenders having been called for."

Now, Sir, I find, as a matter of fact, that not only were no tenders called for, but no specifications were made and no particulars agreed upon between the Government and the company, so far as I can find, as to what the work was to be, except in regard to a very few details. I must trouble you with a few extracts from the correspondence and the Order in Council, to try and show what the agreement really was. I confess I have not been able myself to form a very clear idea of what was to be done under this agreement, and I doubt if the Minister had any clear idea. In fact, it seems to have been one of those curious contracts between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which the company are able to interpret most favorably to themselves, and in regard to which the Government do not seem to have any chance of contending with them before any tribunal. The secretary of the company, on the 17th of May, 1883, writes:

"Referring to the negotiations which have been lately taking place, with a view to the reception by this company of the Thunder Bay branch, from Rat Portage to Prince Arthur's Landing, I am instructed by the directors of this company to state, that while the company are prepared to take over this portion of the railway and equip and operate it, they have not as yet had time to complete the examination of it, as to the extent to which it has been completed, or to which its condition would meet the requirements of the contract between the Government and the company.

"In order, therefore, to prevent any misconstruction hereafter, as to the position of the company in assuming possession of this portion of the railway, I am instructed to say that it will be taken over by the company, under express reserve of the rights of the company to have it completed in all respects in conformity with the contract, to the same extent as if the company were not now undertaking its operation.

"I am further instructed to state that the company have reason to believe that its condition and state of preparation are open to all the objections contained in their letter to the Department of Railways and Canals, under date the 2nd of February, 1882, with reference to the line between Telford and Rat Portage. In addition to the points suggested in that letter, and without relinquishing any right of the company in respect of any matter not designated here, I would indicate various timber trestles across water stretches, which, in the opinion of the company, would require to be filled, in whole or in part, to conform to the spirit of the contract; and it is probable, also, that timber work of various bridges require renewal, from decay having taken place since such work was constructed."

He seems to have had a lower opinion of the work done on that part of the line than the hon. Minister had the other day. He goes on:

"Without further specifying details in which the company believe the work is undoubtedly incomplete, I have only to repeat that in assuming this portion of the railway, the company do so under express reserve, not only of their rights in respect to the matter referred to above, and in their former letter, but also of all other matters in connection with this section, which they would be entitled by their contract to have adjusted if they had awaited the entire completion of the work before taking possession of it."

This letter goes on to refer to details in regard to which there was apparently nothing put in writing; but we find a letter from Mr. VanHorne, of the 3rd of July, to the Acting Minister of Railways, in which he says:

"Owing to the necessity of immediate action, no details were agreed upon (between him and the Government), except that so much of the work as was covered by the contract of Manning, McDonald, McLaren & Co. should be completed by the company at contract prices, less 15 per cent., which had been allowed the contractors for preliminary work. This work was all included in what is known as contract 42."

He then goes on to point out that contracts 41, 25 and 13 were also incomplete, that several stations and side tracks, &c., were wanted along the line between section B and Winnipeg, that some 19,000 or 20,000 feet of side track, 25 station buildings, 27 section houses, 2 engine sheds and turn-tables, and 20 tanks were required. He also makes vague statements to the effect that a large amount of ballasting would be required, that ties were decaying and required renewal, and that the line, in short, though not yet completed, needed considerable repairs, and that some new work would have to be done to conform it to the company's standard, instead of the low standard which had been latterly established by the Government. He said:

"It is already apparent that many difficult and embarrassing questions will arise in connection with the final completion of the railway; and, with a view to avoiding these, and to securing the completion of the line and buildings in conformity with the standards of the company, which, in most cases, differ from those of the Government, the company desire to propose to relieve the Government of the entire work for a lump sum."

Mr. VanHorne puts the case very neatly. "In order to avoid all embarrassing questions that might arise in connection with the final completion of the railway," he offers to take it for a lump sum—in order to avoid any embarrassing questions as to the proper cost of what he had taken, whether it was at contract prices or not, I suppose. He proposes to simplify the matter, and he says:

"The company will undertake, for the sum of \$940,000, to complete in a first-class manner the entire line from Selkirk to Winnipeg, and provide all sidings and all depots, section houses, engine sheds, and all other usual and necessary structures, and make all renewals of ties and bridges, and do all other necessary work."

And so on. These are the only specifications, I think. The line is to be completed in a first-class manner. And what is a first-class manner? In an Order in Council adopted by the Government, the work is to be completed to the satisfaction of the Chief Engineer; there is no other definition of what a first-class manner is. It is all left to the option of the Chief Engineer, and we have found before that that gentleman was not hard to satisfy. He was satisfied, if I remember rightly, after an inspection of a few hours of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's books at Montreal, that all the expenditures of the past few years had been proper, and were devoted to the objects intended; and he so reported to the Government. It was not hard to satisfy him then, and I do not suppose it would be with regard to the final completion of this road. At all events, there is no absolute standard by which the manner of completing the road is to be tried. At the close of his letter, Mr. VanHorne explains that the additional 15 per cent. deducted from the payment to contractors for preliminary work would bring up his offer to the sum of \$981,000, instead of the sum of \$940,000, first mentioned. The next day the Chief Engineer reported that he had made a calculation of what the cost of the work would be, and he agreed approximately with Mr. VanHorne's estimate. I find next a memorandum, dated the 5th

Mr. CASEY.

of July, of the hon. Minister of Agriculture, then acting as Minister of Railways, advising the acceptance of Mr. VanHorne's offer, but he states the sum at \$926,000 instead of \$981,000. I hope the hon. gentleman will take a note of these figures and explain how this discrepancy arose. It turns out that by the acceptance of this offer from Mr. VanHorne the only safeguard contained in the first agreement between the Government and the company, viz., that the remainder of the work on section B was to be finished at contract prices, is taken away. Instead of forcing them to finish at those rates and do the other work at a lump sum, it is proposed to do the whole work at a lump sum, no amount being fixed for any particular part of the work. And there is, as I have said in a former debate, no specification of what has to be done, no appropriation of any part of the money for any particular work, no price agreed upon for such work as is done. The Chief Engineer is to make a report, from time to time, as to how much is done. On what scale of prices he is to base his report I cannot imagine, because he has nothing to go by as to the price of the work done, although it is his certificate which entitles the company to payment. I find that certificates which are brought down amongst the papers contain no allusion to details at all. The company intimate from time to time that they require a little money, the engineer certifies that a certain lump sum is due on the work, and the company are paid. It is for that reason I want to get copies of the estimates on which such payments have been made, showing the quantities and rates. It appears from a subsequent letter of Mr. VanHorne that there was an agreement with the Government, of which I find no trace but this letter. This agreement was to the effect that the company could take over the rolling stock at a valuation. I find that valuers were agreed on by the company and the Government, who valued the rolling stock at \$185,000, leaving the sum of \$740,000 still due the company. Now it will be remembered also that Sir Charles Tupper estimated, in a speech of last year on this item, in Supply, the total amount remaining to be done to finish this contract—the contract for section B—\$359,800, leaving, out of the \$966,000, a balance of \$607,800 to be paid to the company for work outside the completion of section B. I should like the hon. Minister to explain how this estimate of the value of that work was arrived at.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all permits, licenses or liberties given to any person or persons to cut timber in any part of the territory declared by the Order of the Queen in Council to be within the Province of Ontario? Also, the name or names of the person or persons obtaining such permission; the extent of territory embraced, the amount received by the Government and the amount, if any, still unpaid by the party or parties for such permission?—(Mr. Mills.)

Return showing the expenses, in detail with dates, incurred by the several members of the Government and any other person or persons in the service of the Government sent to England or elsewhere, on behalf of the Government, from 23rd of January, 1884, to date.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

Copies of all reports and communications made to the Government by the Port Credit Harbor Company and all memorials, petitions, reports of engineers and correspondence in reference to the condition and state of repair of the said harbor.—(Mr. Platt.)

Copy of a certain pamphlet entitled "The National Policy," purporting to have been printed by the Industrial Publishing Company and purchased in 1883-84 by the Government and circulated in England, with a view of promoting emigration to Canada, together with a statement of the number of pamphlets purchased, the price paid and name of the author, the publisher and person to whom the payments were made; also copies of all pamphlets purchased or circulated by the Department of Agriculture since 1st January, 1883.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This being a wild night, I will not ask the House to meet again, but move that we adjourn.

Mr. CHARLTON. I think that we might sit to-night and get through the Order paper, and adjourn to-morrow night instead, so as to give hon. members an opportunity of enjoying the reading of the famous humorist, Mark Twain.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The House, of course, will judge to-morrow, as to whether it will cut the Session in twain or not, but this being such a wild night, I think we had better adjourn.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 17th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 38) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Bill (No. 40) further relating to the Central Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Temple.)

Bill (No. 42) to amend the Act respecting offences against the person.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 43) to authorise the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Curran.)

THE RAILWAY COMMITTEE.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that Mr. J. W. Bain be added to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—ASH WEDNESDAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Thursday next at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AFFECTING ANIMALS.

Mr. POPE moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 44) respecting infectious or contagious diseases affecting animals.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Mr. POPE. The Bill is a consolidation, with certain amendments which are required to the existing Act, the better to enable it to be carried out, but without altering the principle in the slightest degree. The amendments are pretty numerous, but are of no importance so far as the principle of the Bill is concerned.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DUTIES OF JUSTICES OF THE PEACE.

Mr. TUPPER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 41) to amend the Act respecting duties of Justices of the Peace, in relation to summary convictions.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. TUPPER. This Bill is introduced for the purpose of amending the 53rd section of chapter 31, relating to summary convictions before Justices of the Peace, so that the form contained in the schedule of that Act shall conform to the 53rd section. At present, considerable difficulty often arises owing to Justices of the Peace following the form prescribed in the Act, and in doing so including in the conviction the words:

"Unless the said sums and the cost and charges of conveying the said prisoner to the said common gaol shall be sooner paid."

The section under which that conviction is made does not provide any express words for that part of the conviction, and accordingly it has been held, and is laid down in the books, that the conviction can be quashed on the ground of the Act not directing explicitly that these words shall appear. Either the form or the section ought to be amended. I propose to amend the section.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN, in the absence of Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD, moved:

That all the Petitions presented to this House on the subject of bankruptcy and insolvency be referred to the Select Committee on those subjects.

Motion agreed to.

CENSUS COMMISSIONERS AND ENUMERATORS.

Mr. POPE moved:

That the report of Committee of the Whole on certain proposed resolutions respecting the rates and allowances to certain census commissioners and enumerators, be received, and that the said resolutions be read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was not here when the discussion took place on the resolutions. It was then arranged that, on the reception of the report, the hon. gentleman would modify the resolutions by introducing maximum rates. If not advised of this, he had better defer the order.

Mr. POPE. I did not hear anything of that kind, nor do I think it could well be done. In the first place, we did establish a maximum rate for the census commissioners, \$4 per day, and a maximum rate for the enumerators, \$3 per day, made up in different ways—so much per mile, so much per family, &c. Notwithstanding that, and notwithstanding the fact that it was the rule adopted in the larger Provinces we found when we got into the Territories and British Columbia that people would not take the census at maximum rates, although in Manitoba we had no difficulty, as a rule. Although these are my maximum rates at this moment, I must be at liberty to pay enough to enable me to get men to do the work in places where these rates will not suffice. The difficulty in paying as they do in the United States, so much per head for every man, woman and child enumerated is this, that you give a bonus to the enumerators to inscribe more people than there really are. Speaking with a gentleman conversant with this subject, in Washington, last spring, he told me that there were really more people enumerated in the United States than the country had through this system of paying so much per head.

Mr. BLAKE. This shows the difficulty of proceeding with a measure in the absence of the Minister who is responsible for it. In this case he appears not to have

had his attention directed to the discussion which took place during his absence, when the proposition was suggested from this side of the House that maximum rates should be established, and wherein closing the discussion, the hon. the First Minister said :

"These resolutions are merely to fix the rate of remuneration, and they in no way pledge the House, except as to this point, especially when the proposition of the leader of the Opposition is carried into effect, and a maximum is stated."

My proposal was that the Bill should contain the maximum rates but when we come to the discussion the hon. gentleman dissents from that view, and gives reasons, more or less valid, which, he says, render it imprudent that maximum rates should be stated.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman does not want me to do an impossibility.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not want the hon. gentleman to perform an impossibility. There are a great many possibilities that he is quite unable to perform, and I would not be so unreasonable as to ask him to go further. I am discussing the question as it was understood to be settled on the last occasion; of course, if the House is satisfied by the argument of the hon. gentleman, that within a certain portion of our territory and under certain circumstances, exceptional rates have to be paid, that may be a reason for relaxing a wholesome rule and allowing the hon. gentleman the latitude he desires in those portions. The hon. gentleman has stated with reference to the Province of Manitoba, that he has no difficulty in fixing a maximum. Why not fix it for that Province and make an exception for the cases which necessitate one? If there be a portion of the North-West Territories in which it is impossible to fix the rates, let us give discretion to the hon. Minister limited to that region and to the circumstances which render it necessary to give that discretion. It seems to me, after the understanding reached in the hon. gentleman's absence, that he is called upon on this occasion, unless there be some overruling necessity to the contrary, to fix a maximum rate where he can.

Mr. POPE. I did not speak for all Manitoba but for the thickly settled parts. If I were to fix a maximum for taking the whole of the census, I should have to fix it at a price that would place me in an awkward position in dealing with places where the census ought to be taken at a lower rate. I say that the maximum rate will be \$3 per day, calculated as I have before said, for the enumerators, and \$4 a day for the commissioners. From that I will have to vary considerably in some parts of Manitoba and the North-West and in British Columbia. This is the same course as that taken last Session when I do not think any one complained that we gave too much, though there were many complaints that we did not give enough. In fact, I doubted myself sometimes whether I was not inclined to be a little too economical in that case.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course if the hon. gentleman determines to depart from the understanding of the other day, and without reason or cause refuses to fix a maximum rate which his colleagues actually declared was reasonable, in so far as it could be done, we know our position in this House and are powerless to resist him.

Motion agreed to, and resolutions read the second time.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 21) to provide for the taking of a Census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin.—(Mr. Pope.)

Mr. BLAKE.

INSURANCE ACT, 1879, AMENDMENT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that Bill (No. 20) to modify the application of "The Consolidated Insurance Act, 1879," be read the second time.

Mr. BLAKE. Explain.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. As the House is aware, this is a Bill introduced for the purpose of amending the Insurance Act of 1879. Under the operation of that Act, no organisation or company giving insurance under the assessment principle was allowed to transact business in the Dominion of Canada, unless it deposited \$50,000. A number of associations have come into existence since that Act was passed. I may mention the Foresters, the United Order of Workmen, an organisation of the Masonic body, a large number of Roman Catholic organisations in different parts of the Dominion, especially in Ontario and Quebec, the Odd-fellows, the Sons of Temperance, the Commercial Travellers' Association, the Grangers, the Civil Service organisation, and others that practically, under the operation of the law, have been acting in violation of its conditions and provisions. There have also been representatives of associations and companies in the United States, who have been issuing policies, receiving money and taking risks upon the same principle since that period. It was found exceedingly difficult to take legal action against one of these without treating all who had, under the strict provisions of the law, violated it, in the same way, and there were many reasons why the Government thought that fraternal organisations such as I have named, that were incorporated either by the Local Legislatures or the Dominion of Canada and were doing business on the assessment principle, should not be subject to the law, but should be permitted to do business under certain conditions without making the deposit of \$50,000. The provisions of this Bill are intended to meet the case of such organisations, whose members are largely men in moderate circumstances, who perhaps could not pay up the sum required under the provisions in regard to regular insurance companies.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, I observe, has introduced a provision by which these various associations may carry on their business if they are licensed to do it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If they are registered.

Mr. BLAKE. And that registration is to be at the discretion of the Minister of Finance.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Of the Treasury Board, I think.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course there is the Superintendent and the Minister and the Board, but we understand who the ruling spirit is. It is therefore at the discretion of the Minister, without any principle of action being set forth upon which that discretion is to be exercised, that these associations are to be permitted to carry on their business. I think that a very objectionable provision indeed. I think the general principle upon which the decision is to be reached ought to be stated in the legislation, but there is no hint given in the Bill which is to guide the Minister in agreeing to or refusing to permit a registration.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Under the general Act the powers given are very considerable, and the Commissioner of Insurance has very large power in the matter. It would be upon his recommendation that action would be taken, but, as long as the inspection system continues under the Act of 1879 or under this Act, very considerable powers must be given to that officer, because it would be very largely on his report as to the condition of the company that the registration would be granted or refused. I do not know what conditions the hon. gentleman would introduce to

define the case in which the application should be accepted or rejected. It strikes me that it would be exceedingly difficult to do that. Our experience in the last few years has been that there have been organisations operating not so much in the Dominion but without the Dominion, with agents in the Dominion, companies or organisations authorised by the State Legislatures which have had representatives here transacting business, and that has not been found to be a safe or satisfactory plan. If we take any of those fraternal organizations such as I have named, I cannot see very well how any great difficulty can occur by requiring them to submit a statement of their rules and regulations and the conditions upon which the payments are to be made. They cannot vary very much, because all these organisations act on the principle that, on the death of one of the members, a certain sum must be paid. Of course, there might be some provision which it would be quite clear to the Inspector of Insurance could not be recognised, and he might not be able to recommend that the company should be registered. I do not, however, see how any conditions or terms can be stated in the Bill which will define what will authorise the parties to submit a statement of their affairs to be registered. There must be very considerable power in a matter of this kind given to the Inspector, and I do not see how we can introduce anything that would be definite, and at the same time would work satisfactorily.

Mr. MILLS. But if they are incorporated under a law of the Provinces?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These organisations must be incorporated either by the Provincial Legislatures or the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. MILLS. Do you propose to control the provincial incorporations?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Bill says that only those companies shall be registered which have been authorised either by the Local Legislatures or the Dominion Parliament.

Mr. CASEY. Does the hon. gentleman propose that the prohibition shall apply to companies incorporated under local Acts within any particular Province?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We do not propose to interfere with them at all.

Mr. MULOCK. If the hon. Minister of Finance could allow this Bill to stand over for a short time I know it would please some persons. I have had some communications from some bodies in connection with it, and their intention was to attend before the Minister, with a view of discussing the provisions of the Bill. I am not at present in possession of their arguments, and therefore I cannot present their case, but I know, from the communications that I have had, that some bodies have serious objections to the Bill. The particular bodies from which I have had communications are the Trade and Labor Council, and one of the orders the hon. Finance Minister has named. We are at a very early date of the Session, and the Bill has been a very short time before the House. It is true that it was introduced last year, but it was withdrawn, and was only distributed a week ago yesterday. It seems to me that the public interest would not suffer by the second reading being allowed to stand over.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may state to the hon. member that it is exactly the same Bill—not altered one word—that was introduced last Session. We had various deputations to the Government expressive of their views, and communications from many religious organisations in favor of the principles of this Bill. There were some objections raised to it because at the time parties were not in a position

to take advantage of it, but they represented that if it stood over for another year, they would be in a position to take advantage of its provisions. That was one reason why, at the close of last Session, these parties remonstrated against our enacting and passing the Bill then. Therefore, it was thought better to give these various organisations a year to put themselves in a position to come under the operations of the Bill. If there is any wish on the part of any number of hon. members of the House that the second reading should be deferred for a few days, there is no objection to allowing it to stand over.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the Minister propose referring it to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, or to pass it through Committee of the Whole House?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Through Committee of the Whole House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If that be the case I think it certainly had better stand over till later, because it is a question that involves a good deal of interest, and the Committee of the Whole House (with all due respect to that Committee) have not been at all in the habit of dealing with questions of this kind. I should think that the Committee on Banking and Commerce, to which, if I mistake not, all insurance Bills have been heretofore referred, would be the proper Committee to which to refer this matter, where it would be more convenient for the Minister himself to discuss it.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the hon. gentleman had better not take the Committee to-day, because it is really in the details that difficulty arises.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Very well, at the suggestion of the hon. member I move the second reading now, and then I will move its reference, so that we can discuss it with greater freedom.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Secretary of State of Canada, for the year ended 31st December, 1884.—(Mr. Chapleau.)

THE MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO.

Mr. ALLEN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 11) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario. He said: This is the same Bill that I introduced last year but I allowed it to stand over at the request of the right hon. the First Minister, who said he wished to consult the Minister of Justice about it. The Bill gives all creditors for a ship's supplies the first lien on the ship, and places parties who live in the Province in the same position under the Maritime Court as those who live in foreign countries. I find from my own experience, and from the large amount of correspondence I have received from various parts of the country, that both the owners of ships and steamboats, and the parties who furnish them supplies, are desirous that the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court should be so extended as to place all supplies within its provisions. I believe that ship-owners who are desirous of paying their honest debts, and of placing their officers who command the ship in a position to purchase the supplies and other necessaries from the best houses, on the best terms and at the lowest prices, are in favor of the extension of the Act in this direction. We know that many losses have been sustained by merchants who have supplied ships. When a ship comes into a port and the captain goes to a merchant for a supply of coal, for instance, the merchant is not aware that the vessel is mortgaged. There is no time to make an enquiry, and the merchant supplies hundreds of

dollars worth of coal, perhaps, and then he finds that the mortgagee claims control of the whole ship and refuses to pay for the supplies. The nominal owner is not in a position to pay the bill, and consequently these losses are sustained by those who supply the vessel. Now, Sir, in the interest of fair play, I think we ought to place the owners of ships in such a position that all supplies, as well as repairs, should be the first lien upon the ship. Same objection was raised by the inhabitants of Ireland some time ago, and we find that the jurisdiction of the Maritime Courts there was extended so as to reach every owner in all parts of the country except in the particular town where the owner resides, and where the supplies were furnished. That was a concession which added greatly to the advantage of merchants and ship-chandlers who supplied goods; and I believe the opinion of a large majority of ship-owners, captains, and officers and merchants will be found of the opinion that it would be in the interests of shipping and of justice and of our country at large to grant an extension of the maritime jurisdiction in Ontario, thus placing them in a position which I believe would be of advantage to all parties concerned. I hope the House will take the matter up in the spirit of justice and will ventilate the matter; if there is any objection let us hear it; but I believe such objections will not be found to prevent the House from unanimously deciding that this extension shall be granted.

Mr. LISTER. I think the Bill now under consideration should receive the approval of the House. What is asked by the promoter is, that those persons who supply goods or do repairs to ships belonging to people living and domiciled in this Province, shall have right of action against the property itself. Prior to 40th Vic., chap. 21, the Act of 1877, we had no law in this country by which an action could be brought against a vessel for anything. The maritime law only extended to the seaports where tide ebbs and flows. In that year the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake) introduced the Act which it is now sought to amend. That Act provided for and gave authority to the Government to establish in the Province of Ontario a Maritime Court, and it gave jurisdiction in all matters arising out of and connected with navigation on inland waters within Ontario, as the jurisdiction of the Vice-Admiralty Court extended to such cases without that Province. In order to get at the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court or Maritime Court of Ontario, it is necessary to refer to the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court as it existed in the Province of Quebec and other Provinces, that court being created by an Imperial Act, 26 Vic., chap. 24. It provides that the Vice-Admiralty Court shall have jurisdiction in case of seamen's wages, master's wages and disbursements on account of ship, pilotage, salvage, tonnage, damage done by ship, bottomry and respondentia bonds, claims between owners, claims for necessaries when no owner and part owner is domiciled within Ontario. It gives a right of action for every imaginable claim that the maritime law knows, except the case of goods supplied or repairs done to vessels, the owners of which reside in Ontario. If the owners reside out of the Province of Ontario, then the persons who furnished the supplies or did repairs shall have a remedy against the vessel; but if the owners or any of them reside in Ontario, there is no remedy against the vessel. The persons supplying the goods or doing the repairs are bound to seek redress from the owners of the vessel and not against the vessel itself. The ground on which that doctrine proceeds is, as laid down in the law books, that where the owners are resident within the country to which the vessel belongs the credit is supposed to have been given to the owner of the boat and not to the boat itself. I cannot see myself why that distinction should be made—why in cases where the Maritime Act provides for giving a right of action against the vessel it should stop there, and why persons who enhance

Mr. ALLEN.

the value of a vessel by repairing it or by enabling the owners of a boat to proceed on a voyage by supplying it with goods, should be debarred from bringing an action against the vessel itself. But such is the law, and the hon. gentleman who introduces this Bill seeks to remedy what I conceive to be a defect, by doing away with this distinction, and providing that those persons who supply goods and do repairs shall have the same remedy against the vessel as the persons to whom I have referred have for wages, and so on. I think this is but equitable and right. The vessel is augmented to the value of the repairs done, the owners of the boat get its value increased to that extent, and it is but equitable that the vessel should be responsible to the people who do those repairs. We know from experience, and it is a fact of every day occurrence, that ships receive supplies from merchants and others at the different ports on our lakes and rivers. It is the common impression among people that vessels are liable for everything supplied to them, and they do not receive knowledge as to what the law is until they come to recover for supplies furnished, when they ascertain that the vessel is not responsible, and in many instances they find that the owners are irresponsible persons from whom they can obtain nothing. I repeat that in my opinion this is not fair, equitable, or just, that the people who furnish supplies to vessels in order to enable vessels to proceed on their voyages, and from which the owners derive benefit, should not be placed on the same footing as persons mentioned in the Admiralty Act. We know that in many cases it is necessary to repair vessels, and as the law now stands the man who does the repairs, while he has a lien on the vessel, he has no power to enforce it, and unless Parliament confers on him the power asked in this Bill he will continue to remain in the same position as before. As I have stated this change will enable owners to prosecute their voyages easily, because whenever it is known that the vessel is responsible for whatever she receives, there will be no difficulty about obtaining credit. People do not stop to enquire as to who the owners are. A vessel may be divided into 64 shares, and the shareholders may be scattered all over the Dominion, and it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to recover judgment against them. They may be worthless financially. If they are worthless, they have reaped the benefit of the merchant's goods and the result of the workman's labor and can escape payment. Such is the position of the law to day, and that law should be changed. It may be said that it should not be changed because we follow the English law, because the Admiralty Court in England does not provide for a lien to supply men, and that therefore we should not pass such an Act here. I think that is no good argument against the Bill. If the vessel should be responsible for wages, towage, salvage and other claims, it logically follows that it should be responsible for any sort of claim that benefits the vessel, or facilitates its navigation or increases its value. I think, Sir, that is a logical conclusion, and therefore I say that for my part I can see no reason why this Bill should not become law because it is not the law in England. On looking at the laws of the United States—their laws being also based on the English law—I find that the matter has come before the Congress of that country. Only last year a Bill was introduced in the United States Congress almost identical in wording with this one, providing that the people doing work on vessels, and the supply men, should have a maritime lien. That Bill was referred to the Judicial Committee of Congress, and that Committee made a unanimous report, of which the following are the concluding words:—

"Your Committee entertain no doubt of the power of Congress to legislate upon these subjects, nor of the necessity of so framing the law as to secure uniformity of practice and the same right and priority of lien and remedies in all cases to material-man, without reference to the domicile of the vessel furnished with repairs or necessaries. They therefore report back a substitute for the Bill under consideration and recommend its passage."

In that report, as hon. gentlemen will observe, they see no reason why supply men should be placed in any less advantageous position than any other person entitled to a maritime lien; and I think the report of that Committee is a very strong reason why this House should take action in a matter of very great importance, not only to the shipping interests of the country but to the people who supply the ships. The reason that this matter came before Congress was that in some of the States of the Union the state laws provided that the supply men and the persons doing repairs should have a lien on the vessels, regardless of her domicile, and the laws of other states provided that there should be no lien if any of the owners or part owners left the state in which the work was done or the goods supplied, and in order to have uniformity, Congress took hold of the matter and the result was a reference to this committee and the adoption of this report to Congress. Now, although it is the law of England that where the owners live within England there shall be no lien, still I call your attention to the fact that the English law, so far as Ireland is concerned, is different. An Act has been passed in England by which the owners of vessels living in Ireland, if the goods are not supplied at the home port—and the home port is defined to be the port to which the vessel actually belongs—if the goods are supplied three miles from the home port, there is a lien. Now, if we had the same law here, if when the goods were supplied at any port except where the vessel is registered there should be a lien, it would be in accordance with the law of England affecting Ireland. I say, then, that in fact, and for all practical purposes, the law of England, so far as it extends to Ireland in this matter, gives to supply men and to persons making repairs a lien on the vessel, and if that is the law of Ireland, and if it is in the interests of all parties in the United States that that should be the law there, I submit, with all respect to this House, that it should be the law of this country. I say it is the imperative duty of the Government to introduce such legislation as this; and I say that to allow the law to go on as it is does a very great wrong to the merchants, ship-builders and workmen of this country. I repeat that injury is being done to the owners of vessels of the country, on account of the difficulty I have already adverted to, of being spread over the country—the difficulty at a critical time of being able to get necessities for their vessels, or to get their vessels repaired. If this Bill becomes law that difficulty will be swept out of existence, and no matter where a vessel may be it can be repaired and get the necessary supplies to carry on its voyage. I find, Sir, that in France, and in all the countries of Europe which have adopted the old Roman law, liens are given on vessels for every kind of material, supplies, or work done on them; and it is only in the United States, England and Canada that such a law does not exist. I think such a law is a fair and just one, and I trust it will receive the favorable consideration of this Parliament, and that the House will not prorogue until the Bill which my hon. friend has introduced has become the law of the land.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find that I have not with me the brief which I received from the hon. the Minister of Justice with respect to this measure. I am not at first sight inclined to oppose a second reading of the Bill, but it is a matter which must be carefully considered before it becomes the law of the land. I would like to know what is the opinion of the shipping interests in regard to it. The gentleman who introduced the Bill, and the gentleman who has just spoken so fully and ably on the matter, have stated that it is in the interests of the ship-owner, in order that he may get facilities which he otherwise would not have. I am not quite so sure from my recollection of former discussions on this subject that the ship-owners are in favor of it. I think that on the whole they were opposed to it;

that they believed that as a whole they can command sufficient credit without having any additional credit given to them by their property being seized for any debt big or little. I am strongly inclined to believe that they will be opposed to this Bill when its effect is considered by them. The only other question is, is it in the interests of the general public, the merchants, workmen, and others who supply vessels? The hon. gentleman quotes the report of the Judicial Committee of Congress on the measure, proving, as I understood him, a general lien for all matters of supply. One can quite understand that a specific lien for the repair of a vessel or the construction of a vessel should be dealt with by the Admiralty Court or the Maritime Court of Ontario; but I do not go with the hon. gentleman when he says we must follow it out to its logical consequence, and that all supplies must also be given to the vessel. Now, in effect this Bill applies only to the Maritime Court of Ontario, which is an inland Province with few or no vessels that ply on the ocean, and the effect of the Bill is simply to deprive the ordinary courts of law in Ontario of the rights of dealing with this subject, and to hand it over to the Maritime Court. The reason for depriving the ordinary courts established for dealing with all subjects of litigation, of jurisdiction over claims arising out of granting supplies to vessels, ought to be very clear before that course is taken. If I remember rightly, when this measure was before Parliament on a previous occasion, the ship-owners opposed it on the ground that their vessels were liable to seizure at the most inconvenient time, the remedy being *ad rem*, and that they themselves were liable to heavy damages occasionally. For instance, we will suppose a line of steamers running from the extreme west to Montreal, which are advertised to perform the journey within a particular time, and to call at particular ports. The shipowners allege that the indiscretion of a purser, or a captain, or a steward, might lead to the seizure of a vessel *in transitu*, just before or just after leaving a port. The voyage might thus be interrupted on account of a claim which is a false one, which the owner disputes; and he says his vessel may be seized, a voyage may be lost, his contracts as a common carrier may be all broken, and he may be liable to an infinity of damages by the seizure of the vessel. That, I think, was the line taken by some of the ship-owners when this subject was discussed, as it has been several times, before. For these reasons I would call the attention of the House, especially of all those gentlemen who represent constituencies in Ontario which contain ports or harbors, and of all those especially who are interested in the shipping and transport service of the Province of Ontario, to the importance of the subject. I shall not object to the second reading of this Bill, but I would ask the hon. gentleman not to press its further progress after this discussion, short as it is, and I suppose instructive as it ought to be to the public, until the ship-owners and the great transport navigation companies, whose vessels ply on our waters, shall have an opportunity of directing their attention to the subject, and having the Bill fully discussed before it becomes law.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the suggestion of the hon. gentleman is an extremely reasonable one, that the Bill should be read a second time, and then stand over for a considerable time until all parties interested should have an opportunity of being heard. I speak with a somewhat dim recollection of the precise reasoning which led me to take the view I did on this subject on a previous occasion; but as well as I remember, the view I took was this: that whatever may be the civil law with reference to liens, in other countries which adopt the old Roman law—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They had no foreign navigation.

Mr. BLAKE. Yet, the principle of the lien is one which has been gradually drafted on to the English law, and its application is not confined to maritime affairs only. But the lien on supplies is one of an altogether artificial statutory creation. Where this lien was created, if I remember rightly, it was created not on the theory that it was just to the supplies of this particular class of goods to give them a lien which the suppliers of no other class of goods possess, but that it was in the interest of the navigator that the supplies should be obtained; but because he was away so long outside of the jurisdiction of the courts, and because his voyage might be for nothing, and even damage might be sustained, there was no absolute certainty, without the vessel being held, that the goods would be paid for. I believe that was the reason the lien was extended to this class of supplies in the English law, and we just applied it here. We have been extending the application of the principle of the lien in other cases in the Province of Ontario. Whether we should extend that principle in this case to the supplies, no matter whether the domicile of the owner be within or without the Province, is a matter I think open to fair argument and consideration. The interests of both parties are fairly to be considered. With reference to the remark of the hon. gentleman that this measure was ousting the jurisdiction of the civil courts in Ontario, I do not think that will be the case. I think the Maritime Court has a limited jurisdiction, and there will still remain the right of application to the ordinary courts of the Province.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no doubt that the jurisdiction of the courts *in personam* still remains notwithstanding the passage of this Bill. But apart from the merits of this Bill altogether, I think the Government ought to consider the propriety of a thorough change in our maritime law, in the direction of simplifying the proceedings of the court, and lessening the costs. In 1882 the late Deputy Minister of Justice addressed a circular to those members of the legal profession who were practising in the Maritime Court and to business men, ship-owners and others, informing them that complaints had been made to the Government of the complicated nature of the machinery and the enormous expense incurred in enforcing the law, and asking their opinion as to the propriety of changes. I believe the Deputy Minister was inundated with answers, all pointing in one direction. Now, one can easily understand that. We have two or three statutes on this subject, the original Act and the amendments, and I think there are something like 265 rules of the Maritime Court; and the expenses, as any person who practices in that court knows, are simply scandalous and outrageous. I believe there is no court established in this country in which the costs are so large as they are in the Maritime Court. I think I gave the House an illustration of that in 1882. I mentioned one case, the case of the *Josephine*, in which the claim was a comparatively small one, and the costs to the plaintiff alone exceeded \$350. In another case, that of the *Isaac May*, the costs on one side amounted to \$700 and on the other side to \$750, to enforce a claim of something like \$250. This subject is well worthy of the consideration of the Government, and, if the Act is to be carried out properly, they ought at the earliest possible moment to devote their attention to the necessity of simplifying the proceedings and lessening the costs. There is no reason, in my judgment, why a claim under a hundred dollars, for instance, for a seaman's wages should not be sued for in precisely the same way as you sue for a claim in the Division Court, at about the same expense, and with as simple a proceeding. The same judge could enforce both claims because the judge of the County Court is, I think, in all cases, the judge of the Maritime Court. Instead of having nearly three hundred rules to guide and direct the

Mr. BLAKE.

profession in the working out of this Act and instead of entailing enormous expense by cumbersome proceedings, there is no reason why the rules and proceedings should not be much more simple and much less costly. I know of a case in which the claim was for \$102 and in which the costs on both sides amounted to over \$500. The hon. gentleman will, I think, admit that this is a scandal of the worst possible kind and that it ought to be rectified. The Government were alive to the necessity of this in 1882, but I am not aware that they have taken any action in that direction since. In 1882 I introduced a Bill in this House to simplify the proceedings in the Maritime Court and in cases in which the claims were under \$200, to place them somewhat on the same basis as those before the Division Court, giving the judge power to decide them in a summary way and in like manner as ordinary civil cases before the Division Court. The measure did not receive much consideration at the hands of the Government, and the matter was dropped. In moving for papers in 1882, I discussed this matter in the House and the hon. the First Minister then admitted the necessity of some immediate and radical change being made in our whole maritime law, and I suppose it was in virtue of the assurance the hon. the First Minister then gave that the circular to which I adverted, sent out by the Deputy Minister of Justice, was issued. I am not aware that the Government have done anything in the matter since, but I trust they will give their attention in this direction. As to the present Bill, I must say I was always opposed to a maritime lien. I never could understand the reason why one class of creditors should be put on a better footing than another class. I have always opposed the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court in that direction, namely, giving one class of creditors a preference over others. However, Parliament took a different view, and passed an Act giving a maritime lien. Now, it does not appear to me that a man who had a vessel towed, or the seamen, or the other parties entitled to the maritime lien under the Vice-Admiralty Act of England, should have this preference over a man, for instance, who has made repairs to the vessel which may have been of the first possible consequence to the owner, who, without them, could not have prosecuted his maritime venture successfully. I can see no earthly reason logically why he should not be entitled to a maritime lien. I agree to some extent with the hon. the First Minister that the man who furnishes the supplies may be in a somewhat different position, but where a vessel is damaged by a storm such as those which often occur on our lakes it becomes a matter of the first necessity that the vessel should be repaired promptly. The repairs cannot be delayed, they must be done at once, and I see some strong reasons why, in so far as the repairs are concerned, the laborer or the mechanic who does them should be entitled to his maritime lien. I rose, however, more particularly to draw the attention of the Government to the question of costs, and I trust the hon. the First Minister will see the necessity of dealing with this question promptly.

Mr. MITCHELL. I listened with a good deal of attention to the remarks of the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) and I must say I entirely agree with every proposition he has advanced. I think it is unnecessary to repeat the arguments he has given, but will say this that the present Admiralty law is a great burden to the shipping interest of this country, and to the foreign vessels visiting this country. The machinery is cumbersome, full of delays, and the administration very imperfect, in my opinion, and I have had some little experience to my cost. I quite agree this is a matter which ought to be taken hold of by the Government. They ought to take up the whole question of the laws regulating our shipping and the remedies for claims against shipping, and deal with it from a Government standpoint. While I have no objection to

this Bill, I must say that I agree with the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) that there is a distinction to be made between the laborer who performs work and expends his time upon the ship in doing work which may be a matter of necessity to do in order to keep that ship afloat, which may be of vital importance to prevent her being delayed, or it may be a question of her being frozen up or something of the kind—it may be necessary, I say, in that case to give a lien, but I certainly would not give any advantage to the trader who supplies a vessel with goods when the resident owner is within reach of the civil law. I think in dealing with the change in the Admiralty laws of this country we ought to bring them more in accord with the laws in civil courts; the same speed and simplicity ought to be applied in maritime as in civil cases and the Admiralty Courts done away with altogether.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I remember quite well the statement by the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) as to the excessive costs in particular cases. I am informed, however, that by the rules of the court just now the costs cannot exceed \$10 on any claim under \$100. That will cover, I suppose, most of the claims.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). That is at the discretion of the judge.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

HOLES IN ICE ON FREQUENTED WATERS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton) moved that Bill (No. 22) to amend the criminal law and to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes cut in the ice on navigable or frequented waters, be read the second time. He said: This Bill has been before the House on two or three occasions, and I believe it is very well understood; and if I am to judge from the expressions I have heard in the House on its introduction on several occasions, it meets with the approbation of every hon. member. I believe, however, the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Hall) proposes to move an amendment of which he has given notice to add to the Bill by making it apply to holes in abandoned quarries, and as I have no objection to that I hope my hon. friend is in a position to move it now. I do not wish the Bill to lie over, as it may meet the fate it has on other occasions, because when the ice goes away people do not see any necessity for the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

OTTAWA RIVER SURVEY.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew) asked, Whether a report has been submitted to the Department of Public Works of the survey and exploration made by Mr. Guerin, C.E., of that part of the Ottawa River between Mattawa and the head of Lake Temiscamingue, during the past summer; if so, whether and when the said report will be laid before the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The survey and exploration had been made by Mr. Guerin, Civil Engineer, by order of the Department of Public Works on that part of the Ottawa River between Mattawa and the head of Lake Temiscamingue during the past summer. The report has just been made, and I think it was brought in to-day, but it will not be ready to lay before the House for some time. The Chief Engineer must examine it and then report to me. I hope the hon. gentleman will before the Session is over call my attention again to the matter in order that it may not be again forgotten.

THE AWARD TO THE CONTRACTORS FOR SECTION B.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, my reason for moving for the opinion of counsel taken in regard to this matter is contained primarily in some remarks made by Sir Charles Tupper in discussing this item on the estimates of last year. Being asked why the item of \$395,000 was put in the Estimates for an award to these contractors he explained that the award had been made by two of the arbitrators only, and that the award was made for claims that the Government had always resisted and considered that they should still resist, that they had consistently declined to give the least color to the claims of the contractors for damages in these particulars, and that he was not satisfied yet that the award made by two out of three arbitrators was perfectly valid, or might not at least be appealed against. "But," he said:

"We think it prudent to take the vote; but at this moment the matter has been referred to the Department of Justice, and, as the amount is a large one and greatly exceeded that which the Government considers they should claim, by any possibility, it is proposed, before paying the award, to take the opinions of the ablest counsel at the command of the Government, who will carefully examine the whole question. If it is considered it is an award from which we should appeal, from which there is a prospect of appealing with success, the appeal will be had. If, on the other hand, we are advised, after the best opinions we can obtain, that it would be hopeless to appeal, that there is no prospect of successfully appealing, then this money will be paid."

I was informed by the hon. the Acting Minister of Railways the other day that the Government had taken the opinion of counsel and had been advised to pay the money, and the money was paid. I consider that it will be interesting to the House to obtain a copy of the opinion given, and I should have added a copy of the case submitted to the counsel. I hope the hon. the Minister will allow me to amend the motion in that sense before putting it in, so as to obtain a copy of the case submitted for opinion to the counsel who was actually consulted, as well as the opinion given by him upon that case. I think it important to have a copy of the case, because I find in the agreement submitted to the arbitrators there were special provisions for an appeal. It was agreed, in the first place, that arbitration should be had and that two of the three arbitrators should be competent to make an award, but this proviso was put in:

"And it is further agreed that this agreement of reference may be made a rule of one of the Divisional Courts of the High Court of Justice for Ontario if the said court should so please, and further, that in the event of either of the said parties hereto disputing the validity of the said award or moving in a said Divisional Court of the said High Court to set the same or any part thereof aside, or in any other event, the said Division of the said court or any judge of the High Court of Justice shall have power at any time, to remit the matters hereby referred, or any or either of them, to the reconsideration and redetermination of the said arbitrators, and with and upon and subject to such directions, powers and terms as to the said court or judge may seem proper, and that the provisions of the Common Law Procedure Act and of the Judicature Act and any other Act in force in the Province of Ontario applicable to arbitrations shall apply to this arbitration."

I notice, therefore, that not only was there provision for a possible appeal against the award, but for an order being made by one of the Ontario courts for recommitment to the arbitrators, not only in case of an appeal against the validity but "in any other event," which would certainly cover the case where the Government considered the award, though it might be legally valid, was not in itself a just award. I think, therefore, that the case submitted to the counsel should have covered the question not only whether two out of the three arbitrators were competent to give an award, but whether the award itself was just and consistent with the evidence laid before them and the premises upon which the case was founded. I think if the Department were advised by counsel or themselves believed without the advice

of counsel that the award was unfair, that anything had been omitted in the conduct of the case, which, if not omitted might have obtained a more favorable verdict for the Government, they should have taken advantage of this provision to secure under an order of one of the Ontario courts a new trial before the arbitrators. Of course, I do not know whether they took advantage of the provision to have this agreement of reference made a rule of one of the divisional courts of Ontario. If they did not, I suppose the section might not apply, but it was their duty to have done so in order that they might have an opportunity of appealing after the award was made. I consider that the Government should have taken every possible step to have this award appealed against under the provisions of the agreement without recourse to the advice of counsel at all. Sir Charles Tupper told us that the claims presented by the contractors were by him considered invalid. In the first place, they claimed that they should be recouped because they did not gain access to their contract as early as they expected, because the contract on Section 15 was not completed as early as had been agreed upon with the Government, and secondly they claimed damages because the amount of work to be done by them was reduced and they had not as great opportunities to make money as they expected. Upon both those grounds, Sir Charles Tupper thought they had no valid claim. Under these circumstances the Government ought to have fought this matter to the bitter end by all legal means at their disposal. The fact that this was not done, the fact that it was deemed necessary to obtain the opinion of counsel to shelter the action of the Government behind that opinion shows either a desire to shirk the responsibility or a desire to have the action of the arbitrators passed over quietly and the contractors paid the amount. Perhaps \$395,000 is not a very large amount to us now, accustomed as we are to deal with millions and tens of millions every Session, but the people of Canada will consider this amount an important one and will require more information in regard to it. I, therefore, propose the motion of which I have given notice, amended in the sense I have mentioned, if I am allowed to do so. I move for:

Copy of case submitted to counsel and opinion given by counsel consulted by the Government as to the validity of the award of damages to contractors for Section B, Canadian Pacific Railway, and as to the action that should be taken in reference to such award.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—SECTION B.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copy of separate report or finding of Judge Clarke one of the arbitrators on the claims for damages of contractors for Section B, Canadian Pacific Railway, in regard to such claims or to the award in reference thereto signed by Messrs. Brydges and Light, the other arbitrators.*

He said: It will be remembered that Judge Clarke was the arbitrator appointed by the Government on this arbitration. It appears from the award that all the arbitrators concurred in the first award sent in, namely, as to what should be allowed the contractors in regard to the classification of the work; but only two arbitrators, Mr. Brydges, the contractors' arbitrator, and Mr. Light, the umpire appointed by Chief Justice Ritchie, of the Supreme Court, concurred in the second award which gave this lump sum of \$395,600 for damages in regard to the claims to which I referred when speaking to the last motion. That Judge Clarke did make some report to the Government we have the evidence of Sir Charles Tupper in debate last Session, when he admitted that Judge Clarke had written a letter on the subject; and he quoted, to the best of my recollection, some figures from it as follows: That \$275,000 of this lump sum was allowed the contractors on account of delay in completing section 15, and the other \$120,000 was allowed to them in regard to their losses by not

Mr. CASEY.

having as much work to do as they would have had under the original contract. When asked by my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) as to whether he would lay that letter on the Table, he stated that on looking at it again he found it to be marked private, and he was advised that one of three arbitrators had no right to make a separate report when it was agreed that two could make a valid award; that therefore he could not make any further use of the letter of Judge Clarke, that he could not lay it on the Table, but he would not retract the statements he had made as to the contents of said letter. Now, Sir, I am not a lawyer, but I think I will be borne out by the opinion of hon. gentlemen on this side who are lawyers, in the assertion that it is rather a strange contention that the Government's own nominee on an arbitration of this kind has no right to make a separate report to the Government in regard to the matters of fact decided by that arbitration. If such is the etiquette in such matters I am sure that etiquette ought to be changed. But I am not at all satisfied that such is the etiquette; I am not at all sure that Sir Charles Tupper was a good enough lawyer to be absolutely sure of what was the legal etiquette in such cases. But at all events the report was made, and even if it must be considered private in the first instance, which I do not admit, it could nevertheless be made public by obtaining the consent of Judge Clarke to its publication—a consent which he ought to be ready to give as a representative of the Government upon this arbitration. It is all the more necessary that he should have made such a report, and that his report should have been made public, because the award itself is in the vaguest and most indefinite terms. The first award, as I have said, goes into some details. It declares that so many yards of work which were classified as loose rock should have been classified as solid rock; that so many yards of work classified as earth should have been classified as loose rock. On these figures the total amount of the award was made up in the Department of Railways itself, taking the contract prices and applying them to the quantities established by the arbitration. The second award, however, relating to the far larger and more important part of the question at issue, after reciting what had already been done, simply says:

"We award and determine that there is due and payable by Her Majesty to the said contractors, for and in respect to the claims and matters in difference between the parties so referred to us and not taken into consideration in our said former award, the sum of \$395,600 which sum we direct shall be paid to the contractors forthwith."

There is nothing in this award to show how much is for damages on account of delay, how much for reduction of work, and how much for other claims submitted; and I shall point out later on, that there are various other large and indefinite claims also submitted, to which no reference is made at all. I claim that the Government had a right to know—and, if the Government knows, the House has a right to know—to what particular claims that award referred—how much of it was for delay, how much of it was caused by reduction in the amount of work to be done under the contract, etc. This last item is particularly important because it arises out of the conduct of the Government themselves. They directed the reduction of the work to be done, they permitted delay on contract 15, and if damages have been incurred on account of their action, it should appear in the award and we should be made aware of it. I hope the hon. Minister will not only agree to bring down this report, but that he will now favor us with some verbal explanations. He told us the other night he could not carry in his head a lot of figures about these matters, but it is very easy to carry them in one's pocket; and I am sure he has had sufficient notice of this motion to have procured figures from the officers of his Department, and he ought now to be able to read them to us, as he read them to us the other evening from that paper.

Mr. POPE. I have no objection to bring down all the papers we have. I am sure we have no report.

Mr. BLAKE. We know that the Government have a paper from Judge Clark giving his views on this matter, because we heard the hon. gentleman's predecessor say so across the floor of the House last Session. He announced the fact to us and communicated to us a portion of its contents. Subsequently he said it was private, and he did not propose to bring it down; but no motion was made to bring it down. The question is now raised. I maintain that Judge Clark could not, with propriety, give a private communication, on an occasion when he was acting in a judicial capacity. I maintain that he was bound to make a report to the Government; and if he made it, it must be produced; that there are no grounds on which it can be withheld from this House. It was suggested by the hon. member that something had been said as to there being no power in one of three arbitrators to make a minority report. The validity of a minority report is one thing, but the capacity to make the statement is another. If you take the two greatest arbitrations of modern times, in each of those there was a minority report. If you take the Geneva Arbitration on the Alabama claims, Chief Justice Cockburn made a minority report. If you take the Fisheries Arbitration at Halifax, Mr. Kellogg made a minority report. There is no physical and no legal difficulty in a man who is a minority making a statement on the grounds on which he dissents. But that there is no difficulty we know, because it has been done. We have it stated that this third arbitrator actually made the statement, that it is in writing and is in the hands of the hon. gentleman opposite. I say as regards the paper which we are told was in the hands of the Government and which contained Judge Clark's views with reference to this matter, it is not only desirable that it be produced, but its production cannot without impropriety be refused.

Mr. POPE. I understand that; but I put it to hon. members whether it is right, after I have stated there is no report in the Department, that an hon. gentleman should rise and tell me that I have it. I say there is nothing of the kind in the Department. I enquired and was told there was no minority report. I will bring down everything which is in the Department relating to the matter, but do not let the hon. gentleman get up and try and cram things down my throat. I will meet the wishes of the hon. gentleman in every way I can, but he cannot make me give information I have not got.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways, if he be the Acting Minister of Railways, to the fact that this document which we ask for was publicly quoted by his predecessor, as has been stated twice. Surely a document that was publicly quoted by the Minister of Railways, in reply to an attack on his Department, is in existence. If it is not in existence and has been destroyed, we know the conclusion to draw. It is quite possible if the Acting Minister knows nothing about it, a cable might be addressed to Sir Charles Tupper asking what he had done with it. It was a document of far too great importance to be lightly put aside. It was a document we ought to have, for we have paid enough for it in all conscience. To Judge Clark, according to the report of the Auditor General, \$7,250, a sum larger than the salary of the Minister, was paid last year for three different services, one as County Judge, one as arbitrator in this very matter, \$1,200; and an amount of \$4,000 odd as member of the Intercolonial Commission. I say that that gentleman had no right to make a private report. The Minister had no right whatever to quote from that document unless he and his colleagues were prepared to lay it on the Table of the House. I do not know whether the Acting Minister was present on the occasion; if he was not present he can con-

sult the *Hansard*, and he will see that his predecessor referred to the document in question. There can be no impropriety, so far as I can see or imagine, in desiring the production of such a document, and if such is the case, Ministers cannot object to bring it down.

Mr. POPE. I can only repeat what I stated a few moments ago that every single paper we have touching this matter will be brought down; but I will not undertake to make papers.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the Acting Minister telegraph to the late Minister?

Mr. POPE. No; I do not think I will.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Then it is quite clear the hon. gentleman does not want to give the information. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I am not surprised that the hon. gentlemen should seek to shelter themselves under the statement that certain documents may be private, and therefore cannot be brought down. We had the same story yesterday, and no doubt we shall have it to-morrow; and Parliament is to be turned into a gathering for the convenience of hon. gentlemen and to pass their measures, instead of being the grand inquest of the nation for the transaction of public business.

Mr. MILLS. The arbitrator who dissented from the majority of the arbitrators in this matter was the arbitrator appointed by the Government, and it would be a most extraordinary circumstance if the arbitrator appointed by the Government, dissenting from the views of the other arbitrators, should not have communicated to the Government formally the grounds of his dissent. We find the cases to which the hon. member for West Durham has referred—the case of the Geneva Award Lord Cockburn, who dissented from the views of the other arbitrators, entered into an elaborate discussion of the reasons of his dissent. He stated fully and explicitly, in a document submitted to the Government which appointed him, the reasons why he could not approve of the conclusions at which the majority of the arbitrators had arrived. This course was followed also by Mr. Kellogg in the matter of the Fisheries Arbitration. And certainly the arbitrator appointed by the Dominion Government in this matter in question would have been derelict in his duty if he had failed to communicate to the Administration how it was that he could not agree with the conclusions reached by his colleagues. They made a report, they stated what their award was, and it is clear that Judge Clark must have communicated to the Government the grounds of his dissent from the conclusions reached by the majority of the arbitrators. In fact, what we would reasonably expect, we were informed, actually did take place. We were informed by the hon. Minister of Railways last year, who was then in his place, that Judge Clark did communicate to him the grounds of his dissent. That communication is a public document. It is not for Judge Clark to express his dissenting opinion in private any more than it is for a judge upon the bench to do so. It is his business as a public official charged with a public duty to state how it was that he could not agree with the conclusions reached by the majority of the arbitrators. We know that such a communication was addressed to the hon. Minister of Railways on the part of Judge Clark, as it was his duty to address such a communication, and the representatives of the people in Parliament are entitled to know what the conclusions of Judge Clark were. If there is any duty devolving upon the House of Commons more than another it is to control the public expenditure of the country. This is a charge upon the public treasury, and the public, through their representa-

tives, are entitled to the fullest information upon the subject.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. minister says he will not give any information which he does not possess. We do not expect he will; or at all events that he will make a practice of doing so, although we have sometimes had information from Ministers, the sources of which we could not exactly trace, and respecting which we were almost inclined to imagine they had done as an Irish wit said another gentleman had done, viz.: that he depended upon his imagination for his facts and his memory for his wit. We have had occasion to suppose sometimes that Ministers depended on a similar source for their information and their facts; but I quite acquit the Minister of Railways of any intention to give us any information drawn from that source with regard to Section B. This is not an imaginative matter; it is a question of hard cash—of dollars and cents—in which the country will be deeply interested, and they will not accept any imaginary statement, or any quibbles as to the production of facts or information which really exists. Now if the hon. gentleman has not that information we want to know where it has gone. We know that it was in the Department last year; Sir Charles Tupper said so and we know it was there. We know that he quoted from it in the first place without hesitation, and that thereby he made it a public document, but afterwards he professed to think that it was not a public document and that he had been breaking all sorts of legal and social rules of etiquette by quoting from a private communication from Judge Clark, with reference to a matter involving \$396,000, in reference to which Judge Clark had been the accredited arbitrator for the Government. Sir Charles Tupper knows, at all events, what has become of that information, and the Acting Minister has been reminded that he could ascertain from Sir Charles Tupper what has become of it, simply by sending a cable message. We know that considerable sums amounting to thousands of dollars have been spent for telegraphic messages by the Government, though we do not know for what purpose, and yet forsooth the country is too poor to telegraph to Sir Charles Tupper for important information as to what became of this \$396,000? It is not because the country cannot afford it that he will not telegraph; it is simply because he knows what was in that paper and because it is something which he does not want to bring to the House. I do not state that as a matter of positive knowledge but as the only conclusion which we can draw from the facts. We know that Sir Charles Tupper quoted from the paper, and then withdrew it on the plea of its being private, that his successor declared that it disappeared from the Department, and also declared that he would not try to ascertain what has become of it. What other conclusion can we draw from these facts? We believe—and we believe the country will believe—that that paper has been got away with in some fashion because there was something in it damaging to the Government, or to the claims of their particular friends the contractors for Section B.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copy of the claim put in by the contractors for section B on which the award to them of \$395,500 was based.

He said: This is something which really should have been included in the return for which I moved last year, as part of an Order which passed the House on March 28th, 1884, asking for:

"A copy of any award or report made by the arbitrators appointed to settle claims of contractors for section B, Canadian Pacific Railway; a statement of all sums paid in consequence of such award; also, statement of claims submitted by said contractors before said arbitrators; also, statement as to which items of said claims are still undecided by said arbitrators."

Mr. MILLS.

One of these has not been brought down, and I have accordingly put a notice on the paper; but if the Minister will say that he will bring it down without the motion I will not press it, though I wish at present to urge the reasons why it should be brought down. There is nothing in the documents before us to show what was submitted to the arbitrators. We have been discussing the award as if we knew what had been submitted. Sir Charles Tupper discussed it last Session as if he knew what had been submitted; I have been talking about it to-day as if I knew, and we have been talking as if the Acting Minister of Railways knew, but though we may have an idea as to the general nature of the claims put in, I find that there is no specific agreement in writing, or none brought to the House, at all events, as to what was submitted to the arbitrators. An Order in Council was passed on the 28th March, 1881, declaring that the matters and claims in dispute between the Government and the arbitrators might at some future date, when the Government might consider the work sufficiently advanced to justify such action, be submitted to arbitration. A subsequent Order was passed on the 2nd day of April, 1883, about something. That Order is referred to in the agreement from which I quoted a short time ago, but it is not quoted in detail, and the Order itself is not amongst these papers. The agreement says that the matters and claims referred to in that Order in Council should also be submitted. Perhaps it is private and confidential, for if a report of an engineer to the Government is a private and confidential communication, I suppose an Order in Council may sometimes be so too. Then there was another Order in Council of the 20th of November, 1883, declaring that the time had come to submit this matter to arbitration, and appointing Judge Clark the Government arbitrator. On looking at the agreement for the arbitration, I find that it states:

"And whereas, by an Order in Council, dated the twenty-eighth day of March, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one, authority was given for a reference of these claims of the said contractors to the arbitration of three arbitrators, one of whom should be chosen by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and one by the contractors, the third to be chosen by the other two, or in accordance with the arbitration clauses of the common law procedure Act of Ontario, and that such reference should be made whenever the Government might consider the work sufficiently advanced to justify such action, but to be in no way taken as an admission of the validity of the claims.

"And whereas, by a certain other Order in Council, dated the second day of April, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-three, it was provided that all claims and matters in difference between the contractors and Her Majesty, arising out of the work done under the said contract, should be referred to the arbitration provided for by the Order in Council of the twenty-eighth day of March, in the year of Our Lord one thousand eight hundred and eighty-one.

"And whereas the contractors have represented to the Government that they are now prepared to submit their claims to the special arbitration authorised by the said Orders in Council, in respect to the three following items: 'Loose rock,' 'rock outside of the prism or slopes of the cuttings,' and 'cross-logging.'

"And whereas by an Order in Council of the twentieth day of November instant (1883), it is authorised that the claim of the Government against the contractors for the use and hire of rolling stock, &c., amounting to the sum of \$57,539.37, be also referred to the said arbitration as a counter claim, to be dealt with at the same time that the questions of 'loose rock,' 'rock outside of the prism,' and 'cross-logging' are considered, and that the said Government claims, together with the three items before named, be first considered and awarded on."

Then it goes on to provide further:

"It is hereby agreed that the said arbitrators shall first consider and award on the following items or matters in difference, namely, 'loose rock,' 'rock outside the prisms or slopes of the cuttings,' and 'cross-logging,' and the counter claim of the Government above referred to, and that the said arbitrators may from time to time make their award and awards in writing as aforesaid, on the above mentioned matters, and on all other matters in difference hereby referred, until they have finally awarded upon and disposed of all the matters hereby referred."

Now the question is, what are the "all other matters" thereby referred? They are not stated in the agreement of submission. We have no statement of the claims submitted to arbitration and the only hint of them was in a letter written to the Government

by the contractors before the first Order in Council was passed, in which they stated a large number of claims. They wrote on the date of the 7th of January, 1881, a letter which covers several pages of this book. In the letter, there are a large number of very vague and indefinite claims, which they boil down into a few proposition, at the end of the letter :

"That we claim the Government are in default in not giving us means of access by rail over section No. 15, within a reasonable time after the 1st of July, 1879; that in that respect the contract is broken on the part of the Government, and we are entitled to all the damages sustained thereby.

"That we are, subject to such claims for damages, ready and willing to go on with and complete the contract in the manner agreed, both as to rock-borrowing and the making of embankments, within the time limited in that behalf; and we have no doubt, having regard to the preparations we have made, of our ability to do so.

"We decline to assume the responsibility of building the structures now designed and handing them over as part of a complete road bed, and in any event it would be out of our power to obtain the proper timbers therefor, or to do such work at the prices provided for pile driving in the schedule."

And so on at some length. They have a very poor opinion evidently of the work as designed latterly by the Government. They say, in more than one place, that they are afraid of taking the responsibility of putting up such a flimsy work as the Government has ordered to be done on that part of the road; they are afraid it will fall to pieces. I have referred to the only specifications we have that were submitted to the arbitrators. The agreement which I have read from is the only thing I can find in the nature of a legal submission at all; and I submit to the hon. members and to the lawyers in this House, whether that amounts to a legal submission, or whether under that vague submission the arbitrators had not the latitude of enquiring into almost everything connected with the contract without the legal authority of deciding on anything. I believe, and I am backed up by the opinion of lawyers to whom I have talked on the matter, that there was no legal submission, that the whole affair was irregular and illegal, and that for this reason there was the best reason for appealing against the award of the two arbitrators. If the hon. Minister will bring down a copy of the claim submitted to the arbitrators, it will perhaps throw some light on the matter. I will also amend this motion, by consent, by asking for that missing Order in Council of the 2nd of April, 1883. I am informed by my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) that it was promised last year.

Motion as amended agreed to.

STAFF COMMANDER BOULTON.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for :

Report of the Auditor-General and also of one McGee, as well as for all papers, letters, accounts, cheques and newspapers connected with any claim of Staff Commander Bolton against the Department of Marine and Fisheries or the Government, for any amount of money which he alleges to be due him for salary or otherwise, or which he asserts has been withheld from him, or in relation to any dispute between said Bolton and any officer of the Marine and Fisheries Department, in regard to cheques drawn in favor of said Bolton.

He said : In connection with this resolution I desire to say that some irregularity, if I am correctly informed, has taken place in the Department to which this refers. It appears that Staff Commander Bolton who has been in charge of a party sent out for the purpose of making a survey of Georgian Bay, was furnished with amounts from time to time on account of salary and expenses, and it appears that cheques were forwarded to him for these amounts payable to his order. If I am correctly informed, cheques were also drawn not payable to his order, and of the issue of which he was not aware until he returned. I believe that on his return he found, on enquiring at the Department, that his account was in arrears or overdrawn, and after some investigation it was found that some of the cheques which ought to have been for-

warded to him for endorsement were not forwarded; that the word "order" was erased and "bearer" inserted, the cheque cashed, and the money charged against his account in the Department without his being made aware of it. I understand that the question was submitted to the Auditor-General, who made a report on the matter, in which he stated that Mr. Tilton, who was then accountant to the Department, was indebted to Mr. Bolton for the sum of \$307, and required him to refund him that amount. I do not wish to cast any reflection upon any officer of the Department by any means; I only wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that apparently an improper action or an irregularity has occurred. I certainly think that in the payment of parties for services performed, the cheques in all cases, without exception, should be made payable to order, and the endorsement of the party to whom they are made payable should be procured before the money is drawn. It appears that in this case this was not done. If Mr. Tilton claims he acted for Mr. Bolton in having the word "order" erased and the word "bearer" substituted, I contend he acted improperly, because I hold that it is decidedly wrong that any person in charge of any duty connected with any Department should be permitted to act as the agent, in any capacity, of any person doing business with the Department. Whether the statute makes any such provision I know not, but if it do not it should; it should provide that no servant in any Department be permitted to act as the agent of any other person. It appears this transpired some time in 1883. Since this has transpired and before it was fully cleared up—the papers possibly will show the date it was cleared up and the refund made—Mr. Tilton has been removed from the position of accountant and made Deputy Minister of Fisheries. It is rather singular, in my opinion, that while a charge of that kind hung over the head of an important officer, the head of the Department should so overlook this charge that he promoted the officer in question to the position of Deputy Minister, before a satisfactory settlement had been come to in regard to this irregularity. I cannot understand why it was done. Certainly no business man would act thus with any one in his employ under similar circumstances; certainly no business man would take one of his employees, who was under suspicion, out of a lower and place him in a higher position until such time as a very satisfactory explanation had been given of the charge made. I do not know what the explanations were that may have been made to the hon. Minister before he made this change, but the fact remains that such irregularities were transacted, that he took that servant out of his position and put him in a higher one, while the servant was charged with that crime, if it may be called a crime. The proceeding appears to be a very strange one. It looks as though the Minister were compelled to make the change, as though he were under the power of his employee, because certainly, in ordinary circumstances, the natural course to be adopted towards an employee guilty of such an irregularity would be to dispense with his services. The fact is, that in place of permitting him on probation to occupy the position he then held, he is taken out of that position, put into a higher and more lucrative one, a position of greater trust, and yet, under the circumstances, the imputation with which he stood charged before the Department is not cleared up or satisfactorily explained. This is the reason I have for moving for all these papers. I hope that when they come before the House I may find that the representations which have been made are not correct, but I am afraid, in fact I have good reason to believe, that a very large portion of the statements, if not the whole, will be found to be just as I have made them.

Mr. McLELAN. I was at a considerable loss to understand why the hon. gentleman should have entered into a discussion of this matter and should make charges

affecting the character of an officer of my Department and in the service of the Government—why he should make the charges before he had seen the papers and understood what he was saying. But, he has given the explanation. He wanted if possible to get a blow at the head of the Department, at the Minister, and make it appear that the Minister had been guilty of some grave dereliction of duty in promoting a man against whom there was this charge in regard to the payment of Staff Commander Bolton. I beg to submit that the late accountant of the Department of Marine and Fisheries was promoted months before there was any question raised as to the position of Staff Commander Bolton's salary. Staff Commander Bolton came to this country by the direction of the Admiralty to engage upon that survey. His salary was not fixed at the time he came, nor for several months after he entered upon his duties, and therefore, during the first months that he was engaged, payments were made to him simply on account, and there was an understanding, I have reason to know, with Staff Commander Bolton, when he left for his work in the Georgian Bay, that certain sums should be sent to his wife in England, on account of his salary. The hon. gentleman says that all these cheques should have been sent direct to Staff Commander Bolton instead of being made to bearer, as two of them were, and should have received his endorsement. That would, perhaps, have been the more regular way, but it would have involved a great loss of time. I have understood that Staff Commander Bolton was very anxious that, at the earliest possible moment that money could be said to be due to him, it should be sent across the water to Mrs. Bolton, who was then living in England, and had a family to maintain there. The Commander, in a letter, so late as the 19th of last September, writing to the Department, says it would be impossible for him to get cheques cashed and dealt with whilst on the survey. I had occasion to visit that neighborhood, I think in August, and I found that the vessel and crew had to leave the work on which they were engaged and go some distance in order to raise money upon cheques that had been sent to them. Under the arrangements and the understanding that were had between the accountant and Staff Commander Bolton, when he was leaving on his survey in 1883, two cheques were drawn payable to bearer. The first was changed from "order" to "bearer." I want the hon. gentleman to understand that no change was made after the cheque was made. It was made and filled up payable to bearer, and was signed by the Deputy Minister, Mr. William Smith, and the accountant together, and the words "to bearer" were initialled by Mr. Smith. That was for the purpose of sending a bill of exchange to England, to Mrs. Bolton. Later, another cheque of a less amount, \$300, was treated in the same way, in the following month; but, in the absence of Mr. Smith, who was away on departmental business, it was so treated by the officers of the Department who were authorised under Order in Council to sign cheques; and Mr. Tilton was the gentleman who initialled "to bearer" in that case. These are the only two cheques upon which the Auditor General found any difficulty in arranging the accounts of Commander Bolton. The hon. gentleman says that Mr. Tilton has been called upon to refund a sum of about \$307. Well, the only sum that has been refunded, that has been repaid, upon which there was any difference of opinion between Commander Bolton and Mr. Tilton, is a sum of about \$113. In regard to \$13 of that, there was no difference of opinion. A cheque was issued for \$300, which was sent to the bank to purchase a bill of exchange for £60. The difference between the cost of that bill of exchange and \$300 still remained—some \$7 or \$8. In another case, also, there was a difference between the cost of a bill of exchange and the amount sent to the bank, the total in the two cases being this \$13, which the Auditor said had to be refunded to Commander Bolton.

Mr. McLELAN.

There was another difference as to the transmission of a £40 cheque which was not paid in the way the accountant had directed on the other side, and it came back through the Bank of Montreal into the Finance Department, and was entered upon the books as a second charge. As soon as Commander Bolton returned to Ottawa from his survey, Mr. Tilton called his attention to this, and said, "On the accounts that appear on the books, I think there is an error in a bill of exchange for £40, or about \$200, and we will arrange it if you will look over it." I saw Commander Bolton when a question arose about the differences in the accounts. I met him and asked him if that matter in difference was not one which might be readily settled between himself and Mr. Tilton. He said Mr. Tilton had called his attention to that overcharge and that error. I asked him to come in and take the money himself, as I did not want it to be put in the way of a refund to the Treasury, because I would therefore lose the amount from the grant, and the grant was running small for the expenses that were incurred, and I was anxious to save that much, at least, of the grant, and have it paid to Commander Bolton instead of being refunded to the Treasury. In fact, in so far as that is concerned, there really was no difference between the accountant and Commander Bolton.

Some hon. GENTLEMEN. Six o'clock.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope that hon. gentlemen will have some consideration for the Minister, and allow him to explain when a very serious charge is laid against him. Hon. gentlemen ought not to interrupt him in that way.

Mr. McLELAN. Commander Bolton acknowledged to have received at the Department \$100 on the 1st of November, but he claims it was from a cheque that he had subsequently received, and which he had endorsed himself, and therefore the dispute between the accountant and Commander Bolton was as to whether that \$100 was paid out of the previous cheques, or, as Commander Bolton claimed, out of the cheque of November. The Auditor General required that \$100 to account for all the cheques that were charged to him to that day, and the Auditor General decided that in addition to the two sums amounting to \$13, the difference between the bills of exchange and the cheques drawn, he should either furnish to the Auditor General a receipt for the \$100 or make a refund of it. The accountant has paid that \$100, but under protest, claiming that it was the balance of the first cheques, and not as Commander Bolton states, on the cheque of \$300 of November. I therefore think that when all the papers are brought down, and the hon. gentleman has an opportunity of examining them, he will not speak in the same tone and manner with which he addressed the House this evening.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. When the House rose, the hon. Minister, in reply to the remark I had made asking for a return of certain papers connected with a difficulty that arose between Mr. Tilton and Mr. Bolton, stated that it would have been better for me to reserve my remarks until the papers were before the House. Now I beg to say, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps I would have reserved my remarks were it not for the fact that the papers in connection with the duties devolving upon this very officer had been ordered by the House, and had not yet been brought down. On the 20th March, 1884, the following return was ordered, moved by Mr. Somerville (Brant), and seconded by Mr. McMullen:

Return showing all sums received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of rental of rivers and streams; also showing sums paid into the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of fines imposed for violation of the fisheries regulations, the return in each case to show

amounts so received during the years 1882 and 1883, with the date received and the names of depositors, and the dates on which such sums were deposited to the credit of the Government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these returns have never been brought down to this House, and I know that I was justified, under the circumstances, in making the remark I did, because if I had not pointedly drawn the Minister's attention, perhaps these very returns would never be brought down that I now ask for. I hope now, that we may get both the returns asked for last year and those I am now asking for. The Minister also stated that he was not aware of the difficulties between Mr. Tilton and Mr. Bolton at the time that he appointed Mr. Tilton as Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Well, it is very singular that he was unaware of that fact, because if I am correctly informed, I think the hon. Minister will find by the papers I now ask for that the difficulty arose some time in September, 1883—that these irregularities actually took place in 1883. The present deputy not having been appointed until some time in July, 1884, I think he will find, when the cheques are produced, that that irregularity took place in 1883. I hope when the papers come down the House will have an opportunity of examining into the whole question and deciding whether any irregularities or improprieties took place in the Department of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. McLELAN. I may say, in respect of the return ordered last year, that the Secretary of State sent to my Department, as well as to other Departments, a list of all the orders to which returns had not been made, and they are now being prepared as rapidly as possible. I think I brought down one or two asked for last year, and I will see that the one now asked for is brought down as soon as possible. The hon. gentleman is entirely in error when he says that the Department became aware of this in 1883. It was not until November, 1884, that I heard anything about it, or that anything was known about it by the officers of the Department. So late as September, 1884, Commander Bolton wrote to the Department, asking for a statement of his account, and, with the permission of the House, I will now read his letter :

“GEORGIAN BAY, 17th September, 1884.

“MY DEAR MR. GOURDEAU.—By an inadvertence I had no copy of my paid contingent account for August. Would you kindly let one of your clerks give me a copy as soon as convenient, to assist me in the squaring up of my accounts to the 30th of June last. I enclose you a statement of moneys received and expended, from the commencement of the survey to the end of fiscal year, as near as I can come to it. The only thing I am in doubt about, is my own salary. Had I known the late accountant was not keeping a separate account of it, I would have been more particular about what I received last autumn. Please to understand that I send this account quite privately, with a view to assisting you in letting me know how I stood to the Department on 30th of June last, for really I do not know whether the Department owes me money or the reverse. Before I left Ottawa I tried to make it understood how literally impossible it is to cash a large cheque like the one I lately received for salary and wages for last month, and, as you are doubtless aware, have written officially for the money in future to be sent in individual cheques, as was the case in July.”

Mr. Gourdeau, I may say, was the acting accountant after the appointment of Mr. Tilton as Deputy Minister.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course, it is quite impossible for the House, in view of the contradictory statements, to arrive at any conclusion as to what the state of the account may be between Mr. Bolton and Mr. Tilton; but upon the Minister's own statement it seems to me that an extremely grave irregularity and impropriety has been committed with reference to the management of the public moneys, an irregularity and impropriety so grave that I am surprised the hon. Minister should have stated it across the House without indicating his own entire dissent from the transaction. There is no security whatever with reference to public moneys, if they are to be dealt with as the Minister has stated the public moneys have been dealt with in this case. I understand that money cannot be paid, under our law and

regulations, except to the individual to whom, by the vote of Parliament or by other authority, they are due. I understand it to be the rule that cheques or other letters of credit, instruments of payment, shall be made to the order of the person who is entitled to the payment, and that if there is any difficulty in the way of the personal receipt by that party in cashing the cheque, if anybody else is to receive it, a letter of attorney, according to the practice of the departments, is to be given in favor of some other person, who may receive the money or cheque and acquit the public service of the demand. It was so palpable that, even with those precautions, even when you adhere to the law, even when you arranged that there should be some person, if not the individual, who would be able to acquit the public service of the debt, it would be an improper thing that persons in the public service should be that attorney; that so long ago as 1870 an Order in Council was passed, on 25th January in that year, providing that no officer in the Civil Service shall, under any circumstances, be permitted to act as attorney for the receipt of public money. That order has remained in force ever since. So, had Mr. Tilton held a power of attorney from Staff Commander Bolton to receive his salary, it would be a breach of duty by Mr. Tilton to have accepted that power and to have received the money, and it would have been a breach of duty on the part of the other officers of the Department to have permitted the cheque to be payable to Mr. Tilton's order or to have accepted his endorsement on the cheque for that of Staff Commander Bolton. It is not for me to defend the Order in Council. It was passed when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. It was held unrepealed during the period when their successors held office. It has been left unrepealed ever since. It has remained the law for fourteen years at least. If, therefore, the hon. Minister had stated that Mr. Tilton had a power of attorney from Staff Commander Bolton to receive money due to that gentleman and to acquit the Department of the debt, he would have told us of a breach of the rules regulating the Civil Service and of the Order in Council and a grave breach of discipline. He has told us, however, that Mr. Tilton had no power of attorney, and that two cheques made payable to bearer instead of to order were handed over to this officer, and one of those cheques, it seems, in the absence of the chief of the Department, was actually made out by the Accountant; so Mr. Tilton made the cheques payable to bearer in order that he (Tilton) might receive the money.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Tilton and Mr. Goodall.

Mr. BLAKE. Whether there was one actor and two conspirators in this matter, I do not know or care. But for one or two officers to make cheques payable to bearer instead of to order—although the cheques are printed as payable to order, so that the country may have that security—in order that one of those officers might himself receive the money, was a breach of discipline infinitely grosser than it would have been had Mr. Tilton received power of attorney from Staff Commander Bolton, and produced it as a reason why he had power to receive the money. That, however, would be a breach of discipline. But what was it, according to the statement of the hon. Minister, when the person appointed to sign the cheques, drew them in a form which deprived the public of the usual security, and drew it because he had not authority to endorse the cheque or receive the money? That which was done with regard to the two cheques for \$300 might be done the following day with two cheques for \$300,000; yet there was no condemnation of the transaction by the hon. Minister, and the only man he denounced was the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) who has submitted this motion.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with a good deal of interest to this discussion. I have done so because the hon. gentleman whose reputation was assailed by the hon. mem-

ber for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) is an officer who was placed in the Department by myself, a gentleman who, for seven years and a-half, while I occupied the hon. position of Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was my private secretary and accountant of the Department. During the whole of that time I found Mr. Tilton a straightforward, upright, honorable man. I believe him to be so still. I have watched with intense interest, not only the charges brought against him by the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), but the explanation of the hon. Minister in his defence, and I have come to the conclusion that what the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) has said, that there has been a looseness, a violation, perhaps, of a regulation of the Department, may be perfectly true. Everyone who knows Mr. Tilton is aware, if he has a failing, it is a disposition to oblige, to conciliate and to accommodate everyone with whom he is brought in contact. I can understand the position of Mr. Tilton in regard to Staff Commander Bolton. A gentleman coming from abroad, appointed to perform a duty on the Georgian Bay, where it was impossible, as he wrote, to cash cheques and transmit money to his wife, who, with his family, is in England, for their support, asks Mr. Tilton to do what he did, and Mr. Tilton, with that disposition to assist, which has characterised him, acceded to his request. I have listened to the charges brought against him. I was disgusted with the course pursued by the hon. gentleman who brought this motion before the House. Where the private reputation of a public officer is assailed in a matter such as this, about a paltry \$200 between Mr. Tilton and Staff Commander Bolton, the duty of a public man, such as the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), in bringing the matter before the House, was to have laid the matter calmly and dispassionately before the House, not to have dilated and discussed the merits of the case until we had the papers before us and were able to form an opinion as to whether the outside charges brought against Mr. Tilton were true or not, and hon. members had an opportunity from the papers of ascertaining the facts. I have come to this conclusion, and I believe it will be found to be the correct one, that, from the letter which the Minister has read, it appears that Staff Commander Bolton did not know the actual state of his account, at all events as far as public money is concerned and the amount drawn by Mr. Tilton. The Minister states that there is only \$13 difference between the bills of exchange drawn and the drafts placed in Mr. Tilton's hands. I am surprised that the reputation of an honorable man like Mr. Tilton should be assailed about a paltry matter like this; and I take this opportunity, from my place in this House, as one who has known him for years, to say that until some evidence more substantial than mere outside rumors, mere scandalous attacks by rivals, perhaps, in office, by persons envious of his position and jealous of his honorable position, I cannot believe he is guilty. I am surprised that hon. members should come forward and prejudge the question, and ask the House to prejudge it. I do not deny that the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) is right in saying that no public officer should act as a party to receive money. Perhaps that matter may have been overlooked. It was not, however, a question of receiving, but of transmitting money to Staff Commander Bolton's wife and family in England, while he was on Georgian Bay and could not get cheques cashed; and if, after two or three years of transactions of this kind, a question did arise in the accounts—as they are very likely to have arisen, Staff Commander Bolton not having an opportunity of checking them and perhaps not being very accurate in keeping accounts—I say it is an outrageous thing that the character of an honorable public officer, as I know Mr. Tilton to be, and such I believe him at this moment to be,—I say that it is outrageous that an attempt

Mr. MITCHELL.

should be made to throw a reproach on his character—and through him attack the Ministry, for what I can only describe as either political or envious individual purposes. Why is not the reputation of Mr. Deputy Smith assailed in conjunction with him? Mr. Smith signed one of the cheques, and signed it "bearer."

Mr. BOWELL. He changed it and initialed it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Why? Because Mr. Tilton has been a true supporter of the party in power, while Mr. Smith has been a renegade to the party in power, and therefore they let Mr. Smith slip by, and try to drag Mr. Tilton down to the level of the mean curs who never should have attacked him.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think the hon. gentleman might have remembered, when he lectured my hon. friend on the impropriety of attacking the character of civil servants, that for him to speak in the terms which he has just used towards an old and valuable public officer like Mr. Smith, is certainly, considering his long standing in Parliament, a grosser outrage than anything that was said by my hon. friend with reference to Mr. Tilton.

Mr. MITCHELL. It is a new experience to me to be lectured by the man who has vilified the Premier of this country on every possible occasion, as the hon. gentleman has who has just sat down.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You will get it, if you deserve it as he did.

Mr. MITCHELL. You will get it before I am done with you.

Motion agreed to.

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF WHEAT AND FLOUR.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved for :

A return showing the quantity and value of wheat and flour imported into and exported from the Dominion, by Provinces, during the six months ending 31st December, 1884.

He said: I ask the privilege of adding to the motion the following:—

"Distinguishing in the imports the quantity entered for home consumption, and in the exports the product of Canada."

Mr. BOWELL. This motion is covered by one which was made on the 6th of February, by Mr. Cameron (Middlesex), with the exception of the words which the hon. gentleman now proposes to add. The motion of the hon. member for Middlesex was for :

"A return showing the quantity of wheat, flour, corn and cornmeal imported into and exported from the various Provinces, from the 1st of July to the 31st December, 1884."

That covers the whole of the motion with the addition of corn and cornmeal. If that motion, which has been carried covers, as I think it does, the hon. gentleman's motion, I would have no objection to instructing the addition to be made to it, showing that entered for home consumption, and that for exportation the product of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). That is the information I am anxious to get.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am sorry that the Minister of Finance is not here, for when this subject was referred to last year I called his attention to the fact that a strong disposition exists to have the duty taken off cornmeal, an article which is scarcely produced in this country, and which is largely consumed, at least by the poor people of my own county. When I called his attention to it last Session, when we were passing the Estimates, the Finance Minister stated then that he could not take the duty off that year. I said, we may hope, then, that next year it may be taken off, and he smiled upon me. What he meant by that smile I

do not know, but if he were here I would ask him to interpret that smile, and to say if he had any intention of removing the duty. I notice that a delegation of millers has recently waited on the First Minister, with a view of getting an increased duty on flour, claiming that the duty which exists on flour and wheat was relatively against the National Policy, and against the interests of the manufacturers of flour in this country. Now, I want to say for one, that if the Government intend to increase this duty, that it is just as well to take this early opportunity of explaining what my position, with regard to the matter, will be; for if the Government have any intention of complying with—to use the words which were applied by the hon. member for Durham (Mr. Blake), to the correspondent of the *Herald*, in relation to a certain question the other day—if they intend to comply with the impudent suggestion of the millers, and that additional duty is to be imposed, this House and the Government may depend upon it that there will be a fight for it before it is put on.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish it distinctly understood that I did not state that the proposal of the millers was an impudent proposal—it was quite a different proposal that I characterised as impudent. I wish, as far as I can, to placate the hon. gentleman. My efforts in that direction have not been very successful heretofore. I paid him, I think, a very handsome compliment the other night, and gave him a free advertisement of his enterprise, and he attacked me very violently. I shall make another effort—I do not know whether I shall succeed or not—and I will say of him that, from all I have known of him these many years, I think Mr. Tilton was an admirable man to be his private secretary.

Mr. MITCHELL. While I thank the hon. gentleman for some of his compliments, I do not think his attempt to pay a compliment to me is very happy. I did not say that the hon. gentleman said that the report of the millers was an impudent attempt. I used the same language with reference to the millers that the hon. gentleman used in relation to the correspondent of the *Herald*, in connection with a much more important matter. As I entered this House I heard him use the expression, “the impudent suggestion of the correspondent of the *Herald*,” and I applied that expression to the attempt of the millers. I say that the efforts of the millers to impose a tax of \$1 a barrel on the flour used by the poor people of this country is an impudent attempt to get more protection, which shall not meet with my support. The hon. gentleman can pay compliments if he likes. I have not received many compliments from him during the last twelve years, at all events since 1873 or 1874. Latterly he has been disposed to pay a few compliments, for which I am very thankful; I am thankful for small favors. I respect the hon. gentleman's great abilities and talents. I know the hon. gentleman imagines that he is the greatest man in this House. I dare say he is—when a lot of us are out of it. But on my responsibility, as a representative of the people, I have the right to act for myself, and I shall endeavor so to conduct myself in this House as to do credit to the people who have done me the honor to send me here to look after their interests.

Motion agreed to.

DRAWBACKS ON MANUFACTURED EXPORTS.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved for:

Return of all claims presented for drawbacks on goods manufactured for export (since the date of the last return made to this House), showing the names of all applicants, their place of business, the articles on which the drawback was claimed and the amount of each claim, distinguishing between the claims which have been allowed and those which have been disallowed, and those under consideration and not yet decided, and giving the reason for such disallowance. Also,

copies of all regulations made by the Department with reference to such claims, together with a copy of one allowed claim and the sworn declaration thereto of each exporter.

He said: This motion asks for a return similar to what has been brought down during the last few years. In previous returns a great many sheets have been taken up with statements of refunds on tins for lobster canning. I have no desire to get these in detail, as I know they entail a great deal of work, and are all similar. It would answer my purpose if the number of claims were stated in the aggregate. If it is prepared in that way, I think the return can be brought down very soon. I judge, from what I have seen in the newspapers about interviews with the Ministers, with reference to claims made by manufacturers for drawbacks, that probably new rules have been adopted, facilitating the handling of the matter by the Department. If so, I desire to have copies of all those new regulations.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no date stated in the return, and I suppose the hon. gentleman will have no objection to have it brought up to the 1st of this month.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Whatever date will suit you will suit me.

Mr. BOWELL. Say the 1st of the month. I might add that the return will not be encumbered this year with any statements of the drawback on tin. As there is no duty on tin now, there is no drawback.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has that been the case all the year.

Mr. BOWELL. Oh, yes; it was taken off two years ago; but the last return contained every claim that was made previous to the placing of tin on the free list.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Have they all been settled?

Mr. BOWELL. I think so.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTORS OR CLERKS OF WORKS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT, in the absence of Mr. Mackenzie, moved for:

A statement showing the names of all persons employed by the Department of Public Works or other Department of the Government as inspectors or clerks of works on any building or other public work during the years 1882-83 and 1883-84, with statement showing the amount paid to such persons for services as such officials, and the rate per month or per diem to each; also, the gross amount expended by the Government in each year on such works under the inspection of each clerk of works; also, a statement showing the actual profession or calling of each such clerk of works.

Mr. POPE. The hon. the Minister of Public Works wished to add from 1873-74.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That ought to be put in a separate work. The result of making additions is, first, to add largely to the expense, and next, to defer bringing down information we want to use to a late period of the Session.

Mr. POPE. You will get it down soon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When?

Mr. POPE. Very soon; not to-morrow, but very soon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If we get it soon, I have not the least objection, but let the hon. gentleman make the addition.

Mr. POPE moved, in amendment, that “since 1873-74” be added.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS IN NOVA SCOTIA AND CAPE BRETON.

Mr. McDougall moved for

Statement of subsidies in cash and subventions, of whatever kind, on railways in the Province of Nova Scotia, including the Island of Cape Breton, chargeable to capital account, since the date of Confederation, whether in aid of construction or acquiring of said railways, and the number of miles located in each county.

He said: I may state, Mr. Speaker, that the information sought by the motion which I have just tabled, refers to a subject of great importance to the Island of Cape Breton, and in a special manner to the people of the county which I have the honor to represent, which is my apology for offering a few remarks in relation to the peculiar position occupied by the Island of Cape Breton in the railway history of Nova Scotia. Many years previous to Confederation railway agitation was commenced by the people of Cape Breton, and strong appeals were being made by the people to the Parliaments of those days, but without any satisfactory result. Previous to Confederation the Legislature of Nova Scotia, however, undertook the building of several lines of railway east and west in the Province. Those lines have been taken by the Dominion Government, and have been, by Acts of this Legislature, further aided and extended, besides the extensions which have been aided by Provincial subsidies and subventions. I am aware that legislation took place in this House, as well as in our Provincial Legislature at Halifax, which provided for the building of a line of railway to the eastern seaboard of Cape Breton, but, so far as I am aware, Sir, not a dollar has been expended, and not a mile has been built in Cape Breton to this day. We have certain lines of railway in the county which I represent, but these lines were built by private enterprise and without any aid from our Local Government, and I am of the opinion that when the information which I now ask for is placed on the Table of this House it will fail to show that a single dollar was paid by the Dominion Legislature in aid of those roads. Sir, while millions after millions of money were being voted and expended under the authority of the Local Legislatures of Nova Scotia and this Legislature as well, so far as I am aware not a dollar has been expended on railways in Cape Breton. The people of Cape Breton are a hardy and hard working people, and to that fact may be attributed the degree of success and prosperity to which they have attained in the prosecution of their respective avocations, and not, Sir, to any attention which they have received at the hands of successive Administrations, both local and Dominion, who have been from year to year appropriating and legislating away in other directions the benefits accruing from their hard labor, which they were obliged to perform while undergoing hardships and disadvantages which were not being endured by their fellow people in the more favored sections of the Province. The people of Cape Breton, Sir, are engaged in some of the most important industries of the Dominion. They are engaged in agriculture, commerce and shipping, mining and fishing. It will be necessary, Sir, that I should briefly refer to the comparative standing of the extent to which those industries are being prosecuted by the people of Cape Breton with that of their fellow people on the mainland and other parts of the Dominion, in order to show to the House the just reasons which they have for complaint, and in justification of an equitable participation in the railway expenditures of the Dominion. In the year 1881 there was owned, in the Province of Nova Scotia :

	Nova Scotia.	C.B. Island.	C.B. County.
Horses and horned cattle.	382,770	69,409	21,382
Field Products—		Near $\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$
Wheat, bushels.....	522,602	49,615	17,395

Mr. POPE.

	Nova Scotia.	C.B. Island.	C.B. County.
Field Products—			
Barley, bushels.....	228,748	35,479	11,223
Oats, bushels.....	1,873,113	527,239	150,020
Potatoes, bushels.....	7,378,387	1,234,842	453,815
Hay, tons.....	597,731	107,825	26,208
Home made butter, lbs.	7,465,285	1,603,586	447,302
Cheese, lbs.....	501,655	Near $\frac{1}{2}$	Near $\frac{1}{2}$
		198,851	25,000

With regard to our commercial and shipping industry, I might say, Sir, that owing to our long season of closed navigation, which extends from the month of December until the 1st (and some years nearly the end) of May, we have six months of comparative idleness; but, Sir, I propose to show to the House the extent of our shipping, as compared with some of the principal shipping ports of the Province, as an evidence that our people engaged in that industry suffer for want of a railway. The harbor of Sydney, I may say, is the principal harbor frequented by shipping during the period of open navigation. The shipping which entered that harbor during the year 1884, according to the report of the harbor commissioners, for that year was:

1884—Steamers.....	392	Tonnage.....	275,977	
Sails.....	1,215	".....	193,212	
Total.....	1,607	Total.....	469,189	
1883—Harbor of Sydney, C. B. Co.—open about 7 months.				
Steamers.....	395	Tonnage.....	253,199	
Sails.....	1,091	".....	164,694	
Total.....	1,486	Total.....	417,893	
1883—Pictou—open 7 months. (See Rep. Har. Com.)				
No. of steamers and vessels.....	1,540.	Total tonnage.....	217,634	
1883—Halifax—open 12 months. (See Rep. Har. Com.)				
Steamers and sailing vessels....	775.	Total tonnage.....	301,703	
SYDNEY HARBOR SHIPPING.				
Vessels and Steamers.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.
No.....	1,160	1,173	1,017	1,100
Tons...	245,220	297,990	405,082	455,492

If Parliament had done as much for the improvement of commercial facilities in the harbor of Sydney as it did in the harbor of Halifax, by building their railways, wharves, elevators, docks, is it not proper to assume that the commercial standing of Cape Breton would to-day be double what it is? Referring to the harbor of Pictou, although closed by ice during about the same time as the harbor of Sydney, in view of the fact that by reason of the railway from Halifax east having that as one of its terminal points, being the only means of communication between Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia and the Dominion, I may say it is hardly credible that with all those advantages over Sydney that the tonnage of Sydney exceeds it, in the year 1883, by 200,634 tons, and its tonnage for the same year exceeds Halifax by 116,190. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the fishing. I may be told, Sir, that the fishing industry has no bearing on this railway subject, but it has a very important bearing on the subject of railway extension into Cape Breton. The fishermen of Cape Breton, particularly in Cape Breton, in Inverness and Victoria suffer many hardships, the most of their shores being surrounded with ice during five or six months of the year, and having no outlet by land. They are, in consequence, compelled to secure their supplies in many cases, for the spring fishing, six months in advance, otherwise the best part of the fishing season may be over before they can secure them and get in readiness to commence their fishing after the opening of navigation. In addition to this, they are compelled to send their fish to market earlier in the season,

and when the market is glutted and prices low, for two reasons: that they are compelled to do it in order to be able to meet the obligations incurred in getting their supplies the previous year, and because, if they do not ship before winter sets in, they will not be able to ship for six or seven months more. The fisheries of the Dominion, in the year 1883, were estimated as follows:—

1883.			
N. Scotia.....	\$7,689,374 75	C. B. Co.....	\$223,739 40
N. B	3,185,874 88	Inv	530,323 50
Quebec.....	2,38,997 12	Rich.....	352,993 90
P. E. I.....	1,272,487 93	Vic.....	159,168 40
B. C.....	1,644,645 42		
Ontario	1,027,032 88	Total C. B..	\$1,176,215 20
Total Dom..		\$16,958,192 98	

Thus it will be seen that the Island of Cape Breton in that year possessed one-fourteenth the fisheries of the Dominion. How much better would the condition of this class of our people be if they were in a position to get their supplies whenever they wanted them, and not five or six months before, and if they could send the products of their labor into the markets of the world whenever the prices would be most encouraging. But, Sir, without a railway they cannot better their condition. I will now refer to the coal industry, which is not by any means the least in importance among the industries in which our people are engaged. I may say, Sir, that this industry suffers more injustice in the Island of Cape Breton, owing to the absence of railway facilities and the manner in which successive Governments have dealt with the railways of Nova Scotia, than any other industry. Through this industry the people of Cape Breton, and I might say in this particular, the people of the county I represent, have contributed more revenue to the Provincial Treasury than Nova Scotia proper and more than the proportion according to population, to the Dominion Treasury. Notwithstanding the fact that the building of railways in Nova Scotia proper, by both the Local Legislature and Dominion, not only encouraged the successful working of those mines but created a market for about one-half the present output of coal, between the quantity consumed by those railways and the opening of markets which could not be reached by them without a railway, and which could not be reached by the people of Cape Breton. I will take the amount of revenue paid by the Island of Cape Breton, as compared with Nova Scotia, for a period of years before the existence of those railways, and since, which are as follows, during the period from beginning of 1864 to 1868:—

	Total revenue of N.S. from coal.	C. B. Island proportion.	N. S. proper proportion.	Difference in favor of C. B.	Difference in favor of N.S. prop'r
1864 to 68.	\$284,561 73	\$182,657 07	\$ 91,904 56	\$80,752 41
1869 to 73.	312,137 92	173,409 90	138,728 02	34,681 78
1874 to 78.	310,787 29	147,702 19	163,085 10	15,362 91
1879 to 83.	381,364 93	185,938 90	195,426 03	9,487 13

Thus it will be seen that Cape Breton, in twenty years, paid into the Provincial Treasury more revenue by about \$190,000 than Nova Scotia counties. In consequence of having railway facilities the mining managers of Nova Scotia have an unfair advantage over those of Cape Breton, inasmuch as that during the winter seasons, when, as a general rule, they make their contracts for the supply of coal at the various points, in this instance the people of Nova Scotia can safely calculate the cost of placing their coal at any point, knowing the railway charges, while the people of Cape Breton, who are obliged to ship all by water, have to depend on an uncertain state of freight charges. Besides that, the Nova Scotians can work the mines during the whole year, while the Cape Breton mines are thrown into idleness for about six or seven months of the year. It can be seen, by a statement in the Provincial Engineer's Report, for Nova Scotia, that the building and

existence of those railways into the coal fields of Nova Scotia have not only given increased activity to those collieries, but that the railways in themselves have created a permanent market for large quantities of coal from the Nova Scotia mines. The coal supplied from the different mines in Nova Scotia to the Intercolonial Railway, in 1880, were as follows:—

For Intercolonial use.		Tons.
New Glasgow		95,685
Stellarton		125,373
Spring Hill.....		36,725
Maccan.....		892
Albion		7,320
Dunmore		13,240
Nappan		20
		<u>278,655</u>

Now the total sales for the collieries supplying this coal for that year was:

	Tons.
Pictou.....	434,922
Cumberland	134,671
<u>569,593</u>	

One-half of which the Intercolonial Railway consumed. Thus, the Government build the railways to carry their coal, provide the cars in which it is carried, and take the coal in the end and pay them the price for it at the expense of the people of Cape Breton, as well as those of any other part of the Dominion, while our Cape Breton people have to build their railways, harbors, piers, cars, &c., without any aid and get no Government patronage in coal sales.

COAL SALES BY COUNTIES, 1883.

	Cumberland.	Pictou.	C. Breton.	Totals.
1st quarter, 1st May to 31st Nov.	49,198	78,565	14,231	114,994
2nd " 1st April to 30th June	58,644	116,758	149,753	325,153
3rd " 1st July to 30th Sept.	55,213	156,602	287,098	498,913
4th " 1st Oct. to 31st Dec.	59,292	109,886	161,532	331,463
Total tons.....	222,347	461,809	612,614	1,297,623

Total Cumberland and Pictou... 684,156

These were the coal shipments by quarters of the year. Now, Sir, these facts go to show, that by reason of these mines having railways running to their pits, they are in a position to work their mines to nearly as good advantage in the winter months as in the summer months, while the people of the Island of Cape Breton, who work in the mines, are idle, and have to maintain their equipment, their staff of officers, a large number of horses to work their mines, and feed them for nothing, during six months of the year. Moreover, they are obliged to contribute their quota towards the extension of railways in other parts of the Province, while they do not participate themselves in the benefits to the extent of one single dollar. That is the position in the Island of Cape Breton, as compared with the rest of Nova Scotia, in regard to railway facilities, and I hope that the necessity which compelled me to call attention to the matter at this early stage of my parliamentary career will not exist after the rising of this Legislature at the present Session. I hope the Administration will come before the House with some policy which will provide for the extension of the Intercolonial Railway system into the Island of Cape Breton at a very early day. I hold that if they undertook the extension of that railway into the Island, the expenditure will be one which will be met by an additional revenue from the Island that will place the Dominion Treasury, within not many years, in the position in which it was before a dollar was spent or contributed towards that extension. This is what I have to say with regard to this question, and in conclusion I have to apologise to the House for taking up so much of its time, and to you, Mr. Speaker, as a new member, for I have probably travelled outside of

the latitude to which I was entitled in connection with my motion.

Motion agreed to.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN.

Mr. JACKSON moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the captain of the life-saving service at Port Rowan, Province of Ontario, not already brought down.

He said: During last Session I called the attention of the Minister of Marine to the inefficiency of the life-saving service at Port Rowan. At that time I submitted that the service was deficient in everything except in a second or third-class boat; the sailors were not provided with life-preservers, life-jackets—they had no lines or mortars of any kind, and these are all very important articles for such a service. In answer to my motion, the hon. gentleman stated as follows:—

"I am aware that the boat at that station does not possess all the improvements of the life-boats of the present day. I have, however, had two of the most approved life-boats made in Buffalo, and I have specifications of those made, and they are now ready. I intend to have a number of life-boats of the most approved pattern in use manufactured as early as possible; and if the hon. gentleman's statement is correct, that that is the most exposed position in the west, we shall place one of the improved life-boats at that station."

At that time I made the statement that that was one of the most exposed stations on the chain of lakes, and in proof of that statement I would refer to the loss of life and property which takes place there. There is no official record kept in regard to these losses, so far as I can find, except for the ten years between 1858 and 1868. A report was made for that period and the losses of property amounted to over a quarter million dollars while some twenty-seven lives were lost. Since that time there have been no statistics kept, so far as I know, but I am aware that in the fall of 1883 there were five large vessels lost and eight valuable lives. Again, in 1884, a Canadian propeller, called the *Fortune*, was lost, though I am happy to say that no lives were sacrificed. The life-saving crew did noble work on that occasion in saving the lives of the people upon the propeller though they labored under the disadvantage of having very inefficient boats. A few days before the Session opened I called at Port Rowan and saw the captain of the life-saving service there, and he told me that they had not been supplied with anything during the last year, and the service was in a deplorable condition, not even proper oars for the service. He also told me that the men employed there by the Government, including the captain himself, had not been paid their wages. I think that considering the amount of money that is paid by this Government for other purposes, it is too bad that men depending on their daily wages for the support of themselves and their families should not be paid the money which is due them. I hope the Minister will not allow this notice to pass without effect, but that he will take early steps to see that these poor men are paid. They were compelled to sell their time at a loss of 25 or 30 per cent., in order to maintain their families. Since last Session my attention has been called to a life-boat which is built in the United States, and I saw a statement that the Americans are using a boat called Capt. Dobbins' self-righting and self-baling boat, which is said to be of a very superior character. At the time the statement was made, eleven of those boats had been in the service and all had given excellent satisfaction. Now, I hope the hon. Minister will see his way clear to supply that service with one of those new styles of boats on the opening of navigation, and that before another fall the service will be placed in an efficient state.

Mr. McLELAN. The papers will be brought down as rapidly as possible. I am surprised to hear from the hon. gentleman that the men who were engaged in the service

Mr. McDougall.

at Port Rowan, during the past year, have not yet received their pay. I will make enquiry into that matter. In all cases, as soon as the captain in charge of the station makes his return of the service performed for the period, the cheques are immediately forwarded. I may say further, that on the specifications prepared last season of the Dobbins life-boats, I called for tenders for twelve of them, and six were ordered for construction in Ontario and six in the east. As it is a new work for the boat-builders, some delay occurred, and we were not able to get the boats in time for last fall's service; but I had enquiries made a few weeks ago as to the condition of the work, and I am assured that the boats will be ready for the spring service. They are of the pattern the hon. gentleman describes—self-righting and self-baling. We have procured two of them from the United States, and they are very excellent boats and give great satisfaction.

Mr. JACKSON. Will the hon. gentleman see that these men are paid?

Mr. McLELAN. I will make enquiries to see why they have not been paid. If the returns have been sent in by the captain, I will see that they are paid at once.

Motion agreed to.

CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH—PAYMENT OF LABORERS.

Mr. HACKETT moved for:

Copies of all petitions, letters and other correspondence between the Government and any other parties relating to the payment of wages due the laborers employed on the construction of the Cape Traverse branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway.

He said: I desire to state that, in the spring of 1883, I think, the Government called for tenders for the construction of the Cape Traverse branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway. Messrs. Gray & Wheaton, contractors, of New Brunswick, were the lowest tenderers, and were awarded the contract. In prosecuting the work that season, it appears that they took over with them some men from New Brunswick, who were called sub-contractors, who were supposed to have taken contracts under the contractors and gone on with the work. A number of people on the Island were employed in the work of construction. Matters proceeded very favorably for a while, but towards the close of the season a few of the sub-contractors left between two days, and a number of the laborers were left unpaid. Now, Sir, the question was asked last Session whether any provision had been made in the contract whereby the laborers would be protected in regard to their wages, or whether the Government would see that justice was done to them; and Sir Charles Tupper replied as follows:—

"There is a clause in the contract as follows:—

"If the contractors fail at any time in paying the salaries or wages of any person employed by them upon or in respect of the said works, or any of them, and any part of such salary be one month in arrear, or if there be due to any such person one month's wages or salary, the engineer may notify the contractors to pay such salary or wages, and if two days elapse and the same be not paid in full up to the date of payment, or to such other date as may be in accordance with the terms of employment of such person, then Her Majesty may pay to such person salary or wages from any date to any date, and to any amount which may be payable, and may charge the same to the contractors, and the contractors covenant with Her Majesty to repay at once and any and every sum so paid."

"It is the intention of the Government to do anything in their power under this clause to protect the laborers."

I regret that nothing has been done to protect the laborers, or to see that their wages have been paid under this clause of the contract. I believe some negotiations were entered into to effect a compromise between the laborers and the contractors. I think those negotiations were successful to some extent; but a great many claims are still unpaid, and the laborers, in their endeavors to secure their rights,

entered actions against the contractors. In some cases judgments have been obtained against the contractors in the Island courts, but when the parties proceeded to enforce judgment, no property could be found in the Province, the contractors having left the Province. The matter, therefore, now remains in the hands of the Government, and I hope the Government, in accordance with the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, will see that justice is done to the laborers, and that when they consider it necessary to place in contracts a clause of this kind, they will see the necessity of carrying it into effect, by securing the payment of the laborers engaged on this branch. Most of those people depend on their labor to provide for themselves and their families, and it has been a great hardship to them, so far, to be kept out of their just rights. When the papers come down, I hope it will be found that some action has been taken by the Government towards having them paid.

Mr. POPE. We have heard no complaints about the laborers not being paid; but all the papers will be brought down.

Mr. DAVIES. I may say to the Acting Minister that towards the close of last Session I asked the Minister of Railways whether the contract for the construction of that branch contained a clause allowing the Department to pay the laborers in case the contractors failed to pay them, and Sir Charles Tupper informed me that the contract did contain such a clause, and that he would take measures to see it carried out. I was fully under the impression, after that official statement, that the laborers would be paid. I would ask the hon. Minister to look at that contract, and I think he will find that Sir Charles Tupper was right.

Mr. POPE. I am told that Mr. Archibald, before he paid the contractors, insisted that the laborers should be paid; whether that is true or not I do not know, but that is the rumor. It is very possible that they have not been paid without our knowing anything about it. We have heard no complaints. However, the matter will be looked into.

Mr. DAVIES. Complaints were made last Session, and it was on those complaints that I called the attention of the Minister of Railways to the matter, and he then promised to attend to it.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL moved:

For a copy of the document or instrument containing the assurance received by the Government, on or about the 17th day of April last, from the Grand Trunk Railway Company, referred to by the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald on that day in his place in this House, to the effect that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would set aside £1,000,000 sterling for the purpose of double-tracking the line of the Grand Trunk Railway between Montreal and Toronto.

Also, a copy of the report of the denial of the said assurance, and of the statements alleged to have been made in respect of it, by Sir Henry Tyler, the president of the said company, at the meeting thereof held in London, England, shortly after the said announcement; and copies of all correspondence between the Government and any official of the said company respecting the said assurance.

He said: It will be in the recollection of every hon. gentleman present, that a very important discussion took place during the last Session of Parliament upon the Bill presented by the Grand Trunk for the consideration of and passage through this House. I will not refer in detail to the circumstances connected with that—I was going to say nefarious—transaction; but I will say that a transaction reflecting less credit upon the promoters of it, never passed through this House, and it will be in the recollection of every hon. gentleman in this House, that it became the duty of the First Minister to put a notice on the paper to recall the Bill, for the purpose of undoing the fraudulent transaction completed by its passage through the Senate and

its passage through this House. It will be recollected that it became my duty as a public man, having taken an interest in the matter, to address a letter to the then Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper), in which I reviewed the whole transaction, and it was upon that letter the action of the House took place which resulted in the First Minister putting a notice on the paper to recall the Bill. I will not go over in detail the circumstances that transpired from day to day, lasting some seven or eight days, in which the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway danced attendance around the lobbies of this House and followed the right hon. the First Minister, fawning upon him, for the purpose of getting out of the difficulty. It will be in the recollection of every one how the right hon. gentleman, who, I am sorry, is not in his place, from day to day fenced the question as to what was to be done in relation to that Bill, and it will be in the recollection of every one, also, that after having been repeatedly called upon and having as repeatedly put off a decision in relation to this matter, he said, in answer to me, on the 17th of April, last Session—but I will read both question and reply:

"Mr. MITCHELL. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to state that we were promised the matter of the Grand Trunk Company would be proceeded with to-day, and I should like to know what the right hon. gentleman proposes to do in relation to it.

"Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That item will be dropped. The Government have received assurance from the Grand Trunk Railway Company that they will set aside, out of the money, £1,000,000 sterling to be applied to no other purpose than the placing of a double track between Montreal and Toronto."

Now, Sir, within a very short time after that statement was made by the right hon. gentleman, I find, on the 25th of April of the same year, a report of a meeting of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, held in London. The report is too long to occupy the attention of the House by reading all the scurrility it contains, applied by the people who control that company to the people of Canada, to the country of Canada, as a locality for railway enterprise; to the Parliament of Canada and the Government of Canada. The statements contained in that report are most scandalous as applied to an independent Parliament such as this. I will not occupy the time of the House in reading them, but will confine myself to the object of the motion I have in view, and to find who the Ananias is in this transaction, for there is one, and a big one, somewhere. Sir Henry Tyler said, in reply to a jacknal of the Grand Trunk Railway, by the name of Mr. William Abbott:

"I may mention that the friends of the Canadian Pacific have been trying to do us further harm, whilst Mr. Hickson has been endeavoring to reduce the wages to a proper level—not to an inordinate low rate, but to a proper and fair level. Our antagonists have been stirring up strife amongst our men by articles in the newspapers, and by other means, to try and get them not to accept the reduction. (Cries of 'shame.') Mr. Abbott also asked about an alleged liability of a million of pounds for doubling the line. We have incurred no liability for doubling the line whatever. We are not going to ask you for any money for that purpose at present, and the only statement which has been made for which there is color is this: that when the Grand Trunk Act of 1884 was before Parliament, there was a question of recommitting it because the Lower House did not agree to the amendments of the Senate."

That is the way they put it. If they said the House agreed to recommit it because the legislation was stolen from the Senate by misrepresentation, it would have been nearer the truth.

"And in order to get it through this Session, Mr. Hickson said he would have no objection if one million was reserved for the object of doubling the line between Toronto and Montreal. That seems to be the state of affairs, according to a cable message we have received. I have now only to put the resolution."

And so on. My object in bringing this resolution before the House is to call the attention of this House to the scandalous statements which these people make, the scandalous misrepresentations which they have made. The House will perhaps like to hear some of them. I will give them some tit-bits from the report:

"Some persons have made the suggestion, and with a full view of the law of libel facing me, I would ask how many of the members of the Dominion Government who voted for the £6,000,000 when the Canadian Pacific were interested in the syndicate."

And so on :

"We have been asked to do the bidding of the Canadian Parliament, but I wonder if it is worth while to speak about such a veal and corrupt place as it seems to be."

The report of these men's speeches abounds in such statements and slanders upon the Parliament of Canada. I do not, however, propose to deal with the slanderous statements of these men who have vilified Canada persistently, who have slandered the country, the Government and Parliament, and who have attempted to destroy the credit and the enterprises of our country; but what I want to find out now is this: who told the truth in this matter? Did Sir John, when he said that he had £1,000,000 stg. put aside by the Grand Trunk Railway for the purpose of doubling the track, under an engagement with Mr. Hickson? Did he tell the truth? I believe he did. Or, taking the statement made by Mr. Hickson to Sir Henry Tyler, and repeated by him to the stockholders at their annual meeting, did they tell the truth? I now ask this House, in accordance with the terms of the resolution, that the correspondence and agreement in relation to that transaction be brought down in order that we may judge them ourselves.

Mr. POPE. I can only say to my hon. friend that he must be quite aware that there has been no million of dollars set apart, that there have been no bonds sold, that the thing remains in the position in which it was when this House adjourned. At the same time, I sympathise with the hon. gentleman fully in his remarks as to the observations made respecting this Parliament. I do not think they were creditable to these people, and I am sure every hon. member of this House feels that the hon. gentleman has only done his duty in raising that question. But with respect to this other matter, I was absent from the House at the time, and as regards the assurance, I know nothing; but I know that there is no objection to bringing down the papers. At the same time, there can be no money set apart, as no bonds have been sold.

Mr. MITCHELL. The right hon. the Premier told me personally, after the House rose that day, that he had the document, and that he would bring it down the very next day and show it to me. I know that there is a document, and accept the assurance of the hon. gentleman that it will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL AND BEAVER STEAMSHIP LINE.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

All correspondence between the Intercolonial officials or the Government and the Canada Shipping Company, or the Beaver line of steamships, with reference to the terms for through rates of freight over the Intercolonial.

He said: As I understand it, the other companies which deal with the Intercolonial have arranged a through rate which covers all points, land and sea transport, and which is divided into certain proportions between the railway companies and the steamship companies. This particular steamship company offered a lower through rate, and the inference I should draw from their statement is that they were not permitted to carry out their offer because the Government declined to give them the reduced rates applicable to the other companies unless they kept up the ocean rate. I understand that on the other hand it is stated that the Government was under the apprehension that they would have to share in the reduction, while the company is said to declare that they intended that the

Mr. MITCHELL.

reduction should come entirely out of their ocean rate. Whether they made that clear to the Government or not, I know not. I have had no communication with the company or with anyone on their behalf, except that I as well as others have received this printed document. But I have heard, by means of intending shippers and others, that it was not the intention of the steamship company that the railway company should participate in the reduction, but that the reduction should come out of the ocean rate, leaving the through rate to the railway companies the same identically as that which was accepted on the arrangement with the other two steamship companies. It is important to know exactly how that is, and it is with that view I move for this correspondence.

Motion agreed to.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, reports to Council, Orders in Council, reports of engineers on the ground, engineers in charge, and of the Chief Engineer, plans and estimates of cost in connection with the proposed Trent Valley canal.

He said: It will be in the recollection of members of this House who were members of the former House that this subject has occupied to some extent the attention of Parliament, and also the attention of a very considerable section of the country, and that votes have been taken on account in respect to this canal from time to time. It will also be in the recollection of some of us, who have relations more or less close with that particular section of the country, that, during the general election of 1882, very strong statements were made by gentlemen very high in authority in the Government of the country as to the intention and determination to carry out that canal. Not much progress, however, has been made.

Mr. POPE. A good deal.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, we will see. Not much progress has been made. On the contrary, it seems from the report I hold in my hand, the appendix to the report of the Minister, that new plans altogether are now proposed to be adopted, and a new investigation is proposed to be made. The report, at page 131 of the appendix, says:

"TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

"A continuous location survey, estimate, &c., for the direct line, as indicated in a previous report, was completed last spring, and its general results given by me to the Honorable the Minister."

So that, so long ago as last spring, the report and estimates were completed and the results given to the Minister. I sought, but I sought in vain, for that estimate, plan and results last Session. I was told that they were not completed. At what period Mr. Rubidge supposes the spring to end I do not know very well. The statement is vague, and perhaps he thought the spring did not end until after the Parliament rose. But, however that may be, it seems that it is pretty nearly a year ago since so much was done.

"This," the officer goes on to say, "the most direct and practicable line of those examined, necessarily diverged in many important instances from the route originally projected by Baird, in 1835; for which reason representations were subsequently made by persons locally interested in the undertaking, and acquainted with the character of the country traversed, to the effect that a closer adherence to, and the canalisation of all rivers connecting the several lakes was desirable; that, although more circuitous, such a course would, nevertheless, be much cheaper than its adoption by the Government of the line surveyed by me, and would yet be sufficiently direct for all practical purposes, regarded as a natural navigable highway to the west.

"Accordingly, in view of such representations, and of the importance attached to the section of the best location for this extensive work, the Minister directed that additional information in relation to the original project should forthwith be obtained, to enable me to present an estimate therefor, as an alternative line, in the report on surveys, to be submitted to the Chief Engineer of canals.

"The necessary additional information has, in part, been obtained during the past summer, but a more minute examination of the Severn River, and other waters not included in the surveys for the direct line, remains to be accomplished, and as this work can be more satisfactorily performed on the ice, it will be proceeded with during the winter."

Of course, I suppose this will not be through until the spring, and therefore I do not expect to receive the report of this new survey, but for the present it is clear that operations have terminated with reference to the old survey, and that they terminated nearly a year ago. We have the location survey, continuous, the estimate, and so forth, nearly a year ago, and I hope we shall, at an early day, have these papers placed before us.

Mr. POPE. I may say that we have pushed this forward as fast as we could conveniently. The hon. gentleman knows that we never undertake to do anything without doing it in the most economical way we can, and so we proposed to utilise the ice; but, as he appears to be so anxious that the work shall be carried out, that will be a stimulus to us, and I shall push it forward as rapidly as possible.

Mr. BLAKE. Don't stimulate too much.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—WESTERN TERMINUS.

Mr. BLAKE. When we were discussing, last Session, the plans for the final settlement of all financial arrangements which might be essential to the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the Atlantic, on the one side, to the Pacific, on the other, I ventured to state that it would be essential, in order to carry out the grand scheme of trans-continental traffic, and to ensure the dropping upon our happy and favored shores of all the riches of the Orient, that some other port than Port Moody should be adopted as the Pacific terminus of the road. The hon. gentleman, the then Minister of Railways—I was about to say the hon. gentleman's predecessor, but that would be premature, for at present the hon. gentleman is Minister of only one railway, somewhere in the eastern townships, and is only Acting Minister of all the other railways in Canada—

Mr. POPE. I will send you a pass.

Mr. BLAKE. Thank you very much, but how often does the road go? The then Minister of Railways, I say, rather pooh-poohed the suggestion of mine that Port Moody was not the best terminus in the world for the finest railway in the world, which was about to control the most magnificent traffic in the world. He pointed out that certain admirals and other persons high in authority had reported that Port Moody was the harbor beyond all others, a sort of paradise of harbors, and so I was, metaphorically speaking, sat upon. But, not many months afterwards, I observed in the newspapers, which, as I have had occasion to remark before, always tell the truth, that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was about to leave this paradise of harbors and seek Coal Harbor or English Bay, the two points which I had suggested as affording the probable terminus. I see that the vice-president and the chief engineer or manager of the railway have been to British Columbia, have surveyed the line, have decided to give up Port Moody, have decided upon another terminus, and that extensive works are proposed, with the view of carrying out that plan. It will be interesting for us to understand how far the work which has been accomplished by the Government is to be utilised in this direction. I believe there is a question as to the precise point on the line which has been contracted by the Government, where the road is to diverge to the new terminus. It will also be important to know what the cost is to be for the projected addition to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I therefore beg to move:

For a plan of the proposed route or routes of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from Port Moody, or the neighborhood thereof, to English Bay or Coal Harbor, showing the point at which the route chosen diverges from the main line, and the distance thereof from the present terminus at Port Moody; also an estimate of the cost of constructing the proposed line to the new Pacific terminus, and of the cost of the terminal accommodations there.

Mr. POPE. There is no objection to the motion. Government have not changed their mind, and if this road is to be extended, it is a private enterprise, conducted by the people themselves. As to the cost, I know no more about it than the hon. gentleman. No plan has been submitted to us. We still adhere to the terminus we had formerly selected, as suggested by Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh! oh!

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—THE NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

1. A statement of the present position of the debt of \$600,000 due last Session by the North American Contracting Company, to the Canadian Pacific Railway, with information as to whether the same has been settled, and if so, when and upon what terms; and if unsettled, what steps have been taken or are being taken to procure a settlement; also, a statement of the present position of a sum of about \$600,000 invested by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in stock of the Canada North-West Land Company, with a statement of its value, at the average price for the month of January, 1885.
2. Also, plan and statement showing the grades and curves on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway as far as constructed, including all the Government sections, but exclusive of the line constructed by the company from the foot of the Rocky Mountains to Kamloops.
3. Also, a copy of the prospectus, advertisement and other papers in connection with the recent proposal for the issue of bonds of the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company, guaranteed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with a statement of the amount sold, and the average rate.
4. Also, an estimate of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Callander and Port Arthur, divided under the usual heads of sub-divisions in railway construction, with separate estimate for equipment.
5. Also, a like estimate, in similar form, of the cost of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Calgary and the summit of the Rocky Mountains, and from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to the junction with the Government section, each separately, with a statement of the items in which a saving of \$4,000,000 upon the estimate of last Session is calculated by the officers of the company.
6. Also, a statement of the expenditure by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on any account, except the construction and equipment of the contracted line between Callander and Port Arthur, and between Selkirk and Kamloops.

Mr. POPE. I can say to the hon. gentleman, we will bring down all the information we can get. I cannot agree to give him all that information; we probably could not get it for the next two years if I did, it would take so long to get it ready. Still, we will bring it down as soon as we can.

Motion agreed to.

OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RAILWAY, N.S.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence, Orders in Council, contracts and other papers in connection with the projected railway between Oxford and New Glasgow, in Nova Scotia, or in relation to any companies, or individuals negotiating for the construction of any part of the projected Short Line, within the bounds of the Province of Nova Scotia; and particularly an instrument signed by Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, about 9th May, 1884, whereby he, as representing the Crown, entered into certain engagements with Norvin Green, president of the Montreal and European Short Line Company, or with that company; and all orders or arrangements cancelling the said agreement, and of the evidence as to the ability of the company on which said agreement was made; and of all orders and authorities under which the Oxford Branch Railway was completed, or money thereon expended out of the Intercolonial appropriation, and of all agreements in connection with such expenditure; and of all statements, representations and letters made by, or on behalf of contractors, companies, railway companies, construction companies, laborers, merchants or others, who have been concerned in the work, and of all reports made to any Department, or to Council, upon any of the above subjects.

He said: Some time ago, when it was proposed by the Minister of Railways to aid the project called "The Short Line Company," I felt it my duty to enquire of him whether he had such information as would enable him to say to us that the company was in a position to carry out the work. In the year 1883, I think it was, the hon. Minister gave us very strong assurances upon that point. He said, amongst other things:

"I have taken great pains to ascertain the financial standing and position of this company, and I think that I am in a position to state that whatever work they will engage in they will carry through."

Well, we granted a subsidy, and the contract was let and some work was done. In the prosecution of that work, somehow or other, this same North American Contracting Company that I have just been enquiring about in another connection, got mixed up with it in some way. They contracted to do the work, and they advanced a certain sum upon it—it seems, from some papers I read in the House a while ago, some couple of hundred thousand dollars. Then, just as in the case with their larger contract for the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was not convenient to advance any more money and they stopped; and the sub-contractors were not paid, the store-keepers were not paid, the laborers were not paid, and then there was a general state of discomfort, and trouble, and loss, and vexation to those who had been connected with that work locally, apart from the trouble that belonged to the localities from the non-prosecution of the work. Last year the hon. gentleman brought forward another project. I called his attention to the failures of his former assurances. I called his attention to those facts to which I have just now briefly referred, and the Minister of Railways told me that it was all right, that the trouble was that this company had been engaged upon too small an affair. If they had a bigger railway to build, he said, they would have gone through with it; though I do not see that their having a larger work would be a guarantee that it would be carried through, because, either large or small, the result seems to be the same. But that was what the Minister said, that the enterprise was too small; and he proposed to enlarge the enterprise by a proposition which he submitted to the House, and which he said would ensure its successful completion. So once again the Minister displayed the art of showing the better side of everything, and no doubt when it becomes the duty of the hon. gentleman to whom I am now looking to fulfil his part, he will emulate him.

Mr. POPE. I will try.

Mr. BLAKE. The Minister proved once again that the Long Line Short Line Company was all right, whatever the troubles of the Short Line Company might have been, and the House granted the subsidy over again. It seems we have been doing a little bit of work in connection with the road. We have built a ballast siding, but which was really part of the grand scheme at Oxford. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Pope) shakes his head, but as it forms part of the grand scheme, it was included in the contract or arrangement made with the company, and it was to be sold to them at cost as part of the scheme.

Mr. POPE. I never heard of it before.

Mr. BLAKE. That shows the inconvenience of not having a real genuine Minister of Railways. If there was a real Minister who was responsible for the duties of the office he would doubtless have known about this matter, though the hon. gentleman does not.

Mr. POPE. Are you quite sure about the point?

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite sure. I will give the proof. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Public Accounts and look at the Intercolonial open account he will find a reference to the Oxford siding, that it is to be part of the Short

Mr. BLAKE.

Line Railway. But he has not read them, because he is not really Minister of Railways, and it is not his business to look at or to be acquainted with the accounts relating to this Department. There seems to have followed a lack of performance in this respect as in the other. I find, in the report of the Acting Minister, a reference to this enterprise. He says:

"*Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company (formerly the Great American and European Short Line Railway Company)*."—(See No. 4, p. 24.)—In 1882 a subsidy was voted by Parliament to the extent of \$224,000, for the construction of a line about seventy miles long, between Oxford, about thirty miles east of Amherst, and New Glasgow, N.S.

"Under date the 28th July, 1882, a contract was entered into with the above named company for the building of this road, the work to be completed by the 1st of January, 1884.

"The company commenced work and continued operations until the autumn of 1883, when work was suspended, and has not since been resumed. The contract, accordingly, became null and void. As the subsidy was to be paid upon the completion of each ten-mile section, and as no one section was completed, no portion of the subsidy has been paid."

That is all that is stated in the report. Another contract was signed at a later date, and under the new arrangement between the Montreal and European Short Line Railway Company and Her Majesty, represented by Sir Charles Tupper, as Minister of Railways, for the execution of the larger project. I am creditably informed and believe that such a contract was executed. The Acting Minister shakes his head; but once again, since he did not know what is in the Public Accounts, he has not accurately acquainted himself with the fact, and the officials have not told him what transpired before he took charge of the Department. If he will enquire he will find that on or about 8th May, 1884, a contract was made between the Queen, represented by Sir Charles Tupper, Minister of Railways, and this company. What has become of this contract, whether it has been nullified, whether it was executed on conditions which have not been carried out, I know not; but I am informed that such a contract was executed, and I find in the Public Accounts evidence of that fact, for I perceive that the Government property, the Oxford siding, is to be transferred to this company under some contract or arrangement, and I know of none except the one to which I have referred. It is important to know what the truth is as to these transactions. It is important to know what steps have been taken towards the execution of this work. It is important to know how far the Minister's plan, which had failed hitherto, had really come to successful fruition, and what prospect there is of those people in the locality, who really, as I have been told, relied on the assurance given by the then Minister of Railways, from his place in Parliament, as to the financial stability and resources of the company, obtaining arrangements to satisfy them for the loss which it seems too likely they will suffer unless something is done to put the enterprise on a proper footing.

Mr. POPE. I have no objection to the adoption of the motion; but I may say to the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken in his statement that there ever was a second contract signed by the Department. There was a proposed contract, based on the condition that these gentlemen would commence the work within a certain time, but the contract never was to be handed over to them until they showed a *bond fide* ability to build the road.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it signed?

Mr. POPE. It was not signed by the Secretary of the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. Was it signed by the Minister?

Mr. POPE. It was signed by the Minister, but it was not a completed contract. It was placed in the hands of Mr. Pottinger, and afterwards sent to the Department, where it has remained ever since. It never was to be a

contract until certain things were done. It is true that one condition of the contract was, at the instance of those people, kept out of it, but the real object of the contract not being completed until those people showed their *bond fides*, was just to carry out the suggestion the hon. gentleman made. There has been no expenditure, either at Oxford or anywhere else, except that which was of importance to the Intercolonial Railway itself, and not dependent on these people. I have no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

List of all the unsold Indian lands in the township of Toronto, in the county of Peel.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant) for (Mr. Fleming).

Statement showing all properties, islands and other lands, whether built upon or not, belonging to the Dominion Government, and situated within the limits of the county of Richelieu, the names of the parties occupying the said properties, as tenants or otherwise; the time for which such properties are leased, the annual rent and the arrears due, if any, on each such property, up to the 1st January, 1885.—(Mr. Massue.)

Copy of Order in Council appointing J. H. Morgan as forestry commissioner; also copy of instructions accompanying same; also, date of report from the said J. H. Morgan, which appears as part of the last report of the Minister of the Interior, and copies of any subsequent reports and the date on which the same were received by the Department; also, statement of any payments made to the said J. H. Morgan subsequent to those appearing in the Public Accounts of 1884.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant) for (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex).

1. A statement of the expenditure of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company since the account in Mr. Stephen's letter to the Minister of Railways and Canals, 15th January, 1884, upon branch lines, specifying each line, the expenditure thereon, the purpose thereof, and the additional mileage beyond 269 miles completed at the date of Mr. Stephen's letter. 2. Statement of the cost of equipment of such branch lines. (a.) At the date of said letter. (b.) Since that time. 3. Estimate for any further cost of equipment for such branch lines, so far as completed. 4. Statement in detail of the further sums paid in respect of the extensions or branches east of Callander since the date of said letter, when they amounted to \$3,203,050. 5. A statement of the present condition of the account for advances towards acquiring a line to the seaboard and for other purposes, alleged to be within the charter, shown by the said letter at \$3,482,251; with a detail of any further payments of a like character.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement of the amount expended in repairing the breakwater at Tracadie, Nova Scotia, from 30th June, 1884, to 31st January, 1885, giving the names of all persons to whom any portion of the expenditure had been paid, together with the amount paid to each, and for what; also, copies of all correspondence relating to the same between said dates.—(Mr. McIsaac.)

Return of all certificates for liquor sold under section 99, clause 4, second part of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, by the physicians of the several counties now under the said Act in Nova Scotia, giving the names of each physician and the names of the persons to whom certificates were granted and the quantity supplied in each case, from 1st January, 1884, to 1st January, 1885.—(Mr. Kirk.)

Return of all correspondence, from 1st January, 1884, to 1st January, 1885, between W. H. Rogers, inspector of fisheries for Nova Scotia; also, Mr. Sellon, overseer of river fisheries for Liverpool, Queen's county, Nova Scotia; also, between John Millard, J. Newton Freeman, S. J. R. Bill and others, and the Government or Department of Marine and Fisheries, in reference to a breach of the sawdust law by putting mill rubbish and shingle shavings into the Mersey River; showing also, what fines have been imposed and how many collected; if not collected, whether remitted.—(Mr. Forbes.)

Return showing all sums of money paid and the dates of payment to A. F. Wood and J. A. Wilkinson, or either of them, from the 1st day of January, 1879, to the 1st day of January, 1885. The work done or services rendered as valuers or otherwise during each year. Showing the number of days, weeks or months employed and the number of valuations made on the Murray canal. The amount paid to the several parties on the recommendation or joint recommendations of them or either of them. The length of time the claims had been in existence. The amount claimed and the dates of payment, and the amount paid and the travelling and all other expenses connected therewith and paid to the said Wood and Wilkinson, or either of them, or to any other person or persons, on their or either of their accounts.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the several sums paid, and dates of payment, made by the Government, between the 1st day of January, 1884, and the 30th day of June, 1884, and between the 1st day of July and the 31st day of December, 1884, to the several printing and publishing companies of this Dominion, or to editors, agents or proprietors of newspapers or publishers of any kind, for any work done or material furnished.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, despatches and correspondence between the Governments of Canada and the United Kingdom, and be-

tween the Government of Canada and Her Majesty's ambassador at Washington, not already brought down, relating to the subject of extradition and extradition arrangements.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copy of the report made by the engineer, since January, 1884, on the cost of erecting breakwaters at New Harbor and Indian Harbor in the county of Guysboro', Nova Scotia, and also copy of report on White Haven boat canal.—(Mr. Kirk.)

Copies of the claim of J. B. Plante, of St. Charles, Bellechasse, in relation to certain horses which he alleges have been killed by a train of the Intercolonial Railway, and of which he demands the value; copies of the order referring the said claim to the official arbitrators, and of their enquiry, report and award; of the second reference to the said arbitrators, and of their enquiry and further report; also, all documents and papers relating to the matter in question.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny) for (Mr. Amyot.)

Copies of all correspondence and agreements between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on the subject of immigration to Manitoba and the North-West, together with a statement showing the amount expended by the company in promoting such immigration, giving amounts paid, with dates, to whom paid, and nature of service rendered; also, estimate of the company of number of persons from foreign countries who have actually settled there in each year since date of charter.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Return showing the number of islands leased in the River St. Lawrence, the names of such islands, the party or parties to whom leased, and the yearly rental payable for each of the said islands respectively.—(Mr. Wood, Brockville.)

Statements of the amount paid by the Government to Messrs. George and Andrew Holland, or any other persons, for services as official reporters of the Senate, or for short-hand work of any kind outside of Parliamentary reporting, since 1st January, 1882.—(Mr. Auger.)

Copies of all papers connected with the sale of the Dundas and Waterloo macadamized road by the Government, on the 15th day of March, 1884, including previous applications by any municipality or private parties for the purchase or other acquisition of the road, the conditions under which the road was offered for sale; statement in detail of the expenses incurred in connection with the sale, to whom sold, the amount realised and the amount and dates of the payments made by the purchaser, and the balance, if any, remaining unpaid at the date of this order.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant) for (Mr. Bain, Wentworth).

Mr. POPE moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 19th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the representation of the Territories in the House of Commons.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Bill (No. 47) for the more effectual prevention of cruelty to animals.—(Mr. Charlton.)

BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.

Mr. GIGAULT. (Translation). Asked leave to introduce Bill (No. 46), further to amend the law relating to bills of exchange and promissory notes.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. GIGAULT. (Translation). The present law provides that in order to make a protest valid, a bill of exchange or a promissory note must be presented at the office of the bank or at the place where it is made payable. If such office or indicated place of payment do not exist when the note becomes due, the law does not state what ought to be done. The object of the Bill which I beg leave to introduce is to declare that the presentation of the bill of exchange or promissory note will not be necessary whenever such office or place of payment shall have ceased to exist when the bill or note becomes due. It also provides that the notary or justice of the peace by whom the protest

shall be made shall make a declaration to the effect that after due enquiry he has been unable to find the office or place at which the bill of exchange or promissory note was made payable.

Motion agreed, to and Bill read the first time.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—PORT MOODY AND SAVONA FERRY SECTION.

Mr. HOMER asked, Has the Government granted to A. Onderdonk an extension of time for the completion of the contract on the Canadian Pacific Railway, between Port Moody and Savona Ferry? If not, is it the intention of the Government to grant A. Onderdonk an extension of time for the completion of his contract between Port Moody and Savona Ferry?

Mr. CARON. In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I have the honor to state that no extension has been asked by Mr. Onderdonk, and no extension has been granted.

DUTY ON FLOUR AND CORNMEAL.

Mr. FORBES asked, Is it the intention of the Government during the present Session of Parliament to increase the rate of duty upon imported flour or cornmeal in accordance with the request of the Millers' Association of Ontario? If so, will the duty on coal be increased also?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The intentions of the Government on this subject will be communicated to the House when the Budget is brought down.

ALLAN STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

Mr. FORBES asked, Have the Government received from the Allan Steamship Company, or from the estate of the late Sir Hugh Allan, the amount due, or claimed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for services rendered by the Government steamship *Newfield*, in aiding the wrecked Allan steamship *Moravian* in 1881? If not, is it the intention of the Government to take steps to recover such amount?

Mr. McLELAN. The amount settled upon between the Allan Steamship Company and the Government has been paid. There was some little delay as to the amount that should be paid, in consequence of there being no principle adopted as to the allowance that Government steamers should receive for aid to private ships. I made enquiry of the British Government and the United States Government as to the practice followed there, we followed something like the same practice, and the account was settled.

AID TO EMERSON, MANITOBA.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked, Has any demand been recently made by the town of Emerson, Manitoba, for financial or other aid? If so, what is the nature and extent of the demand? Has the Government assented to the same in whole or in part, or has any action been taken in the premises?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Application has been made by the town of Emerson, and the Government are at this moment considering it, and will probably arrive at a decision in a few days. We have not arrived at a decision yet.

EASTERN EXTENSION RAILWAY, N.S.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) asked, What were the earnings and the working expenses of the Eastern Extension Railway from New Glasgow to Port Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, for each month of the calendar year 1884?

Mr. GIGAULT.

Mr. CARON. If the hon. gentleman would move for a return of the papers instead of putting it in the shape of a question, the papers will be brought down and the information given.

EMPLOYMENT OF JOHN MOODY.

Mr. LISTER asked, Is John Moody employed in any way in the Fishery Department of the Government? If so, in what capacity, when was he appointed, what is his salary, and what are his duties?

Mr. McLELAN. John B. Moody is employed as fishery overseer under the Fishery Department. He was appointed in 1880. His salary is \$50 per annum. His duties consist in enforcing the Fishery Act and regulations on the north shore of the Sydenham River from its junction at Wallaceburg to its source.

WHEAT AND FLOUR DUTIES.

Mr. BERGERON asked, Whether the Government intend to make alterations in the tariff as respects wheat and flour?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The answer I gave to my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Forbes) must be the answer I give to the hon. gentleman who asks this question.

SETTLERS IN THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. GILLMOR asked, How many of the immigrants who arrived in this country from the 1st January, 1884, to the 31st December, from Europe, have settled permanently in each of the Maritime Provinces?

Mr. CARON. On behalf of the Minister of Agriculture, I beg to state, that, from the reports of the agents of the Department of Agriculture, the following immigrants entered the Maritime Provinces:—Nova Scotia, 1,436; New Brunswick, 235; Prince Edward Island, 2; making altogether, 1,673.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. STAIRS asked, When does the Government intend to open the Post Office Savings Banks in the Maritime Provinces?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Postmaster-General is now opening Post Office Savings Banks in the Maritime Provinces.

STATION AT ELGIN STATION, COUNTY OF L'ISLET.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, Is it the intention of the Government to erect a station for the accommodation of passengers and for freight at Elgin Station, County of L'Islet, on the Intercolonial Railway?

Mr. CARON. It is not the intention of the Government to build a station for freight at Elgin Station, County of L'Islet.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT ST. STEPHEN, N. B.

Mr. GILLMOR asked, Whether the building of the Custom House and Post Office at St. Stephen, N. B., has yet been commenced, on which \$15,000 was voted previous to the last general election of 1882; if not, when does the Government intend to commence those buildings?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The lot has been purchased and paid for, and tenders will shortly be asked for.

NORTH-WEST CENSUS.

Mr. FARROW asked, In taking the census in Manitoba and the North-West, is there to be a column to ascertain the last place of residence of settlers, previous to their going to the North-West to settle?

Mr. CARON. It is the intention of the Government to add the column which the hon. gentleman has requested to be added to the census to be taken in Manitoba.

REPORT OF THE PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). With the permission of the House, I would like to move the adoption of the second report of the Committee of both Houses on the printing of Parliament. I suppose it ought properly to have been moved when the motions were called, but I did not happen to be in my place, and if the House will permit me I will move it now. I may say that the report mentions the printing of certain documents; and in addition to that, there is a clause which continues the gratuity granted last year to the assistant clerk in the Stationery Office, to the new incumbent in the office, Mr. Clark. The position is one requiring technical knowledge, and the gentleman appointed to the office is a first-class proof-reader, and an exceedingly good man for that position. The Committee thought that the gratuity given last year of \$200, might be continued to the present incumbent.

Mr. BLAKE. I must ask the hon. gentleman not to put that motion without notice. I have no objection to the recommendation of the report as concerns the printing, but as a general rule any motion which proposes to make a charge on the service of the House ought to be preceded by notice.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Of course, if the hon. gentleman objects that is a good reason for delaying the motion; but the report has been in the Votes and Proceedings for the last three days.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, but I am pointing out that by our custom, when it is intended to move the adoption of a report involving a charge, we have had notice given.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I take the opportunity, with the permission of the House, of calling the attention of the members of the Printing Committee to the desirability of causing to be printed such returns as those I have moved for recently with respect to the receipts and expenditures chargeable to the Consolidated Fund. I noticed they were omitted last year. Now those are of some value. They contain a good deal of information which it is sometimes necessary to look back to in order to refresh one's memory. There is no economy in delay because they might have to be moved for again. They would only occupy half a page, and judging from what I have seen of our Sessional Papers I must say there are a great many other pages occupied with matter of much less importance. I direct the attention of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and of the other members of the Printing Committee to that point. I would also like to know whether any progress has been made in printing the reports of the Factory Commissioners. These have been brought down in manuscript, but they are rather voluminous, and I think if the Minister could have caused them to be printed a little in advance it would have been a great convenience to the House.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. They were only finished the day before I laid them on the Table of the House.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. They will be printed promptly, I hope.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I have no doubt that the reports might be printed in the Sessional Papers with the approbation of the committee. The committee had not

met when the reports of the commissioners were laid on the Table; and I declined to take the responsibility of ordering their printing, as the chairman of the committee of the other House did, without the acquiescence of the committee itself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would just mention to the hon. member for Cardwell, that similar reports have been printed in former Sessional Papers, but the practice has not been uniform.

Mr. PATERSON (South Brant). I desire to remark to the chairman of the Printing Committee with reference to the report of the commissioners that it is stated in the Order in Council appointing them, that the information was sought for for the purpose of enabling us to take legislative action thereupon. It is probable they will be used by the Finance Minister in making his statement, and the hon. gentleman will see how necessary it is that members of the House should have the report of these commissioners in print before that debate comes on. I would like to ask him if he thinks it could be rapidly accomplished.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). If it is the desire of the House that it should be printed, we can give orders immediately to have it printed.

Mr. BLAKE. This document was heralded some months ago by the Finance Minister as an important document, and I dare say we shall hear a good deal about it, and it ought to be printed in full.

LIFE SAVING CREW AT PORT ROWAN.

Mr. McLELAN. A few days ago the hon. member for South Norfolk (Mr. Jackson) enquired of me respecting the payment of the life-saving crew at Port Rowan. I find upon enquiry that the detailed account on the services of the crew was not received at the office until the 8th of February. It was immediately taken up, and the cheques have been despatched to each of the crew engaged in the service.

THE BUDGET.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that to-day completes the third week since we were summoned. We have been summoned two or three weeks later than usual, and the hon. gentleman may see from the questions put to him by various members of the House, that the public are getting very anxious to hear what he has to say about the financial condition of the country. I think it would be a great convenience to all if the Minister were able to tell us within a day or two when he thinks he can make his financial statement. Until we get that he is aware the actual business of the Session cannot make any very rapid progress. I have no doubt that on this, as on other occasions, considerable discussion must arise, and it would be of interest to all on both sides if the hon. Minister could give us some indication when he will bring down the Estimates and when he will make his statement.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am not in a position to state the day that we will be able to lay the Estimates on the Table of the House or to make the financial statement. I should hope that we might be able to do so to-morrow week. As next Saturday is at the disposal of the Government I may be in a position to make the statement on Friday of next week; I am afraid I will not be able to make it on Tuesday.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I suppose I may assume it will not be earlier.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I think not.

HOLES IN ICE ON FREQUENTED WATERS.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 22) to amend the criminal law and to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes cut in the ice on navigable or frequented waters.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. IVES. I move that after the word "justice" in the first section, the words "or district magistrate" be added. In the Province of Quebec district magistrates would be the officers before whom cases of this kind would naturally be tried. I also move that after the word "city" the words "judicial district or county" be added. Our divisions with respect to justices of the peace or magistrates are divided into judicial districts rather than into counties.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. HALL. I beg to move that the following be inserted as section 2 of the Bill:—

The owner, manager or superintendent of any abandoned or unused mine or quarry or property upon or in which any excavation in search of mines or quarries has been or shall hereafter be made of a sufficient area and depth to endanger human life, who shall leave the same unguarded and unenclosed by a guard or fence of sufficient height and strength to prevent any person from accidentally riding, driving, walking or falling therein, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to be punished by fine or imprisonment or both, before any justice of the peace having jurisdiction in the locality in which said mine or quarry is situate.

This is almost identical with the English law in that respect, except that I have added "quarry" to the word mine.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. HALL. I beg to move that the following be section 3:

If within ten days after conviction for one of the offences referred to in the first and second clauses of this Act, a suitable fence is not constructed around said exposed opening, to conform to the provisions of this Act, the person or persons liable for such omission may be again complained of and convicted for said offence, and the plea of a former conviction therefor shall not avail to him or them as a relief from said complaints and conviction.

Mr. MACDONALD (King's, P.E.I.) I think there are very serious objections to this Bill from a Prince Edward Island standpoint. We are accustomed to cutting ice in our rivers and taking out manure for agricultural purposes, and if the people who are engaged in that occupation are required to fence in all the holes they make it will prove a very great hardship. I do not know of any accident having happened for lack of proper precaution being taken to fence in holes made for that purpose. According to this Bill, all persons digging and cutting holes in the ice will be required to fence in the holes they make, and this, I repeat, will prove a great hardship. There are certain other parts of the country where ice is cut for packing purposes, and the people engaged in the work will also be affected by a law of this kind. I think due care should not be taken that such a measure as that should become a hardship instead of a benefit to the general public.

Mr. DAVIES. The Bill is one that looks reasonable, and I am loath to give it my opposition, but the remarks of my colleague prove that as regards our Province at least, in the creeks and bays of which the farmers are accustomed to keep holes in the ice open for the digging of mussels, it might work a hardship, and besides that it would hardly be necessary as these holes are guarded by putting up trees around them, and I never heard of an accident occurring. It is impossible that they could be protected in the manner provided by the Bill, because horses are used for a space of 20 or 30 feet from the holes, and to inclose these openings and the spaces which the horses occupy would prevent the farmers engaging in that work at all. As I remarked

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

before, the Bill looks so reasonable on its face that one does not like to object to it, but in its practical application I fear that it would either be evaded altogether, or if attempted to be enforced it will act very hardly. There never have been any accidents that I have heard of by leaving these openings unprotected; on the contrary, as the farmers erect a barrier of brush around them they are not on the direct line of travel and therefore accidents could hardly occur. The Bill may apply very well to the bay at Hamilton from which city the promoter comes, but I do not think it should apply to our Province.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should think that if this measure becomes law it will completely put a stop to the immense winter fisheries in my own county, and I suppose there are not less than 700 or 800 holes in the ice in the main river in that county. That industry gives employment to many hundreds of people constantly, and if the Bill becomes law it will practically preclude the fishermen from carrying on their business. Now I have seen the effects—in relation to that Province—of the winter fisheries of our country for a great many years, and I believe I may safely say that not within my memory has it ever occurred that these fishing holes proved dangerous to human life. Such a thing may occur, as accidents occur to individuals travelling by rail, but they are the ordinary casualties which cannot be avoided on any ordinary highway of the country, but if this Bill passes requiring that a fence of a certain height should be placed around the holes, there being hundreds of them in the river, it will practically put a stop to that branch of the business. I think the mover of the Bill should hesitate before he forces us into that position. We have found no practical difficulty from the present state of protection, or the local requirements in relation to the protection of these fishing holes, and the universal custom in the principal river in my county—the second largest river in the Province—is one which amply ensures this protection. I may here state, before I point out the custom on that river, that I doubt whether this Parliament has any right to deal with a matter of this kind. It appears to me to be a matter of purely municipal regulation, to be dealt with, if at all, by the municipal councils or the Local Parliaments, and not to be brought in here, where I claim we have nothing to do with it. The custom in our Province—the law in the Province of New Brunswick is, that the municipal councils have power, under a provincial Statute, to make regulations in relation to fishing holes or other openings made in the rivers for the purpose of carrying on business, and the regulation which is required by the municipal corporation in Northumberland County is this: That every fishing hole shall be indicated by placing green bushes around it. They cut two or three spruce bushes, 7 or 8 feet high, and they place them at the holes as an indication, a warning, a sign post to the public, and that is all the protection which is required, and all the protection they have had within my memory at all events. Now there are some 700 or 800 or more fishermen at work in my county, and in other counties the same state of things exists, and if these men have to fence up these holes on the different rivers it will greatly embarrass them in the operation of their fishing, and will create much trouble and expense. If the hon. gentleman desires any protection in relation to his locality let him confine it to the Province of Ontario, or the harbor of Hamilton, or wherever else it may be required; but do not let him by a law of this kind, applying all over the Dominion, embarrass existing regulations and lead to disturbance and dissatisfaction amongst the industrious fishermen in our country. We do not require such a protection, and in my opinion the Bill would be a detriment to the prosecution of business and should not be allowed to pass. I believe the section of which I speak is already passed by

the committee, but I shall take the earliest opportunity at the proper stage to move that it be referred back for reconsideration.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). I believe that the people of that portion of the Province of Ontario from which I come would not wish this Bill to become law. A few years ago the Canadian Pacific Railway Company tried the experiment of running a ferry across the St. Lawrence between Brockville and Morristown. It was attended with a great deal of expense, but it has proved successful after the outlay of a great deal of money and enterprise on the part of the company. Now it seems to me that if the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are to continue to run that boat through the winter, when they have to break holes in the ice as they have to do, leaving large apertures exposed, it will bring them under the operation of this clause, which would be not only a great injustice to the company but would altogether prohibit the only means of communication we now have between the State of New York, or I may say the United States, and that portion of Ontario. For that reason I cannot support this provision of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. The observations which have fallen from several hon. members sufficiently show that the Government has not acted with discretion in permitting this Bill to take the stage of Committee of the Whole, without having previously sifted it in a Select Committee, according to the customary mode of dealing with legislation affecting the criminal law introduced by private members. We have seen from the statements made by the hon. gentleman who last spoke and others who come from different parts of the country, that a measure of this kind should have been referred to a committee whose members could consult with their fellow members from their different Provinces, as to the peculiar local circumstances, and would ascertain whether it was possible so to mould the legislation as to make it at once uniform and just to all. I think therefore it would be a very convenient course that the committee should rise and report progress, and instead of the measure being further prosecuted in Committee of the Whole at this stage, the order for its reference should be discharged and a reference to a Select Committee composed of members from the different Provinces take its place, and after that it could go through Committee of the Whole. With reference to the remarks of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) there is a great deal of force in them,—not as I judge in a constitutional view, but as a question of policy. We can make almost anything a crime or a matter of criminal law here. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has for several years endeavored to make that which is now a matter of civil right in the Provinces, a crime; and so with this matter—we may draw it within our jurisdiction. But in a matter of this kind, particularly where there are different interests and necessities in different parts of the country, it may be impolitic to bring it within the scope of the criminal law, because there is no doubt that the Local Legislatures would have power to pass laws prohibiting the cutting of these holes without sufficient protection, and providing for the punishment of the breach of such laws by fine or imprisonment. There is ample power in the Local Legislatures to do all that may be necessary in order to protect individuals of the locality without resorting to this Parliament at all. Although therefore we have the power to make this a crime, it may be a question whether it is expedient to make it a crime, as municipal provision has been made in some of the Provinces, and may be made in others, and the conditions may be so various as to make it difficult to make an equitable change in the criminal law.

Mr. CARON. The discussion on this Bill has brought out some suggestions from hon. members which I think should be considered before the Bill is proceeded with any

further; and, especially as the hon. gentleman who has introduced the Bill happens not to be in his seat at present, I think the Committee should rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. So far as the principle of the Bill itself is concerned, the protection of the lives of people who have to drive over rivers, and who are exposed to considerable danger, especially at night, from the carelessness of people who for one purpose or another cut holes in the ice, I believe the principle in itself is a good principle. However, several hon. members from the Maritime Provinces have pointed out objections to the Bill which to my mind deserve more consideration than has been given to them, and I would move that the committee now rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. When the House again comes to consider the Bill, the hon. gentleman who has introduced it may be present, and may be willing to accept some of the suggestions which have been made. If my memory serves me rightly, this Bill was last Session referred to a Select Committee.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No, the year before.

Mr. WATSON. As reference has been made to the Eastern Provinces, I hope the Western Provinces will not be forgotten. A great number of men are employed every winter fishing on Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg, and if it were made a criminal offence to cut holes in the ice, a great hardship would be caused to the people.

Mr. IVES. I do not think it would be necessary to consider Manitoba, because it is understood that the settlers are all going to Dakota.

Mr. HALL. Having taken charge of this Bill, in the absence of the mover, I desire to say a word. It is unfortunate that the objections which have been raised against it were not made at the second reading. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) went away under the impression that the principle of the Bill was accepted by the House. It has been before the House two Sessions. In the first Session, it was referred to a committee which had charge of other Bills of a similar character, and by some accident it did not again reach the House. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) will see that there is a difficulty in the way of leaving the question to local legislation, because it concerns the criminal law. I believe, moreover, that the practical difficulty which led the hon. member for Hamilton to bring it before this House was that it applies to rivers which form the boundaries between municipalities. There can be no objection, however, to referring the matter to a committee, and I second the motion made to that effect.

Mr. MITCHELL. If the hon. gentleman will consent to limit the Bill to rivers which form the boundaries of municipalities, I would have no objection to it.

Mr. HALL. I think it would be better to refer it to the committee, and then all the objections could be considered.

Mr. BLAKE. It would not do to say that what is no crime in one river is a crime in another.

Committee rose and reported progress.

SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) (Translation) moved that Bill (No. 3) to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, be now read the second time. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, I think it is my duty to say a few words to justify the legislation I now propose. I do not intend to make a historical sketch of past legislation on this matter, nor do I wish to point out to the House and to the country wherein such legislation affects, in most of its details at least, the position of the

Province to which I belong, and the laws which were passed in that Province. It will be remembered that the Supreme Court Act was introduced in 1875. It was introduced by one of those who are now occupying the position of judges of that court, by the Hon. Justice Fournier, who was then the representative of the county of Bellechasse. The legislation of that time defines the composition of that tribunal, and if we open the Statutes of Canada, 38th Vic., chap. 11, we find that section 4 says:

"Her Majesty may appoint, by letters patent, under the Great Seal of Canada, one person, who is or who has been a judge of one of the Superior Courts in any of the Provinces forming part of the Dominion of Canada, or who is a barrister or advocate of at least ten years' standing at the bar of any one of the said Provinces, to be Chief Justice of the said court, and five persons who are or have been respectively judges of the said Superior Courts, or who are barristers or advocates of at least ten years' standing at the bar of one of the said Provinces, to be puisne judges of the said court, two of whom at least shall be taken from among the judges of the Superior Court or Court of Queen's Bench, or the barristers or advocates of the Province of Quebec; and vacancies in any of the said offices shall, from time to time, be filled in like manner."

As will be seen by the above provision of the law, the Province of Quebec was only entitled to two judges out of the six which were to form this tribunal. As to the jurisdiction of the court itself, it is established by section 17 of the same Act, which says:

"Subject to the limitations and provisions hereinafter made, an appeal shall lie to the Supreme Court from all final judgments of the highest court of final resort, whether such a court be a court of appeal or of original jurisdiction, now or hereafter established in any Province of Canada, in cases in which the court of original jurisdiction is a Superior Court: Provided that no appeal shall be allowed from any judgment rendered in the Province of Quebec, in any case wherein the sum or value of the matter in dispute does not amount to \$1,000; and the right to appeal in civil cases, given by this Act, shall be understood to be given in such cases only as are mentioned in this section, except exchequer cases and cases of *mandamus*, *habeas corpus* or municipal by-laws, as hereinafter provided."

That legislation gave to the court its composition and its jurisdiction. To-day we are asking for legislation to do away with these inconveniences, for the reason that the composition of the court offers no guarantee to the Province of Quebec in particular, and the same complaint has been made by several other Provinces, as I shall prove in a few moments. This is due to the composition of the court itself, and also to the jurisdiction which is given to it. The source of the grievances which are complained of to-day is found in the exercise of that jurisdiction by the persons who are members of the Supreme Court. In the first place, Mr. Speaker, as I said a moment ago, the Supreme Court only contains two judges from the Province of Quebec, and from this point of view we consider that the constitution of that court is defective.

Mr. GEOFFRION (Translation). Why not take them all from the Province of Quebec?

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny). (Translation.) I am asked, Mr. Speaker, why we should not take them all from the Province of Quebec? You will see, Mr. Speaker, that if he only listens to my argument the hon. member who has just interrupted me will find an answer to his question. If the several judges of whom the Supreme Court is composed were all conversant with our laws, if they were familiar with all the laws of the Province of Quebec, with the French laws and civil laws; if before that court lawyers from any one of the Provinces had full liberty to plead either in French or in English, I could well understand that one of the great objections against that court would be deprived of its strength, but under the present circumstances that court is closed to lawyers of the Province of Quebec, who are unable to plead in French before it, for the good reason that they are not sure that they will be understood by several of the judges. This complaint has been formulated long ago. Every year it has been made here, within these walls; it has been dis-

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny).

cussed in the press of the country, it has been uttered among the people of the Provinces. People are complaining that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court is an infringement on the rights of the Provinces, on provincial legislation. In order to show what is public opinion on that point, I could not do any better than to quote textually the words which have been uttered, under various circumstances, on the floor of this House, respecting the composition of that court. In 1881 the hon. member for Laval, (Mr. Ouimet) speaking on this question said:

"These judges for Ontario never learned or practised our Quebec laws, in respect of which they are to decide any cases brought before them. It is absurd to expect that those judges can, by merely opening our civil code or any of our French books—some of them do not understand or read French—can understand our law. I therefore say the constitution of the court is vicious and absurd. I will vote for its maintenance if properly remedied."

An hon. member from another county (Mr. MacCuaig), who was a representative of the county of Prince Edward in 1880, stated as follows:—

"The opinion entertained by the majority of the inhabitants of the county I represent, is this: We have a Supreme Court composed of six men, two from Ontario, two from Quebec, and two from the Maritime Provinces. As I understand the matter, the two judges from Ontario are not at all familiar with the laws of Quebec, while the two judges from the Maritime Provinces are not familiar with the laws of either Ontario nor Quebec. Now, in Ontario, we have an Appeal Court composed of four judges of high legal attainments, and well qualified to decide finally upon most every case that comes before them. But a case taken from our Court of Appeal, presided over by four judges of Ontario, may be taken to the Supreme Court, and their judgment overruled by four judges from Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, not at all familiar with our laws. This is not a all calculated to create any confidence in the decisions of the Supreme Court. I am told that in the Province of Quebec the Court of Appeal is composed of five judges, and they are certainly entirely better qualified to decide, according to the laws of the Province, than the four judges of the Supreme Court can be, who come from the other Provinces."

The hon. member for Halton (Mr. McDougall) also expressed himself as follows at that time:—

"It does seem, on the face of it, rather absurd to appeal from the judgments of a court of five judges, especially upon questions arising out of the civil laws peculiar to the Province of Quebec, to a court of six judges, only two of whom have any real knowledge or acquaintance with the principles of those laws. It seems more absurd still, when an appeal is taken from the judgments of courts in Ontario, that in this court, although the two Supreme Court judges from Ontario may concur, that their judgment should be overborne by the opinions of the judges from the other Provinces, who are not familiar with the laws of Ontario."

The Government themselves, I think, were of the same opinion as to the composition of the tribunal of the Supreme Court, and the hon. Minister of Public Works then uttered the following words, on the importance of which I beg to call the attention of the House:—

"I desire to be careful as to what I say, not only because I am speaking as a member of Parliament, but because of my position as Minister of the Crown. I do not charge these judges with dereliction of duty, which is charged against them outside, because I have no evidence of it. I wish to show, however, that the complaint made by the hon. member for Montmagny does not come from him alone, but is felt throughout the whole Province of Quebec, that the judgments of that court are not really rendered by the whole bench, but are the result of the deliberations of the two judges from that Province. This is unfortunate, and I hope the matter will be considered, in order that the evil may be remedied."

The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) also expressed, in the month of April, 1879, the following opinion on the matter:—

"It would be easy for the House to understand the cause of this dislike when it was borne in mind that whilst no one could sit as a judge in the Superior Court or in the Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Quebec, without having first followed a course of law and practised as a lawyer during at least ten years for this tribunal of last resort, and which was called upon to confirm or reverse the decisions of Quebec judges, four out of the six judges were chosen from the other Provinces, without being previously obliged to study the civil laws of the Province of Quebec."

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who introduced, a few years ago, a Bill altogether similar to that which I am now presenting myself, addressing himself to the Speaker of this House, said:—

"But we all know that the Province of Quebec occupies a very exceptional position, as far as her system of local jurisprudence is concerned. We all know that it is the only Province which is governed by the principles of the civil law, as amended in old France, while all the other Provinces are governed by the principles of English common law. Let us look at the *personal* of the six judges composing the Supreme Court. Four of them are judges of the English common law, and only two of them are conversant with the principles of the civil law, which rule the Province of Quebec; only three know the French language, in which all or nearly all our laws are written, and so one-half of the court can not even learn our laws. I ask, is it possible that, under these circumstances, the people of that Province can be satisfied to see the decisions of their Superior Court, presided over by a judge generally of long experience, revised, as they are often, by the Court of Review, composed of three judges, and finally examined by the Court of Appeal, composed of five judges, every one of them being lawyers of several years' standing, and familiar with the principles of our own peculiar system of jurisprudence. I say, is it to be expected that the people of Quebec would be satisfied to see this Supreme Court, where only two judges are supposed to know anything of our local laws and customs, reverse the decisions of all these courts?"

Such are, Mr. Speaker, the opinions which have been expressed since the Supreme Court exists. These opinions or fears have been felt by another hon. member who was my predecessor as representative of the county of Montmagny. In 1875, Mr. Taschereau, now one of the judges of the Supreme Court, expressed fears, which were about identical to these, by addressing the House in the following words:—

"As regarded their civil cases, he humbly thought that the people of their Province were quite satisfied with the different degrees of jurisdiction now existing in Quebec. It was a well known fact that their court of last resort, the Court of Queen's Bench, was now so composed as to inspire full confidence and respect. Of the decisions of this high and enlightened tribunal the Bill proposes that an appeal will be to the Supreme Court in all cases where the amount or value of the thing demanded shall exceed \$1,000 currency. Well, how would these cases be disposed of? Out of six judges who would compose the Supreme Court, he did not expect that their own Province would be represented by more than two judges, and our own population, the French Canadian element, by more than one judge, perhaps. Without alluding for the present to the unfairness of this proportion, if it was adopted, and without insisting now on the fact that their population was about one-fourth of the population of the whole Dominion, he would content himself with laying down this proposition: one of two things. Either the two judges from Quebec would, in fact, control the whole court in the decision of civil cases coming from Lower Canada, and in that case the authority of their Court of Queen's Bench, composed of five judges, would be superseded by that of two judges, who could not be possibly more competent than the members of their Court of Appeals, and might possibly be inferior to them. And, moreover, in that case, the two judges from Quebec might differ one from the other, and then the decision of the case would rest altogether with the other members of the court, unfamiliar with their laws and customs. Or, in the other supposition, the entire court will presume to hear and judge their civil cases, and then their two judges, although agreeing together, might find themselves in a minority, and then they should find, perhaps, the decision of all their Lower Canada courts, of all their Lower Canada judges, reversed by judges of other Provinces. The truth, the exact truth of this proposition, could not be denied, and the danger to which he drew their attention was too apparent and too imminent to be overlooked."

Such were, in the past, Mr. Speaker, the fears entertained when the Supreme Court was established. Now the experience of the past has not, in the least, dispelled the hostile feeling against the constitution and composition of that court, which has been manifested mostly in the Province of Quebec. This hostility was not limited to that Province, for the Province of Ontario and the Maritime Provinces also had in this House representatives who were not afraid to stand up and state how very small was their confidence in the composition of that tribunal. I do not speak here of the different judges who compose that court. Let it be well understood that the personality of the judges is completely out of question. Until now we have had no reason to complain against such or such a judge in particular, but I am speaking of the composition of the court from a purely theoretical point of view. The hostility which is now found to exist has been created by the composition of the court itself. In the month of February, 1880, the then Minister of Justice, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. McDonald) thus expressed himself:

"My hon. friend says that in the Province of Quebec the court is unpopular. Now I regret that extremely, but I quite understand that it

arises from causes entirely beyond our control. Perhaps it is a natural feeling that the members of the bar from that Province and the people of that Province should not entertain so strong a feeling of confidence in the decisions of this court, on questions of law arising under a system of jurisprudence different from that of other Provinces, and in which they are only represented by two judges."

At that time, Mr. Speaker, even the Minister of Justice, one of the members of the Government, was not afraid to acknowledge, on the floor of this House, that the causes of discontent which were complained of by the Province of Quebec were just causes of discontent; he gave expression to that idea by making, himself, the complaints which I am now making to day, against the composition of the tribunal of the Supreme Court. But we have still better than that, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. leader of the Government openly expressed the following opinion:—

"But that some dissatisfaction exists, I cannot ignore, and I am sure that the greatest amount of dissatisfaction arises from the Province of Quebec. That is easily to be understood, when you consider that the courts in the Province of Quebec are composed of judges learned in the special law of Lower Canada, and specially fitted to adjudicate on all questions under that law; and the feeling is, that they have more confidence in the judgments of the ordinary Superior Courts than the Court of Appeal from the judgments of these courts. The court here is principally composed of judges who have been educated under the system based on the laws of England, and the majority of these judges are not specially trained in the system of law which form the basis of Lower Canada jurisprudence. Of the six judges, only two are from Lower Canada. We do not know what mode is adopted by the judges among themselves, in discussing their judgments, or in what mode they approach the examination of the cases submitted to them, but it is alleged that the judges coming from the other Provinces leave, very much, to the two judges coming from Quebec, the appeals from that Province. Hence it is argued that to these two judges is left substantially the decisions of the cases from Quebec. It is felt that the decisions of the courts below have greater weight than the opinion of the two judges, who may reverse the judgments of the courts below. The consideration of this difficulty is not a new one to any member of the last Parliament. The difficulties connected with establishing a court satisfactory to the Province of Quebec was one of the great reasons that made me hesitate so long in presenting a measure for the establishment of the Supreme Court, which I twice submitted to the Parliament of Canada, and that hesitation induced me to postpone pressing the measure while I held the office of Minister of Justice. But we now have it, and I think we ought to try and make the best of it as a Dominion court."

Thus it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that the leader of the present Government himself fully concurred in the nature of the complaints which we were formulating then and which we are still formulating to-day. And the hon. Minister of Public Works, in the speech I have quoted a moment ago, in his speech made in the month of February, 1881, again dealt with this question, and said:

"The hon. member for Montmagny remarked that many of the cases from the Province of Quebec are believed to be decided by two judges only, whom we must understand to be the two judges from that Province. Of course we have no legal evidence of such being the case, but we cannot close our eyes to the fact that there is a conviction in the Province of Quebec that in the large majority of cases it is so. How that conviction has arisen I cannot say; but it is another reason why the court is unpopular in that Province. I do not say that it is a very popular court in the other Provinces; on the contrary, I think that in many of the Provinces the same feeling exists towards it."

Nothing is easier, Mr. Speaker, than to prove this sentiment; nothing is easier than to prove that the opinion expressed by the hon. Minister of Public Works is an opinion based on statements which have been made in this House. In order to establish that point, all I have to do is to quote those statements, and the first name I come across is that of the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) who thus spoke in the month of February, 1879:

"The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill only spoke the feelings of a great portion of the people of Ontario in explaining it. There was a strong feeling in the community against the multiplying of the courts and it was being expressed in almost every portion of the country. The Supreme Court was regarded as entirely useless, while at the same time a great cost to Canada."

The hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) expressed himself in the following terms:—

"The hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill had done nothing more than express, in its introduction, the feeling which was entertained, not merely in the Province of Ontario but still more largely in the Province of Quebec, with respect to the necessity for its abolition."

The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) held the following opinion on the Supreme Court:—

"He failed to hear any observations of the hon. gentleman for East Northumberland casting reflections on the Supreme Court, but had he gone that far, he would not have gone further than public opinion would have justified. No other court was so unpopular to-day, particularly in Ontario. They had a perfect right to discuss this question in Parliament."

The hon. member for North York (Mr. Strange) expressed the following opinion in 1881:—

"The question was put to me whether, in the event of this question coming before the House, I would apply myself to words favoring a repeal of the Supreme Court Act. I took the ground that we have in Ontario a Court of Appeal to which any cases from the inferior courts might be referred, and that in my opinion—an unprofessional one, of course—so far as that Province was concerned, the Supreme Court was unnecessary, and therefore, that I should have no hesitation in voting for its repeal."

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you wish to hear the expression of public sentiment in the Maritime Provinces, all you have to do is to refer to the *Hansard* of 1880, and you will see that the hon. member for Lunenburg thus gave expression to his opinion:

"With all due deference to the remarks of our right hon. friend the leader of the Government, in opposition to the Bill now before the House, for the repeal of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, I feel bound, in justice to the county and Province I have the honor to represent, to support my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Keeler) and endorse the sentiments by him expressed."

The constitution of this court has created, as I have just said, a feeling of hostility, existing not only in the Province of Quebec, but also in the Province of Ontario and in the Maritime Provinces. If we refer to the speech made in 1880 by the right hon. leader of the Government himself, we find the following statement, which, I think, does not show a great deal of confidence in the composition of that court. The hon. leader of the Government thus expressed himself:

"I must admit that I do not think there is any advantage to be gained in shutting one's eyes to the fact that the court, by some accident or misfortune, has not obtained that confidence which such a tribunal ought to have succeeded in obtaining. What may be the cause of this, it is bootless just now to discuss."

The hon. member for Niagara (Mr. Plumb) who is no more a member of this House, did not wish to leave us without having also his word to say on the subject. He said:

"I have listened with attention to the arguments of both parties. There are certainly reasons for discontent against the court."

And the hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) uttered the following words:—

"It is perfectly true that the court has been objected to as not giving satisfaction to some people in Ontario. There have been some complaints, but I think the general foundation of the complaints has rather been delay in giving judgment, which may be remedied. In some cases the judgment has not given satisfaction. We think that, perhaps, to some extent, the Supreme Court has been a little too ready to overrule the decisions of the judges in Ontario, especially those in the Court of Chancery. But, for my part, I feel the necessity of the court, and regret that there should be any faults or defects in the manner in which justice is administered there."

And the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), in answer to the hon. member for North Victoria, quoted the following words, which the hon. member for North Victoria had said on a previous occasion:—

"The public and the profession are very little satisfied with the constitution of the court. It is absolutely necessary that this constitution should be modified and strengthened."

And, Mr. Speaker, not only was there a sentiment of hostility expressed against the Supreme Court, not only was it shown to the public that there was a lack of confidence in that institution, but people even went further, and charges were brought against it. I find the following words in a speech made on the 10th of February, 1881, by the hon. Minister of Public Works:—

"I do not agree with those members who believe that the Supreme Court is all we should expect it to be. Far from it. If I am not mis-

M. LANDRY (Montmagny).

taken, to-day, perhaps at this moment, judgment is being rendered in that court in a case which has been standing for months. Delays such as this are one of the reasons why that court—we must say it, because it is in the mouths of the people—has not become a popular court."

The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) thus expressed himself:

"Judgment is being given at this moment and, so far as we can learn, there scarcely appears to be any agreement among the judges in relation to it. We are going to have some four or five judgments. All of the judges are presumed to be very eminent in their learning; on this subject no two of them entirely agree with each other; the effect of such disagreement in opinion will be to destroy very largely the confidence of the public in this court."

Mr. Speaker, when all these questions had been brought before the Government, when, year after year, the several members of the House had given vent to their complaints and had echoed public sentiment as it existed, not only in the Province of Quebec but also in the various Provinces forming parts of the Dominion of Canada, the Government adopted a certain line of policy and gave us promises.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) I shall not undertake to read all the promises which have been made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) I shall point out a few. In 1880 the hon. Prime Minister said this:

"We ought to face the question, however, and enquire into the cause of the dissatisfaction which is so prevalent. It seems to me there must be a remedy. There must be some means of meeting the objections which experience has verified. The Government desires to press this seriously to that extent."

And a little further on, the hon. Prime Minister added:

"The Government desire to address themselves earnestly to this matter, and to make a full and exhaustive enquiry into the best means to remove the objections and into the best means of making the court, in every sense, efficient and satisfactory. If the House will be satisfied with a statement of this kind and will not wipe out of existence this court, I think the country will be satisfied, and that this Parliament will be able to remove the objections which have been taken possession of the public mind and make it a satisfactory and efficiently working court."

This promise, Mr. Speaker, was not clear enough, at least if we are to judge by the following remarks made on the 26th of February, 1880, by the hon. Minister of Public Works, who then said:—

"I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I desire that the position of the Government in relation to that question should be well understood. I fear that when my hon. friend the Prime Minister explained the views of the administration, his voice was not strong enough to be heard throughout the House. I would say, therefore, that it is the intention of the Government, during the recess, to examine the question, with special reference to the Province of Quebec, so as to ascertain what steps must be taken in order to meet the objections which have been raised and the inconveniences resulting from the working of this court."

And further on:

"When there is an appeal from the courts of the Province of Quebec to the Supreme Court, we find ourselves in this position: that often a judgment rendered by a large majority of the Court of Queen's Bench may be reversed by the Supreme Court; that is to say, that a judgment may be rendered by four or five judges of the Court of Appeal of the Province of Quebec, and yet that judgment may be appealed to the Supreme Court, and there reversed by two judges called from the Province of Quebec. Two-thirds of the judges of the Supreme Court do not understand the laws of the Province of Quebec, and they are, therefore, liable to err in cases coming before the court from that Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, it was to those inconveniences the hon. Prime Minister referred, when he stated that the Government would make it their business, during recess, to endeavor to find a remedy. The House must understand that, when the Government take that position and make so solemn a promise, it is their intention to meet the objections which have been raised, and to come down next Session with a measure calculated to meet the just complaints of hon. members from the Province of Quebec, and to remove the grievances enumerated by them this evening."

Mr. Speaker, this was said in 1880. In 1881, three years ago, we find the following statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works:—

"The hon. member for Montreal East (Mr. Coursol) has alluded to the promise made last year by the First Minister, and I think confirmed in as strong language afterwards by me at a later period of the debate on this question. I regret the right hon. gentleman is not in his place, because I am sure he would say that any promise he made or authorised his colleagues to make would be fulfilled. We have not been in the habit of making promises to Parliament and not fulfilling them."

A few days later—we were then voting supplies—in the month of March, 1881, the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), on the occasion of the voting of a certain sum of money for the Supreme Court, asked if the change, promised by the Government in order to satisfy public opinion, was to be made soon, and this question brought out the following answer from the hon. Minister of Public Works:—

"The Prime Minister will, no doubt, answer this question within a certain time, and I have no doubt that his answer will satisfy my hon. friend and the Parliament."

In fact, Mr. Speaker, some time afterwards the question was again raised, and the Prime Minister gave the following answer:—

"It is quite true that the Government are liable to the charge of not carrying out what they promised to do, that is, to investigate this subject and to endeavor to remove the difficulties or the objections that are raised, chiefly, if not altogether, in the Province of Quebec. I am not one who would at all minimise the difficulties of the question. I showed that when I was Minister of Justice in a former Government, on two occasions I brought in a Supreme Court Bill, but after the measures were laid on the Table for discussion, the objections raised against it from the Province of Quebec, the extreme difficulty of constituting a tribunal that would meet the case of Quebec, which has a separate system of law and organisation, and added to that, the difficulty arising from difference of language—these difficulties were so great that they deterred me and the Government of which I was a member from legislative action on the matter. The succeeding Government introduced the present measure and carried it into effect. Almost immediately after there came from Quebec a murmur of dissatisfaction."

And further on he added:

"So far we have been able to come to any solution that would be satisfactory to the bar of Lower Canada. We must however, address ourselves to that subject, and I will again state to my hon. friend that during the recess the Government will take the question into its serious consideration, and if they do not, after giving it their best consideration, individually and collectively, work out a satisfactory solution, Government will be prepared to form a Commission, in which the bar of Lower Canada will be strongly represented, to see if a satisfactory solution cannot be arrived at."

And again:

"If the Supreme Court is to be maintained a solution must be found to remove the dissatisfaction which exists, at all events, among the Franco-Canadians of Lower Canada."

Well, Mr. Speaker, during the next Session the Government brought down a measure; it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and I find that on the 10th of February, 1882, the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) in moving the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne, alluded to the legislation promised by the Government. He said:

"That we learn with much interest that several other measures of importance will be submitted to us and that among them will be Bills for the winding up of insolvent banks, insurance companies and trading corporations, for the consolidation and amendment of the laws respecting the Dominion lands, for the amendment of the Acts relating to the Supreme Court of Canada, and Bills relating to the tenure of office of the judges of county courts."

The Session passed by, Mr. Speaker, and the Bill was never brought before the House of Commons. Nevertheless, a Bill was moved in the Senate by the hon. Minister of Justice. As far as I can remember, that Bill provided for the appointment of assessors. It was intended to appoint the Chief Justice and the other judges of the Court of Queen's Bench, of the Province of Quebec, the Chief Justice and five puisne judges of the Superior Court of that same Province, as assessors to the Supreme Court of Canada. And the Bill provided that the names of these twelve assessors should be registered on a rotation list, so as to form six divisions of two members each. Then each case brought

before the Supreme Court was to be pleaded before the judges of that court, assisted by two of these assessors, who were to receive a sum of \$300 for each sitting of the court which they would have attended. As I said before, this Bill originated in the Senate, where it died, and we never saw it in the House of Commons. In order to do away with the inconveniences already mentioned, it seems to me that two means could be adopted: there is the complete abolition of the Supreme Court, or the limitation of its powers. The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Keeler), who has been carried away by death, while in the exercise of his duties in this House, introduced, on the 21st of April, 1879, a Bill to repeal the Acts respecting the Exchequer and Supreme Court. This Bill, which was the first of its kind, provided for the complete abolition of the Supreme Court. It was lost, and during the next Session, in the month of February, 1880, the same member again introduced the Bill; it was read the first time, and when it came to the second reading an amendment was moved by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), asking that the Bill be postponed to six months thence, and a vote of 148 was given in favor of the amendment, and of 29 in favor of the Bill; that is to say, there was a majority of 119 in favor of the amendment. During the next Session the hon. member for Northumberland again introduced the same Bill, but death overtook him before the Bill was called for second reading. With the permission of the House I was substituted for Mr. Keeler, and I moved the second reading of the Bill to abolish the Supreme Court. The majority was adverse to us, but it was reduced from 119, which it was the preceding year, to 49, on the motion proposing the six months' hoist. The next year, in 1881, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), introduced a Bill similar to that which we are now discussing, to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. It was read the first time, and there was a debate on the motion for second reading, but the vote was never taken. It is that same Bill which is now on the Table. This Bill does not ask for the abolition of the Supreme Court; we do not ask that, because in a previous Parliament the opinion of hon. members has been repeatedly consulted, and public opinion seems to be adverse to the abolition of that court, but we ask that its jurisdiction be limited; we ask that the court be not called upon to decide upon wholly civil matters which crop out in the Province of Quebec, and in all the Provinces at large. The first clause of the Bill reads as follows:—

"The appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court of Canada is abolished in all cases where the matter in dispute relates to property and civil rights in any of the Provinces, and generally as to matters of a merely local or private nature, and coming within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Legislature of any of the said Provinces, according to the meaning of the 'British North America Act, 1867,' and the Acts amending the same."

The Act of British North America, 1867, contains section 92, which is as follows:—

"In each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to matters coming within the classes of subjects next hereinafter enumerated, that is to say: property and civil rights in the Province; the administration of justice in the Province, including the constitution, maintenance and organisation of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in those courts, and generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in the Province."

Well, Mr. Speaker, all cases arising from such Provincial legislation would be, by the Bill now before the House, taken away from the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. The second clause of the present Bill reads as follows:—

"This Act shall not apply to cases decided by the Exchequer Court of Canada, nor to cases where the matter in dispute affects the constitutionality or validity of any Act or statute of any one of the said Provincial Legislatures, which cases shall continue to be subject to appeal to the said Supreme Court, as now is or hereafter shall be provided for."

Finally, the third clause of the present Bill enacts the following provision :—

“This Act shall not apply to appeals already instituted or pending before the said Supreme Court.”

Such is, in a few words, the legislation I now propose, and I propose it in the hope that it will meet one of the greatest difficulties which, at the present time, are throwing such discredit on the Supreme Court, which is not the fault of the judges, but of the composition of that court. The Government have already pledged themselves to find the proper means of overcoming the difficulty, but until to-day it appears that the problem has been too difficult to solve, or that the Government have been too busy to pay a little attention to this question. At all events, for one reason or another, the remedy which has been promised has not been applied. I think that under the present circumstances, the Government will not make any opposition to the measure I now propose; or that if they do, it will be only in case they will be prepared to introduce a better measure, and then I will be most happy to withdraw my Bill in favor of the Government measure. This legislation—and I will conclude with these words—has been promised by the Government not only to do away with the grievances which are complained of, but it has been asked for, and is now, by the people of the Province of Quebec. As provincial autonomy is still occupying public attention, I believe it would be good policy to take away from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court laws which were enacted by the Province of Quebec, and, as one of my hon. friends beside me truly remarks, laws which that court does not understand. Therefore, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. TUPPER. This is a matter which deserves the serious consideration of all the members of this Parliament. I regret exceedingly that my knowledge of the language of the mover of this Bill is so imperfect that I was unable to follow him throughout his argument, but I judge from the Bill itself that the hon. gentleman seeks for an expression of want of confidence on the part of this House to a very great extent, at any rate, in the Supreme Court of Canada. I am very glad to be able to say that I do not believe, from the general expressions of opinion we have heard, both in this House and out of it, that the hon. gentleman is warranted in drawing the inference that there is a want of confidence in the Supreme Court among the people of this country. The subject to which the hon. gentleman has addressed himself, and concerning which he has cited so many quotations, has been before this Parliament and before the people of this country for some time, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman has a right to conclude from any past discussions that there is a desire on the part of the people of Canada to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to the extent proposed in this Bill. So far as the Province of Nova Scotia is concerned, I think I am safe in saying that there is almost a unanimity of opinion on the part of the business people of that Province, who have had any experience in the matter, in favor of that institution, and I believe the same general opinion exists in the other Maritime Provinces as well. There may be perhaps a greater desire in the Maritime Provinces than in the others to retain the Supreme Court, from the fact that we have not in those Provinces so many tribunals as there are in the Province of Quebec and in the larger Province of Ontario. The people of the Maritime Provinces are in general of the opinion that suits involving important questions concerning the rights of property and civil rights should have all the advantage to be derived from their thorough discussion. I say, therefore, that the Supreme Court of Canada is favorably regarded by us on the ground that it enables questions raised in a suit to be thoroughly and satisfactorily discussed before being finally adjudicated

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny).

upon. Our opinion in Nova Scotia is attributable to a certain extent, to the limited number of tribunals there; and it is no reflection, I take it, on the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, that the opinion of the Province of Nova Scotia, is due in large measure to this fact that we have only one court, so to speak, in that Province in which those questions I have mentioned are discussed before reaching the Supreme Court. The decisions of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia are often reversed by the Supreme Court of Canada; in the latter the judges have the advantage of a double argument, so to speak, that is not only have they the advantage of the decision of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia from which the appeal is taken, but also the advantage of fresh argument on the part of gentlemen who have already argued the question in the court below. Having every reason to feel satisfied with the results of our past experience, it would be, I believe, most unwise, so far as the Maritime Provinces are concerned, to either abolish the court or impair its efficiency and injure its usefulness by frequent discussions of this kind. The hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill, ought, I take it, to deal very gingerly with a question of so much importance, because if that institution is to remain, as judging from expressions of opinion in this House on previous occasions, it undoubtedly will, it is of the greatest importance that it should have the confidence of the whole country; and that confidence cannot be entirely retained if frequent attacks are made upon it, especially by gentlemen holding the responsible position of members of this House. I therefore regard the frequent discussion of this matter as unfortunate from every standpoint, even from the standpoint of those gentlemen who seek to limit its jurisdiction. While I am on my feet I do not think it will be irregular or out of order to mention that while our experience in Nova Scotia has been a satisfactory one with regard to this court, there is one defect, not reflecting particularly upon the judges of that institution but to a certain extent upon its subordinate officers and perhaps upon the Government of the day, which requires prompt remedy, and that is the long delay in the publication of the decisions given from time to time affecting property and civil rights in the different Provinces. While the Supreme Court of itself is of great advantage to the community, it is a most important consideration that whatever it decides, that whenever it reverses or confirms the decisions of an inferior court, that whenever final adjudication does occur, the inferior court and the parties concerned in the matter and the bar of the Province should be made aware at once, not only of the fact that the decision of the court below has been reversed or sustained, but also of the reasons upon which such decision is based. To a great extent, up to this time, this duty has been neglected. The cases are not reported and published as readily as they might be or ought to be; oftentimes years elapsed before a decision solemnly given in this city regarding the rights of parties thousands of miles away are made known to the public, many of the decisions are not published at all, and apparently some of them not yet published will never be published, judging from the long delay that has occurred in their publication. I speak on the subject of this Bill from the very opposite standpoint of my hon. friend (Mr. Landry). He seeks to limit its jurisdiction; he seeks, according to my view, to impair its usefulness; he seeks, so far as regards the Province from which I come, to injure it, to minimise the advantages we now derive from it. He attacks the institution, I defend it. I seek to make it even more generally known and understood than it has been hitherto; I seek to have the decisions more readily made known so that they may be understood with as little delay as possible by all the parties concerned, and thus prevent, as much as possible, litigation which serves no useful purpose; for I believe many suits are brought which would not be prosecuted, if the reasons on which many of the decisions of the Supreme

Court are based were at once published. I do not apprehend that this motion will be carried, but although one of the junior bar in my own Province I felt that I could not allow this occasion to pass without giving my evidence as to the satisfactory experience we have had in the Lower Provinces in regard to this Supreme Court.

Mr. GIROUARD. I rise merely to state the reason why I did not present the Bill which the hon. member for Montmagny has brought to the notice of this House. Since the discussion which took place in this House in 1881, I believe, when I presented a similar Bill, the bar of the Province of Quebec, at least of that section of it, the district of Montreal, from which I come, passed a resolution I believe by a rather large majority approving of the present constitution of the Supreme Court. For that reason, and that reason alone, I abandoned the Bill and allowed it to pass into the hands of the hon. member for Montmagny. However, the reasons I had for not presenting the Bill have not changed. They are the same to-day as they were then, and I shall, therefore, vote for the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BEATY. I always feel a repugnance to motions which I find made in this House with a view of unsettling or changing the established institutions which we have under the Confederation Act. We have not had these institutions long enough in force to find out their true value, and in regard to the Supreme Court I do not know that, with ten years' experience, any large or any serious complaints have come from any of the Provinces with reference to its action or its jurisdiction. The effect of motions of this character in relation to this court or to the institutions which we have under the Confederation Act have this result, they unsettle things generally, and when they come to a question of a court of this character, they necessarily unsettle the rights we have in the laws of the country. It makes matters appear unstable, it makes them appear uncertain as to the laws in respect to property or to civil rights which we enjoy. If I understood the hon. member who made the motion correctly, the chief points he made were the want of knowledge of the judges of the court of the laws especially of the Province of Quebec, and the fact that the Province of Quebec, having only two representatives in that court, would necessarily not have that influence on the general decisions which it ought to have. I think, that being the line of argument, as I understand it—I am not sure that it is correct, but I think those points were made by the hon. gentleman—they are not strong enough to lead us to vote for this Bill and abolish that court. If there was a good reason at all for the establishment of that court, I think it would lead us in the direction of assimilating the laws as far as practicable; but, if a matter solely affecting property and civil rights comes before that tribunal, it must be decided according to the laws of the Province and not upon any general opinion which the court might entertain. It is the law of the Province that prevails in reference to these matters. The point the hon. gentleman makes is that the other judges, who come from Provinces other than that from which the appeal comes, may not be familiar with the law, and may not decide the case correctly. If it were a mere matter of practice, a mere matter of procedure in the courts, that argument might have some force; but, as it necessarily relates to principles of law, I think any judge who has attained the position of Judge of the Supreme Court must be capable of understanding the points presented to the court, and of deciding the cases upon the law of the Province to which it belongs. There is no other reason which I can find why that part of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court relating to property and civil rights should be abolished, and it seems to me that every Province should have the right of coming to the highest court in the country, as it ought to have, in all cases of an important character, the right to go to England for the purpose of having a decision on mat-

ters purely of law. The case may be one affecting the whole Dominion, and under those circumstances the law should be decided by the highest tribunal, and should have the sanction of the highest authority in the land. As to the direction which legislation or judicial decisions should take, I think the principle would be to assimilate the laws as far as practicable. The criminal laws, the commercial laws, the property law and all laws of that character, and the moral law, as my hon. friend here says, should be assimilated, but of course it is impossible to assimilate the laws of the different Provinces without legislation. Why should a man be obliged, if he goes, for instance, to Manitoba, leaving Ontario, perhaps, to learn a different law to that which he knows in regard to property and its rights? Why should he have to do the same thing if he goes to the Province of Quebec, or if he goes to British Columbia why should he be put in this predicament? Yet such may be the case in different Provinces, and under these circumstances the getting a decision, and it may be a common decision, of the provincial law from the Supreme Court gives it the highest sanction and enables all persons to know what they possess and what they are entitled to. The chief point that I wish to make is that it is premature, I will not go so far as to say that it is premature to discuss the question, but to change the relation of the Supreme Court to the Provinces in regard to those matters which appertain to provincial rights or the rights of property or what are termed civil rights. Therefore, I would oppose the legislation proposed in this Bill, and I will certainly vote against it at the present time. Whether changes may come, whether the conduct of the court may be such, or the exercise of their jurisdiction may be such, as to demand some action to be taken must be left to the future; but so far as I know no complaints of a serious character, certainly none of a general character, have come up from any Province as to the action of the court in regard to civil rights and provincial laws. There may have been some quasi-political questions that have created some excitement, but they may be said now to be settled, and beyond that in the matter of property and civil rights there have been no such questions. I shall oppose the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I should have thought some hon. gentleman on the Ministerial benches—notably the Minister of Public Works and the First Minister—would have risen to explain to my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Landry) those quotations which, at great length and with great force, he repeated to the House. The House has been made aware by the hon. gentleman of the discussions which have taken place on the subject, not merely the views of individual members of Parliament, which are of less moment perhaps, as to whether the court is popular or unpopular, as to whether it is a proper subject for abolition or repeal or not, but also the attitude of the Government on the question. We know that propositions were advanced, first by the hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard), and afterwards by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Landry), in the sense of the project of law before us, and we know that they were met by the hon. gentlemen on the Ministerial benches with the statement that there was a difficulty, that there was a grievance, that there was a wrong which required to be redressed, which was difficult of solution but which it was their duty to solve. It was not to be solved in the sense of this Bill, but some different solution was to be reached. They promised solemnly, both the First Minister and the Minister of Public Works, speaking for himself, and the First Minister confirming it, that they would address themselves to the task and would endeavor to meet the difficulty. A recess elapsed and they were reminded of those promises, and they acknowledged them, and stated that they had

found the difficulty greater than ever they had contemplated, great though they thought it to be. But they promised once more to address themselves to the subject in the next recess, and, if they could not by their own intellects devise an appropriate remedy, they said they would appoint a commission, on which members of the bar or distinguished jurists of the different Provinces, and especially of the Province of Quebec, should be asked to sit, and they should be set to solve the question which the Administration had found itself unable to solve. The next recess also passed, and the commission was not, so far as we know, appointed, because the Administration decided that the task was not beyond their own political capacity; they decided that they themselves could meet and grapple with the difficulty, and, as my hon. friend from Montmagny has narrated, they brought forward the fruits of their labors. The result of their incubation was presented in the Upper Chamber. There it was born, and there it died. It never came before this House at all. The Minister of Justice proposed it, but he abandoned his poor orphan and it perished in the cold; and I have not since that time heard of any fresh attempt on the part of Ministers to redress a grievance and cure a defect by them stated to be grave, to be serious, to require legislative action, and which they had promised twice this House, very solemnly, they would address themselves to successfully. On the second occasion the hon. gentleman spoke with a just confidence with reference to his past record. He said: The House knows we are making a solemn promise, and when we are making a solemn promise that promise will be performed. But this is the way it has been performed. I, myself, on that occasion came to the rescue of hon. gentlemen opposite. When the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) was pressing his Bill and hon. gentlemen opposite were inviting him to delay action, I pointed out that the Government had pledged themselves to press the measure through this Session and that, therefore, if he had confidence in the Government—which I had not but which he professed to have—and if he had confidence that the Government would in the future fulfil their pledges, we would have an opportunity of dealing with their measure in this House, and in this House he could propose his own as an alternative measure. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) who had been persuaded by the dulcet tones of the hon. gentleman opposite, yielded to the persuasion of this side of the House; he desisted from prosecuting his measure on my suggestion that his doing so was an obvious indication of palpable want of confidence in the assurance and promises of my hon. friend opposite. He felt he could say no more and he sat down. He and I both expected—one of us having no confidence, and the other having great confidence, in the Government—we both expected that we would have an opportunity of sitting upon this egg of the hon. gentlemen opposite and seeing what we could hatch out of it. But the hon. gentlemen would not bring their egg down here to be hatched by this House, and the result is such as I have stated. Well, now, under these circumstances, when the hon. gentleman, with commendable patience, considering those calamities which his unhappy Province, according to his own accounts, has been for so many years suffering, by reason of these unredressed grievances, by reason of this great and serious difficulty, when I say, the hon. gentleman was silent for this long time, and comes at last with a repetition of the same Bill, and presents to the hon. gentlemen opposite these promises—I will not say made to be broken, but made and broken—these promises made and broken and repeated and broken still, I should have thought, I say, that at the last moment, after my hon. friend had resumed his seat, the hon. gentlemen opposite, whose solemn pledges, made in the face of Parliament, had been brought

Mr. BLAKE.

to their attention by one of their warmest supporters, would have given some explanation of the case and some statement of the course they intended to pursue with reference to his measure and with reference to the court of which it is the subject. I think we have a right to know whether the Government is still of opinion that the constitution of the Supreme Court is defective. Obviously their view was that an alteration should be made, not as to the powers of the court, but as to the composition of the court. That is where they thought the difficulty lay, and it was to that they attempted to apply a remedy. But we do not know now, after these statements, what their present view is, whether they think there is still a difficulty with reference to the composition of the court, and whether, if they think there is a difficulty, they think it is a difficulty which is capable of remedy; whether, having abandoned the attempt to remedy it, if they think there is that difficulty, they think the only course is to adopt the view of their supporter from Montmagny and to agree to this Bill. I hope, Sir, that at an early stage, as early a stage as is possible, of this debate, these questions will be answered. For my own part, Sir, I may say that I believe on theoretic grounds a view very close to that of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) is the proper view. I have always believed that the judicial and the legislative power ought to be co-ordinate, and that the same authority which makes, ought to interpret, the law. That has always been my view, and I have expressed it not unfrequently here as the proper theoretical constitution, and applying that to a federal constitution you would reach the conclusion that if the Local Legislature has exclusive jurisdiction over what the law shall be upon some particular topic, that Local Legislature ought also to have exclusive jurisdiction over the creation of the tribunals which are to interpret those laws. There is another question, that of uniformity, suggested for the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beatty). We know not on the floor of Parliament, that I am aware of, but the public knows, what the hon. member's views are. He is a legislative unionist; and it has been made pretty well to appear in his observations to-night. He thinks there ought to be legislative union. He thinks the law as to property and civil rights ought to be the same all over the Dominion, and if the same all over the Dominion, it ought to be made here and ought to be interpreted by a judicial authority created and under the authority of this Legislature, of course. But that is not the general sentiment. The hon. member for Toronto will find himself, when he makes a proposition of that kind, without very much support in this House. But dealing with the constitution as it is, as a federal constitution, whether more or less perfect, it seems to me to be perfectly clear that, theoretically, if you are framing a federal constitution the same legislative jurisdiction which makes the law ought to create the functionaries who are to interpret it; so that if your local judges go wrong, it is your Local Legislatures that can correct them. If they say: Now, we interpret this law to mean so and so, and if theoretically, the Legislature finds that it is contrary to their meaning and intention in passing the law, they can alter the law, and make it clear, and they thus correct the views of the judges who then interpret the law according to what the Legislature intended the judicial interpretation should be. Now these two powers have not an appeal to the Supreme Court, but to the Privy Council for the correction of an erroneous judgment. Of course, I do not speak of a retroactive law, but I speak of a settlement of the law for the future upon the basis upon which the people's representatives think it ought to be settled; and I say such a settlement must take place in the Local Legislature, and therefore whatever errors of judgment may take place on the part of the local judges, will affect only individual and

isolated cases, and can be cured as to their causes for all future time by the legislative action of the Local Parliament.

Mr. BEATY. Can it not be done now just as well as if it belonged to the Local Legislature?

Mr. BLAKE. Certainly it can, but where is your assimilation? The hon. gentleman was talking of it being necessary to assimilate the law as to property and civil rights; he was saying a short time ago that the laws as to property and civil rights ought to be the same for Ontario, Quebec and Manitoba. How can they be, as long as the legislation as to property and civil rights is vested in the different Provinces? There may be divergence and there may be assimilation, but it must be voluntary divergence and voluntary assimilation. Now that is the theoretical view, but we largely depart from it, in our circumstances, in two respects. First, as to the appointment of the judges of the Superior Courts. We have provided under the Constitutional Act that the judges of the Superior Courts, though those courts are created by the Local Legislatures, shall be appointed by the federal authority; and here there is an infringement, in my opinion, practically, upon the spirit of the federal constitution. My belief is that the judges who are to interpret the local laws ought to be under the appointment of the local executive, just as the courts are confessedly under the authority of the Local Legislatures. But there is something still further, and it is that change which, I may say, almost practically reflects my own judgment as to what ought to be done with the hon. gentleman's measure. The ultimate appeal in all these questions, whether they be questions federal or local, and therefore the appeal in this very class of questions to which the hon. gentleman is adverting, is not, under our present constitution, as I have said it ought to be, with the authority which makes the law. The judicial and the legislative authorities are not co-ordinate, for the ultimate appeal is to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and our local as well as federal questions are subject in appeal to a judicial body created by another Legislature than ours, and entirely beyond our control.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I was observing that whatever the theory might be, the practical result, as our constitution has been framed, and with respect to our extra judicial relations was, that while we have an appeal to an authority altogether beyond our own bounds, it did not seem to me, when the hon. the First Minister proposed, as he did on two occasions, a Supreme Court Bill, and when subsequently Mr Fournier proposed a Supreme Court Bill under the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), that so long as that condition of affairs existed under which matters, which were within the exclusive province, so far as legislation was concerned, of the Provincial Legislatures, were yet for their judicial exposition subject to an appeal to the Privy Council, it would be other than pedantry to object as a question of policy to there being an appeal within our own bounds. And so long as that condition of things to which I refer continues, I cannot reach any other conclusion than this: that however desirable it may be that the judicial and legislative authority should be co-ordinate, however desirable it may be that Local Legislatures should have power to settle finally by their own means and their own tribunals the interpretation of their own laws, so long as so different a condition of affairs exist as that which I have depicted, I did not see that it would be other than pedantry to object on that score to Supreme Court jurisdiction in those respects. The jurisdiction given to the Supreme Court of Appeal in those matters is one within our

own control, is one capable of being modified by us, capable of being abrogated by us, and when we please. If we deem it to be unsatisfactory, we can repeal the law. If we deem the working of the court and its composition to be unsatisfactory we can amend the law, and there is obviously convenience in giving an appeal too—if an appeal there is to be beyond local bounds—within our own territory to judges made, not indeed by provincial authorities, but yet by Canadian authorities over the appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The members from the Maritime Provinces have on various occasions spoken in the same strain as that in which the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) just spoke. No doubt they feel the importance of this appeal, and that it means more to them than to the men who come from the larger Provinces which have already within their jurisdiction Appellate Courts. They are able in the Province of Quebec and in the Province of Ontario to point to those opportunities of appeal and of having more than one decision, to which the hon. member for Pictou pointed as an important part of the machinery of the administration of justice in grave cases; and, therefore with them the necessity is not so great as it is in Provinces which up to this time have had, and are likely so far as I can judge, to continue to have, only one first and final court within their own bounds. It is to them a matter of great convenience; it was to them a great practical improvement in the administration of justice that there should be this appeal. Another reason which animated me in assenting to that part of the proposals of the hon. the First Minister and of Mr. Fournier, was, that, deeming it important that there should be a Supreme Court, I felt it was impossible practically to constitute a Supreme Court unless this jurisdiction were given, because there would be so little work for the court to do if you did not give it this jurisdiction; you could not defend the cost of the machinery before the public unless that amount of work were given it to do. It does not appear to me that if the Supreme Court had been constituted without those appeals from questions of civil rights, it would have lasted up to this time, because I believe the attack directed against it would have been one against the institution costing \$60,000 or \$70,000 and hearing six or seven cases a year, and the general public would have felt it to be a very strong argument; because we know the argument as to the cost of the court with even the very large business that is done compared with that under the circumstances to which I have alluded, was a very strong argument, and it was pressed very forcibly in the Province of Quebec as in some of the other Provinces, and it was pressed in Nova Scotia too by a namesake and relative of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), who very much condemned the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie for imposing on the country a cost which, I think, with a large and liberal measure, he estimated at \$100,000 a year for the creation of a Supreme Court. If the real figures had been appealed to, with the smaller amount of business to which I have alluded, I am quite convinced that the argument would have been very much more emphatic and the results very much more serious than they were. So it has happened, as I say, that I felt myself bound to sustain that portion of the proposition of the hon. gentlemen opposite which involved the giving of this jurisdiction, and that portion of the proposition engrafted also in the Bill which became an Act under the Administration of the hon. member for East York. At that time it was a question among jurists and members of Parliament whether there was power under the Confederation Act to confer this jurisdiction, whether it gave power to the Parliament of Canada, to deal with other classes of cases than those touched on by the hon. gentleman's Bill. I quite agree that there is something to be said in favor of that view, but the balance of the

argument was in favor of the opposite view, that we had jurisdiction and that it was a question of policy. And that question seems to be pretty well practically settled now, because we have had the court in vogue for several years. A very large number of appeals in this class of cases, appeals to the ultimate court of appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, have been taken, and the question has never been raised, or if raised it has been decided adversely to those who thought that the Parliament of Canada had no power to create a court with this particular jurisdiction. The power being at this day conceded, the question is one of policy, and it is not one of policy as to creation but as to maintenance; and so long as we remain with an appeal court outside our own country and not subject to our control at all, dealing with questions of property and civil rights, matters of exclusive provincial jurisdiction, so long I remain of the opinion that we ought to sustain the jurisdiction we have given to the Supreme Court in those particulars. If the court be not properly composed so as to give confidence, reasonable confidence, to all the Provinces, that is another and distinct question to be settled on other and distinct grounds. It is a question not to be settled by the hon. gentleman's Bill, but to be settled by hon. gentlemen opposite as they have promised, but as hitherto they have failed to settle it.

Mr. MACMASTER. I am very glad, and I am sure the House is very glad, to find the conclusion at which the leader of the Opposition has arrived, is that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as it at present exists should be maintained. It did not appear to be a conclusion that would be reached by the hon. gentleman's reasoning before Recess, because the inference, if there was no direct statement, to be drawn from the argument which we had the pleasure of hearing was, that something in the nature of the proposition of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) should be adopted. But that evidently was from the theoretical point of view. Now when we have the matured opinions of the leader of the Opposition, based on experience of the necessities of the country, we find that his conclusion is that it is best to let well enough alone. The proposition involved in the Bill is one of a very serious character. The hon. gentleman proposes practically to take away from the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court everything that falls within the legislative power of the Provinces, because when we take questions of civil rights and property, and everything of a private nature in the Provinces, out of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, we are practically taking everything that falls within the legislative jurisdiction of the Provinces. The effect will be in the first place to take away nine-tenths of the subject matters which now come up for determination before the Supreme Court, to reduce the business of the court to a minimum, and to probably bring about the result which the hon. gentleman called attention to, viz.: that if the court had been left with this limited jurisdiction from the outset it would not have lasted more than eight or ten years. The effect of the passing of this Bill would be really to castrate the court and lead in the end to its abolition. Now, Mr. Speaker, what are the real objections to the court? The hon. leader of the Opposition has waived any objections which he raised at the outset. He then stated that in his opinion, from a theoretical point of view, it would be best that the Legislatures which pass the laws should appoint the judges who are to interpret them. Well, in order to carry out that idea we would require a change in the constitution, so it is probably best to deal with the constitution as we have it. I do not quite agree with the leader of the Opposition that the position taken by the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beatty) was altogether an unreasonable one. That hon. gentleman expressed his preference for the assimilation of the civil laws of the

Mr. BLAKE.

different Provinces. Well, there is a provision in our constitution for assimilating our laws—an express clause in the Confederation Act that the laws of the English speaking Provinces, the laws of all the Provinces except Quebec, may be assimilated by an Act of this Parliament, provided that the assent of the several Provinces is obtained thereto; so this project of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Beatty), with the single exception of its application to the Province of Quebec, may not be so distant as some hon. gentlemen may think. Now what are the objections to the court raised by my hon. friend from Montmagny (Mr. Landry), and we must admit that he has brought to the consideration of this question a great deal of industry and a great deal of ingenuity. I am not one of those who say that the question of the existence of the court should not be discussed in Parliament. If the court cannot stand discussion, let it fall. The hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) pointed out two or three objections. First, he says there are only two judges from the Province of Quebec—only two judges who understand the civil laws of that Province, and that they have to sit *in banc* with four judges from the other Provinces, familiar only with English common law, and therefore that the influence of the judges from Quebec is liable to be overborne. On the face of it there is a great deal in that objection. But we must remember that in the Privy Council of England, which has been thoroughly satisfactory to the Province of Quebec, so much so that in no part of the Dominion has there been a greater expression of satisfaction with the decisions of that tribunal, the Dominion has not a single judge familiar with the laws peculiar to Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. MACMASTER. When I say familiar, I mean that they have not been trained in that law; they are not experienced in it, though they may have become familiar with it by study, but so may the judges in the Supreme Court, familiar with the common law, likewise become familiar with the civil law of the Province of Quebec, especially when they are in constant contact with the judges and advocates from that Province. While referring to the Privy Council, it might be worthy of the consideration of the Prime Minister and the leader of the Opposition whether distinguished Canadian jurists should not find their way to the Privy Council, just as Indian and Australian lawyers have found their way to places on that bench. Sir Richard Couch was, I think, an Indian judge, and I think Sir Arthur Hobhouse is an Australian.

Mr. BLAKE. Sir Lawrence Peacock was an Indian judge.

Mr. MACMASTER. I have no doubt.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Sir Erskine Perry was.

Mr. MACMASTER. I am not aware of any distinguished member of the Canadian bar, in the present generation at least, having been transferred to the Privy Council, and I do not know that that august body would be much injured by the transference there of such eminent legal gentlemen as the leader of the Opposition and the leader of the Government, though it is generally understood that the latter gentleman is not to leave this scene until he departs for a higher and a better one. Another objection raised by the hon. member for Montmagny was that the lawyers of French origin from the Province of Quebec, pleading their cases and speaking in their own tongues, had to speak to judges some of whom were not familiar with the language of the pleaders. On the face of it there is something in that objection; but it is creditable to the judges of the Supreme Court who are not born and bred in the Province of Quebec (for instance Mr. Justice Strong) that they are not merely familiar with the French language, but very familiar with

the French civil law. Again, I do not think this objection is a serious one. Advocates who appear before the Supreme Court bench file their printed books and arguments, and these can be examined carefully by the judges; and again it must be said to the credit of the members of the legal profession of French origin in the Province of Quebec that they address our courts with a grace, an elegance, and skill in the English language that put men of British origin to shame when they attempt to speak the French language. The other difficulties to which the hon. gentleman called attention were more in the nature of fears expressed by way of anticipation, but I venture to say that those fears have never been realized. I am not aware of—and I am tolerably familiar with the decisions of the court—and I cannot point to any case in which, as a lawyer, I can say that the civil law of the Province of Quebec has been overruled by the English judges, and I do not think that any other hon. member in the House can point to such a case. Until the decisions of the court are impugned and it is pointed out and made clear to Parliament that they have not been equal to their functions, and have not interpreted the law correctly, we should not make a retrograde movement by repealing a measure which the leader of the Opposition and his friends, with the aid of those on this side, put on the Statute-Book for the purpose of securing a general court of appeal for this country. I regret that the leader of the Opposition did not express his confidence in the court. I think it would have been well, not only in the interest of the court, but in the interest of the profession and the public, that that learned and hon. gentleman should have expressed his confidence in this court of appeal. He expressed some little doubt in the early portion of his remarks with regard to the system, but these were gradually wafted away at the close of his speech. But I greatly regret that he did not express confidence in the court itself, although I have no doubt that if he had expressed his opinion he has thorough confidence in the court. As far as I can ascertain, not merely from my own experience in the Supreme Court of Canada, but from the experience of advocates from the Province of Quebec, a feeling of perfect satisfaction is entertained by them with regard to its decisions. I would not say that there is entire satisfaction with its constitution. That perhaps might be improved; but as to the manner in which the judges receive the advocates of the Province of Quebec and the attentive hearing they get, I have heard expressions of satisfaction without number. Now, as to the constitution of the court. Where there is smoke there is fire; and there may be some reason—though I do not see any evidence of it—that the ground which the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) takes, that two judges familiar with the civil law of Quebec are not sufficient in order to secure satisfaction in that Province. The Province of Quebec has a system of law peculiar to itself, and it may be that to secure greater satisfaction there should be a reconstitution of the court. I do not know that we should do an unwise thing or be misappropriating the money necessary, if we made some additions to the membership of the Supreme Court—if we provided for the appointment of an extra judge for the Province of Ontario and an extra judge for the Province of Quebec. The people of Quebec would then be sure of always having three judges from that Province sitting for the trial of their cases, and it would be practically impossible to reverse the decisions of the Court of Appeals of the Province of Quebec if the three judges from that Province were for maintaining them. Perhaps eight judges might seem a very large number for the Supreme Court bench. But our circumstances are rather exceptional, and we must temper the breeze to the shorn lamb. I believe there are nine or ten judges in the Supreme Court of the United States; and yet, although the whole number is not required to sit at the render-

ing of judgments, they are so unable to overtake the business that at the present time there are nearly 1,000 appeals in arrear on the roll of that court. These I understand to be the main objections of the hon. gentleman, and I think in the manner I suggest, though the suggestion should not originate with me, those objections might be removed. I would merely reiterate the argument of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Beaty), who said that it would be most unfair to the court, a most unwise and injudicious thing, after it had had an existence of only ten years as a general court of appeal for the whole of Canada, to abolish it without giving it a fair and full trial. When the hon. member has made out a fair case, showing that his Province has suffered or that its civil law has been trampled upon, then there will be a sufficient sense of justice in this House to remedy that injustice. I would merely call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the opinions of a man who was supposed to have, and no doubt had, the interests of this country at heart, and whom hon. gentlemen opposite followed as loyally as Mussulman followed Mohammed—I refer to the late Hon. George Brown, who in his speech on Confederation, after discussing the details, said:

“I say that, taking the scheme as a whole, it has my cordial, enthusiastic support, without hesitation or reservation.”

It is under that constitution that this court has been established and maintained. The late Hon. George Brown, speaking on the very matter which is now under discussion, on the integrity of the constitution and the necessity of preserving our institutions in such a way as to conserve, not only the present, but the future interests of the people, said:

“By placing the appointment of the judges in the hands of the General Government, and the establishment of a Central Court of Appeal, we have secured uniformity of justice over the whole land.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we should hesitate, at this early stage in our progress as a Confederation and in the history of this court, in interfering with the constitution or the powers of a court which has worked with success up to this time, and for which the late Hon. George Brown, as well as the leader of the present Government, held out such fair promise.

Mr. CURRAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to detain this House at any great length on the subject now under our consideration; but, as belonging to the Province which is more particularly to be affected by the measure proposed, I desire to say a very few words. As regards the original constitution of the court, I may say I was one of those who felt that it was premature to establish such a tribunal at the time the measure for that purpose was brought before Parliament. There was throughout the whole Province of Quebec a very strong popular opinion against the measure, and I may further say there was an equally strong opinion amongst the members of the legal profession, that cases coming before this court for adjudication from the Province of Quebec could not receive that consideration to which they were entitled; and at that time I fully concurred in all that has fallen from the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), to-day. However, the Government of the day thought proper to constitute the court, and it has been working for a certain number of years. Under these circumstances, I am under the impression that in bringing forward a measure of this kind, the hon. gentleman who is fathering this Bill should have come before this House armed with something more than his own *ipse dixit*. He should have come here fortified with representations from the various sections of the bar of Lower Canada, showing that the members of our bar, through their duly constituted authorities, felt aggrieved at the manner in which the legal business from that Province was being conducted. Now, we have no such representations before this honorable House. My hon. friend in bringing forward his motion

to-day has not insisted that any such ideas prevail, and we have the statement of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Girouard) that the only section of the bar of Lower Canada that has at all expressed itself, the bar of the district of Montreal, has pronounced against any interference with the present constitution of the court. Now, in view of the fact that more than one-half of the whole business of our courts in the Province of Quebec is transacted in the District of Montreal, I think the action of the learned gentlemen composing that section of the bar may well lead us to believe that the working of the Supreme Court is giving pretty general satisfaction. No doubt, at first view, when we consider that there are only two members of that court appointed from the Province of Quebec, it must strike us that the representation from that Province is hardly strong enough. Yet it appears to me that the remedy suggested by the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) would not for one moment relieve us from any of the difficulties under which we may be supposed to labor. Appointing an additional judge from the Province of Quebec would give us three judges in the Supreme Court, but we should still have three members of the Supreme Court over-riding the judgments of perhaps five members of the Court of Queen's Bench in the Province of Quebec, and thus the difficulty suggested by my hon. friend from Montmagny would still remain. But my reason for opposing this Bill, under the present circumstances, is this, that the *personel* of the Supreme Court at present gives pretty general satisfaction and a sure guarantee that our provincial matters will be properly administered. Under the statutes of old Canada, as well as under our present statutes, ten years' practice at the bar was considered sufficient to render a lawyer competent to be appointed to the bench, that is he could not be appointed unless he had previously ten years' practice. That was the term fixed at the expiration of which a gentleman might be elevated to the bench. Now, if we look at the *personel* of the Supreme Court, as it stands to-day, we find that whilst we have our two members from the Province of Quebec there, three of the original members who were appointed, I think, in 1877, still occupy seats in that court. Now, it strikes me that if after a practice of ten years at the bar, a lawyer is considered competent to become a judge, gentlemen possessing the eminent qualifications of those who have been raised to the bench of the Supreme Court ought, after having sat for eight years upon that bench, after having had our laws expounded before them and studied those laws, not only on their own account, but in conjunction with their distinguished colleagues from the lower Canadian bar, to be at least, as competent to administer our provincial laws, as any person who may have practised ten years at the bar of our own Province. I therefore consider, in view of the fact that we have no outcry against the decisions of this court and no complaints that I see in connection with its judgments; in view of the fact that in hardly a single case have the opinions of the two members of the Lower Canadian section on that bench been overridden by those of their brother judges in cases involving questions of Quebec law, we have a very fair reason to suppose that this court, as now constituted, has given and is likely to give general satisfaction. I see with pleasure that a class of men is now springing up who will be available in the future to occupy seats on this bench. If you look at the bar of the Province of Quebec you will find there more than one gentleman who has graduated at the bar of the Province of Ontario; if you look at the bar of Ontario you will find there a number of gentlemen who are barristers of the Province of Quebec, and if you go to the Province of Manitoba, you will find there large numbers of legal gentlemen, barristers both of Quebec and Ontario, and no doubt from the other Provinces as well. Under all these circumstances, I feel it to be very injudicious on our part to interfere with the court as now constituted. I certainly have great pleasure in re-echoing the sentiments

Mr. CURRAN.

expressed by those who have spoken to-day as to the necessity of maintaining our institutions, of allowing those institutions to take root in the hearts of the people, and certainly if we go on, day by day, altering and amending, we shall not be proceeding in the proper spirit, or in a way likely to endear those institutions to the people at large. In concluding, I will say that whilst on the whole I have never heard any complaint with regard to the judgments of the Supreme Court; yet, from very high quarters indeed, I have received a complaint which, as will be seen by a motion that is now on the Order paper for certain returns, I am endeavoring to investigate—a complaint with regard, not to the judgments of the Supreme Court, but to the very great delay that occurs between the argument of a case and the rendering of a final judgment. We know that many complaints are made that our judges in the Province of Quebec do not decide cases in a great many instances on the spot, cases which perhaps might be so decided, that from time to time the *délibérés* are almost interminable; and, if my information be correct, and I hope it is not, it would seem that to a certain extent this practice of long *délibérés* is creeping into the Supreme Court causing months and months to elapse, in many cases, before judgments are rendered. In view of all these facts, considering especially that the court as now constituted is likely to give satisfaction, taking into consideration that we have two of our own judges on it, and that it comprises other judges who have had many years' experience in the administration of our laws, I feel on this occasion compelled to give my vote against the measure proposed by the hon. member for Montmagny, although under other circumstances I might perhaps be disposed to vote differently.

Mr. DAVIES. I think it is unfortunate that Bills of this kind, having for their object the attacking of the constitution and jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, should be annually brought forward, because they are apt to give rise, in the popular mind, to the impressions that this court is not discharging its duties fairly, and that a strong public opinion exists calling for its reconstruction. It must be evident, from the vast preponderance of opinion of hon. members in the House, that the opinion of the bars in the several Provinces is in favor of the court continuing as it is. It is quite evident the court has given great satisfaction to the majority of the Provinces, and if we accept the statements of the two gentlemen who have just spoken, the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) and the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), two distinguished members of the Montreal bar, even the bar of the Province of Quebec, the majority at any rate, seems to be well satisfied with the constitution of the Supreme Court. The hon. member for Montreal Centre expressed the opinion that its constitution at the time it was constituted was inopportune. I do not agree with him. Speaking as a member of the bar from one of the smaller Provinces, I have no hesitation in saying that the Supreme Court has been a very great benefit to the Province of Prince Edward Island; by all the Maritime Provinces it is looked upon with the highest respect, and its decisions received with the greatest satisfaction. I can give an instance in point to show why the maintenance of that court is strongly desired by the Province from which I come. When the Supreme Court was first instituted a very important Bill had passed in our Province, an Act expropriating lands in that colony. A court of commission had been appointed, which had sat for two years and had taken an immense amount of evidence, which had made awards to the amount of over a million of dollars, and after the awards had been made and a question with which that colony for nearly a century had been agitated finally settled in the manner provided by that Act, the Supreme Court of the Province came forward and in a hasty judgment set aside the whole of the awards. The work of

half a century which had culminated in the compulsory land Act were destroyed, the question was relegated to the position it had occupied a quarter of a century before, and we were on the eve of another agitation, accompanied by all the evils that follow agrarian agitations. The Supreme Court of Canada had just then been established; we took an appeal to it at once; the judgment of our Provincial Supreme Court was reversed, the awards were all maintained in their entirety, and the land question of that colony, to the great benefit of that colony, was settled finally and forever. Since that time we have had the opportunity of appealing, from time to time, when occasion required, to that court, and, as I said before, the decisions of that court have given very general satisfaction, and I know of no Bill which would create more dissatisfaction in the Maritime Provinces than the Bill, if it were carried, which is now before the House. I do not think a member of the bar from one of the Maritime Provinces can be found who would express his feeling or sympathy in favor of the Bill or of the principle of the Bill. If the Bill was carried, so far as the Supreme Court of Canada is concerned, in its relation to the Maritime Provinces, it would be utterly useless. We would have our appeal, of course, to the Privy Council, but the experience of the time preceding the constitution of the Supreme Court here shows that that was not an appeal in reality at all, but merely in name. Very few cases were ever carried there, and we had no intermediate court of appeal, as they have in the larger Provinces of Quebec and Ontario. Therefore, the maintenance of the Supreme Court of the Dominion, as at present constituted, is a vital necessity for the Maritime Provinces of the Dominion, and I hope it will be long ere the constitution of that court is tampered with. I do not wish to prolong the debate, but I desire to call attention, not to the grievance my hon. friend opposite referred to, namely, that the judgments are delayed in their delivery after the arguments have taken place, but that there is a delay in the time between the delivery of the judgments and their publication, and I think that grievance is felt very seriously. I am told that the delay is in part owing to the fact that the judges have not and cannot get clerks to transcribe their judgments and assist them in the copying of their judgments and other work. They have a very great deal of work to do; their work is increasing yearly, and anything that would facilitate the publication of those judgments after they are delivered, anything in reason, I think, should be done by the Government. I think that is a grievance. Perhaps it is a small one, but it is one that is felt generally by the profession, and I hope it will be remedied. I am told by those in authority that it can be remedied, and remedied in one way, by appointing a sufficient number of clerks—one or two clerks, or whatever number may be required—to assist the judges, in order that their judgments may be transcribed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When the Supreme Court system was adopted as a portion of the constitution of British America, it was not adopted without grave consideration by those who were concerned in the original resolutions and in the adoption of the scheme which culminated in the British North America Act. It was considered that, following the example of the United States, there should be one Supreme Court of Appeal, to which all cases, arising, at all events, out of the laws of the Federal Parliament, might go for adjudication. It was afterwards pressed, and successfully pressed, that, as, with the exception of Ontario and Quebec, there were no courts of appeal in the Provinces, the court should not only be a court of appeal on Dominion and constitutional questions relating to the laws passed by the Federal Parliament, but a supreme court of appeal, intermediate between the courts of original jurisdiction and the final court of appeal, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. And in that respect the system varies from the system in the United States.

Shortly after, as it is known, the Confederation was perfected, the question of the establishment of a Supreme Court was, of course, under consideration by the Government of which I was then a member, and a measure was prepared and submitted to Parliament, but it never culminated in an Act. Then, after the Government of Mr. Mackenzie succeeded, they, following the same line of policy as the previous Government, introduced the Supreme Court Bill, which became the law of the land. The hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, says that theoretically he was opposed to the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. No; not opposed to the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps not to the Bill, but he considered that, theoretically, under the federal system, the different Provinces should have their own courts not only of original jurisdiction but of appellate jurisdiction. That was the correct theory as he described it; but notwithstanding that theory, which I suppose obtained in his mind full sway as it does at this moment, he, I think, supported the Bill. The Government introduced the Bill, he supported it, and it became the law of the land, and the court became a court dealing not only with constitutional questions, not only with the decision of Acts passed by this Parliament, but with all matters connected with property and civil rights as well. I think the court has met, as several gentlemen have stated, with the universal approval of the Provinces, with the single exception of the Province of Quebec. Well, that is an exceptional case, as has been argued. The Province of Quebec has its own system of laws, and it is carried through the instrumentality of a language which is not the language of a majority of the courts or of the bars of the different Provinces of the Dominion. The civil law varies in principle in a great degree, and thoroughly in practice, from that which obtains in the other Provinces. I can quite understand why the measure which is acceptable in the other Provinces is not so acceptable in the Province of Quebec. In all the other Provinces the law is substantially the same, based on the common law of England, with some variances of course, from the different Provinces having separate Legislatures of their own. Yet in substance, the body of the law, the *corpus legis*, in all the Provinces is the same, so that a trained lawyer in any of the courts in any of the Provinces, save that of Quebec, is competent in every way to sit in judgment in cases arising in any one of the Provinces of which, perhaps, he is not a member. But, in consequence of the fact that a different system of law prevails in the Province of Quebec, special care was taken to protect the law and the administration of the law of that Province in the constitution of the court, and although there are only six judges, two of them are taken *ex necessitate* from the Province of Quebec. As respects the other four judges, they may all come from one Province. They may all be taken from Ontario, or from New Brunswick, or from Nova Scotia. There is no limitation, there is no provision by which the different bars or benches of the different Provinces are to be represented upon the federal bench, with the single exception of the provision that two members of the Quebec bar or bench must *ex necessitate* be appointed to sit in the federal court. Now one would think that was a sufficient precaution. If it be not so, as has been stated, then the constitution of the court might be altered so as to strengthen that portion of the bench *quoad* cases arising from the Province of Quebec. It is true that the taunt thrown across the floor by the hon. gentleman opposite has some foundation, that we had undertaken on this side to take up that subject. But it is a very difficult subject, and the difficulty arises from the fact that

we have not been able to discover a system by which that bench can be strengthened from the Province of Quebec without giving a predominance to that Province on all the cases that come before the court. If by adding additional judges from the Province of Quebec we would give additional weight to their decisions on cases arising from the Province of Quebec alone, there would be but little difficulty—it would be simply a matter of expenses. But the House must remember that the judges coming from the Province of Quebec, trained to a different law from the law of England, trained to a different law from the common law that prevails in all the other Provinces, and having an equal voice upon the law with which they are not familiar, can and do frequently take the responsibility of giving judgment against the majority of judges from other Provinces. Now, if the bench from the Province of Quebec were strengthened still further, that objection would have still greater force. The other Provinces would say: We are over-riden; our judges, trained to the common law of England, are over-ruled by judges coming from the Province where a different system prevails; and so the complaint which now arises, perhaps very naturally, from the Province of Quebec, would simply be transferred to the other Provinces. They would say that the civilians, those acquainted only with the civil law of Lower Canada, were over-riding the common law, which obtained in all the other Provinces. Now, I am told that practically, Sir—I cannot state with personal acquaintance or examination of the judgments of the court—but I am told that there are few, if any, cases in which the decided opinion and deliberate judgment of the two judges coming from the Province of Quebec, have been over-ruled by the other judges; but I am told also that it is found that frequently the judges from the Province of Quebec have joined with the minority of the other judges of the Supreme Court, and have over-ruled the decision of the majority of the English judges.

Some hon. MEMBERS. French domination.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be impossible, Sir, it seems to me, at this stage of our existence as a Dominion, with this court established under the circumstances, working for so many years, and giving satisfaction to all the Provinces but one, to set it aside. I think, therefore, that my hon. friend, satisfied with bringing this question before Parliament with the ability and perseverance which are his characteristics, can call the attention of Parliament to it again and again, until some mode is discovered by which the constitution of the court may be so altered as to give an additional strength to the Quebec portion of it, and give additional satisfaction to the people of Quebec without, at the same time, causing dissatisfaction to the other Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. You give it up?

Mr. MILLS. Flies on the wheel.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. My hon. friend says we are flies on the wheel. Well, no; we keep pegging away, as Lincoln said. We will not give up, we will keep pegging away, and I have no doubt that by and bye, by some happy inspiration—perhaps a hint from the hon. gentleman opposite—we will be able to discover some mode of satisfying the reasonable demands coming from the Province of Quebec. However, Mr. Speaker, meanwhile I must vote against the repeal of the Supreme Court Act.

Mr. OUMET. I do not rise to answer or to criticise what the right hon. Premier has just said, but I have been listening in vain to hear from him an argument justifying the existence of that court. Suppose, for instance, there was a law providing that a judgment rendered by one judge in a court should be appealed from to another judge in another court, that would be absurd; the idea is preposterous. Well, I think the idea is just as absurd of having a

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

judgment that has been passed upon by five judges revised by five other judges. I understand very well that the people from the Maritime Provinces who have no appeal court—desire the continuance of the Supreme Court. Now I may say at once, Mr. Speaker, that I have nothing to say against the constitution of the court, nor against the members thereof—I have no prejudice against them. But what I say is this: We have what we call a tribunal *de première instance*, the Superior Court, presided over by one judge; then there is an appeal from that judge to the Court of Review, consisting of three other judges of the Superior Court. Now, if we lose a case in the latter court we may go to the Court of Queen's Bench, which is composed of five of our best men; and then if we loose there, we may come to the Supreme Court before five other judges; for, although the court is composed of six judges, five compose a quorum, and it is very seldom that the six judges sit at the same time—at least, I have practised before the court occasionally, and I never saw but five judges on the bench. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the use of piling up tribunals one upon another, more especially when the last tribunal of appeal is composed of but the same number of judges as sat in the preceding court of appeal? As I said at first, the idea of appealing from the judgment of judges in one court to the same number of judges in another court is absurd; and, Mr. Speaker, no one feels that more than those poor people who are obliged to go before the courts to maintain their rights; no one will feel that more than a man who takes an action in the Superior Court to recover a certain amount, and when he has judgment in his favor, is taken by his adversary to another court—the Court of Review, we will suppose—and from that court to the Queen's Bench, and thence either to the Supreme Court here, or to the Privy Council. There is no end to litigation, because there is no end to tribunals of appeal. Mr. Speaker, I am not now speaking as a lawyer. It may be all very well for us lawyers to be able to take our clients from one court to another, always holding out to them the hope that they will finally succeed in the next court. I say the less tribunals of appeals we have the better for the people, and I am speaking for the people now. I say that there is no need of this Supreme Court. I do not say so because the judges give bad judgments; if they gave bad judgments then every one would say they ought to be got rid of. But suppose they only give as good judgments as do our other courts, they are then useless, and besides we have no guarantee that these men are any better men than we have in our own Province. Men are always alike, and the theory of appealing from one judgment to another cannot stand, except if the appeal is from one judge to two or three judges; that is to say, except if you appeal from a number of judges to a larger number of judges. Here we have not that guarantee. If these judges do not reverse the judgment of the court below, they are of no use. If they do, we are told they should be blamed for it. What, then, are they there for? They are of no use, except to prolong litigation, and thereby eventually help to ruin litigants. I lay down this as a proposition: We have too many appeal courts. What is the remedy? I am of the opinion, as are many others, that the theory of the Supreme Court is based on sound reasoning. The Supreme Court is supposed to be the crowning of our judicature; it is supposed to represent the supreme power, the unified power of this Confederation. I think there is reason for its existence; but I say it should be constituted so as not to create an extra appellate tribunal, but to act as a tribunal of last resort. I would make the Supreme Court a large court, consisting of different branches. Those different branches should consist of the several courts of appeal in the different Provinces who would then be incorporated in the Supreme Court. In the Maritime Provinces they have no appeal court, and the Supreme Court would remain their

appeal court. The Court of Queen's Bench, in the Province of Quebec, would be the supreme court sitting in appeal on cases belonging to Lower Canada in the same places as they do to-day. The Appeal Court of Ontario would sit as a branch of the Supreme Court, and be the tribunal of last resort for cases from that Province. When a question of great constitutional importance would arise, the Supreme Court, constituted as I have said, of the judges now appointed here—whose number might be reduced in future, if it is too large for the requirements—and the judges of the provincial appeal courts, might sit together, say fifteen judges. This would be the case on a question of such importance as the last question laid before the Supreme Court, namely, the constitutionality of the McCarthy Act. Then we would obtain the opinions of fifteen of the best men of the Dominion. Such a court might be productive of good results, because the great weight of the decision of those judges might prevent the Dominion Government carrying the case before the Privy Council in respect to a question which only concerns ourselves. I think, with a court so constituted, the Government themselves would be obliged to abide by its decision. Of course, this system which I have propounded may look difficult to work out. I should say that the Provincial Governments, having jurisdiction as regards the constitution of the local courts, ought to be communicated with and approached, in order that an arrangement such as I have indicated may be arrived at. I beg to move :

That all the words after "that" in the said motion be left out, and that the following be inserted instead thereof:—"There are in our judicial system too great a number of tribunals having an appeal jurisdiction; that a humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, praying him to communicate with the several Provincial Governments, with the object of arranging a judicial system, which will diminish the number of appeal jurisdictions, whilst guaranteeing an efficient administration of justice equally satisfactory to all the Provinces."

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House on this subject spoke partly as a lawyer and partly as a layman, and it was the latter part of his observations on the subject before the House which has emboldened me, not a lawyer, to say a few words with respect to this Bill. All my sympathies have been in favor of a supreme court of appeal for our whole country, and I have listened with a great deal of attention to discover what arguments would be brought forward to show why a court should not exist, and why, if it exists, it ought to be abolished. I confess I have not heard sufficient reasons to induce me to vote in favor of the Bill—to vote against the present measure which we have on the Statute Book. I hold as firmly as the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) that too much litigation is neither profitable nor wise; but I still think that it will be found in the main that the litigation as to its amount is rather to be limited by the intelligence and experience of the people than by the number of courts which are erected in a country. Although it is well to discourage litigation as far as possible, is it not well also—if there are wrongs to be righted, and rights to be maintained, that it may be put in the power of those who are wronged or who wish to gain rights to have the widest area of redress possible, and the best ability of the country in the courts before whom they apply for that redress. I think that principle will hold quite as strongly as the other. Every objection which has been urged against the Act which we have at present on the Statute Book is one which could be urged just as well against taking our questions from the courts in Canada to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Every objection which is urged against an appeal to our Supreme Court could equally well be urged against that; and yet I doubt very much if the people of this country, especially since Confederation, have not seen, time and time again, the wisdom and benefit of having that avenue open to

them as a tribunal to which to refer those questions which affect the Provinces differently, or affect the Provinces in connection with the Federal Government. I think that one of the chief objections to this court is an objection which holds most at a time when the court is first established, and which wears away every year that the court grows in age. The objection, as I understand, comes from the fact that certain judges of the Supreme Court are not as well versed in certain methods of procedure and modes of law in one Province as the judges who come from that Province. But is it not true that by the fact of having this court we have all the judges of our country who are appointed to it, or who look forward to an appointment to it, making it a point to verse themselves in these different kinds of law, and so get to learn what we must get to learn if we are to have a united country—all that is to be known of the greater and wider interests of the country, legal and otherwise. Is it not true that year by year the judges will become more versed in these different methods of law, and so this objection will gradually wear away. As I listened to-night to the debate, I found that the difficulty arose from one Province—and there is division of sentiment with reference to the difficulty even in that Province—while from all the other Provinces of the Dominion I think it is but fair to say there is a consensus of opinion that this appellate court is not only beneficial but necessary; and I think the different Provinces, and I am certain the Provinces down by the sea, would be very sorry indeed to have this court taken away as a court of appeal and be confined to their own provincial courts merely—and that is not making any imputation on the calibre or talents of courts we have. Well, if all are satisfied, with the exception of one, and if there be a difference of opinion even in that one, it seems to me that the weight of opinion should hold, especially in the face of the declaration of the leader of the Government, that it is very, very difficult indeed, to hit upon a method which shall be less onerous on one Province while not, at the same time, becoming more onerous with reference to the other Provinces. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) said he looked in vain for a single argument in favor of the continuance of the court. I think I can give him two or three; and yet, if he heard the arguments brought forward by those who preceded me in favor of the court, I am not sure that he will take mine, because the arguments advanced before are probably stronger than any I can offer. But the line of argument I would advance is this: That it is essential to the best righting of wrongs that the area of redress shall be as wide as possible; that we shall be able not merely to go before a magistrate's court, but that we may get beyond, perhaps, the prejudice or the ignorance of a magistrate's court to the higher judicial atmosphere of the County Court—of the Court of Appeal above—and so that if our wrongs are not righted in the first we may feel with confidence that they may be righted in the second, and so on farther. And men who feel that they have wrongs to be righted will never be satisfied until they have power to get, as they have now, the very best talent selected from the whole of the country or the empire to which they belong. I believe that. Again, it is necessary as well to a better feeling with reference to the justice and security of men's rights, not only that there shall be the widest area of redress, but that there shall be men of the best possible ability to sit in the tribunals before which they go. Now, I think it goes without saying that when you pick and choose among the celebrated and strong men at the bar or on the bench in all the Provinces of the Dominion, you bring a wealth of ability, and a variety of ability, and a variety of methods of looking at different questions, which you cannot possibly hope to gain in any single Province, and so the ability which is ensured is greater far than it possibly could be in any single Province. I think it gives a greater feel-

ing of security and content in any community or in any Province to feel that it is not bound to the courts of its own Province, where provincial prejudices might sometimes get in, but that it can go to a court which is outside of those prejudices, as far as possible, and get that justice which possibly might, from some circumstance, be denied them at home. I think that is another reason for that wider court. But the very fact that we have an appellate court for the Dominion makes a better court for each Province. Why? Because every judgment given by a provincial court may be brought up in review before the larger court, and it therefore puts the provincial courts on their mettle. If these courts were of final jurisdiction they might perhaps get a little careless; but they will say: We need to be very careful in looking into the matter, from the fact that every judgment of our court may be brought before judges from all the Provinces. This condition of things ensures that these provincial court judges will do their duty—they are put on their mettle—and therefore we get better provincial courts. I think that is an argument which we might well consider. More than that, and my chief reason for being in sympathy with the Supreme Court is that it is a national court, a bond of union for the whole country—that in it we unite the different phases of legal talent and ability—of race, and of creed and of Province; that the whole Dominion brings them together, where we can look upon them as the central fountain of judicial decision for the whole country. So the Provinces are united by another bond, and they are not simply divided and kept apart amongst themselves, so far as the highest judicial decisions are concerned. I think the benefit in that way—in having this as a bond of greater and closer union—is one which is not to be despised in this argument. I think, also, with several who have spoken on this subject, that although it may be within the power of this Parliament, although it may be within the power of the politicians of the country, to bring up any of our institutions and pass them in review, there is danger in being continually hammering away at what have been, for a certain time, institutions of the country, and so creating a general feeling of uncertainty as to whether these things will last, whether they are sure, whether they are settling down into really strong and stable institutions of the country. So I am in favor of keeping the court. I believe it will grow better year by year. I want it because it is a bond of union, because there we can get the very best judicial talent in our country from all these Provinces, and I want it most of all because I feel that we need it as the culmination of the area of widest redress possible in our country, and it is the place where we can get the best judicial discussions and decisions.

Mr. AMYOT. I heard, with a certain amount of surprise, that the hon. member who has just spoken did not find any good reason for the Bill that has been presented. I think it will be admitted that such a question should be discussed without any reference to the existing judges. It would not be fair to come before this hon. House and say that such a judge and such another judge possessed such and such qualities. I am ready to admit that the present judges are the best judges we have ever had, and that if they were never going to die, we might consent to keep the court as it is at present constituted. But when we come to discuss the constitution of a court, we should do so without reference to the existing judges. I understand that the mover of the Bill does not wish to abolish the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court for any Province that desires to keep the same. The object of the Bill, as understood in the Province of Quebec, is to take away the appellate jurisdiction of that tribunal for the Province of Quebec; and the reasons for that are very clear and obvious. We contend that for us, that tribunal is,

Mr. FOSTER.

in the first place, useless; secondly, that it is dangerous; and thirdly, that it is against the spirit of the treaties. Now, the hon. members of this House know that we, in the Province of Quebec, have a special system of law, entirely different from the common law or the statute law of England, or of any of the other Provinces of the Dominion. Will any of the hon. members of this House tell me what interest they have in forcing us to be guided in these matters by judges who have not studied our laws, who have not spent their lives in being trained to them? They say: We want a court of general jurisdiction; we want unity in our laws. That is all very well, Mr. Speaker; and it has been provided for by the Confederation Act, except in the case of the Province of Quebec. In that Province our cases are first heard by four judges of the Superior Court, and afterwards by five judges of the Appeal Court. Yet we are to be subjected, in spite of our will, to have the decision of those nine judges reversed by two judges! Where is the sense of that? How comes it that there is more brain in two men than in our nine judges? And suppose the two judges should disagree, and there should be one against one; and suppose they agree, and there are four on the other side! I am told that has not occurred yet; but who is to give me a guarantee that it will never occur? Who can tell me who are to be appointed judges in the future? Who will tell me that at some future day judges may not be appointed who will be our hatred, and who will begin a persecution against the principles which we cherish? We must not be blinded, but we must foresee for the future. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) ask: Where are the petitions? Has he not been at public meetings in the Province of Quebec for the last ten years? Has he not read the press? Has he not heard repeatedly the denunciations of the Supreme Court in that Province? We do not want it; we do not want the nonsense of those men, who do not know our laws, undertaking to judge our laws. Keep the court for the other Provinces if you want it; appoint other judges if you like; but we say, for us, we have been admitted by the Crown of England, centuries ago, with all our laws and with all the liberties that we possessed before. Those rights have been maintained; we have spent our blood for them, and for the British flag too; and by the Act of Confederation we were given the guarantee that our laws would be respected, and that the judges for the Province of Quebec would be selected from the bar of that Province. That was the guarantee; and is it because there is another clause surrounded with difficulty in interpretation, that you will impose upon us judges not taken from our bar? That is the injustice that is imposed upon us. As my hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) said, we have already too many tribunals. But there is another reason why we do not want this court; not only is it useless, but it is dangerous. It is against the spirit of the treaty. It is against the general and well understood principles laid down when Confederation was brought about. In the name of the Province of Quebec, whose sentiments have been so often expressed and are so well known, we say: We have entered the Confederation of Canada, but we have done so with the understanding that our judges, taken from the bar of the Province of Quebec, would rule us, would have exclusive jurisdiction, and we do not want that formal agreement to be disregarded. There is the Privy Council, whose jurisdiction is a matter inherent in the colonial system. We have submitted to it; we were bound to do so; we have made that sacrifice, and we will make it as long as the people decide to remain under the British flag. But if we had not that tribunal, we contend that God has given brain enough to the people of the Province of Quebec to rule themselves without being obliged to cross the sea and be ruled by the infallibility of judges in England. More-

over, the English judges have not their minds influenced by the statutes of the other Provinces, and they are always careful enough, when a question of old French law arises, to consult the experience resulting from the large practice of the best French lawyers. But what cannot be cured must be endured, and we have to receive the jurisdiction of the Privy Council, for which I have the highest respect; but we are not bound to endure the other jurisdiction here. We are entrusted with the care of the old laws which our forefathers have always respected, and which we intend to give intact to future generations. And we say to the other members of the Confederation. Arrange your interests as you please; have any court you wish; but for the Province of Quebec, respect our statutes; respect the treaty; respect the Confederation Act; and if any of the representatives of the Province of Quebec think that we are not rightly expressing here the opinion and desire of that Province, let them say so and take the responsibility.

Mr. LAURIER. My hon. friend from Laval (Mr. Ouimet) stated, in the course of the argument he offered to the House, that we are suffering from too many appeals. I do not think the case is as bad as he represented it. He stated that there was an appeal from the judgment of the Superior Court to the Court of Review, and from the Court of Review to the Court of Appeal. This, as he knows, is only partially true. There may be an appeal from the judgment of the Superior Court to the Court of Review, but if the judgment of the Superior Court is confirmed by the Court of Review, there is no further appeal. It is only when the judgment of the Superior Court is reversed by the Court of Review that an appeal can be made to the Court of Appeal. Now, my hon. friend stated, and that was the burden of his speech, that having two many appeals we should suppress the appeal from the judgment of the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court. My hon. friend forgets that though he may suppress the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court he will not make away with the right of appeal. My hon. friend knows that at present, when there is an appeal to the Supreme Court there is an appeal of the Privy Council, and when there is an appeal of the Privy Council there is an appeal to the Supreme Court, and the suitor has the choice between the Supreme Court and the Privy Council; so that if you should suppress the appeal to the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court in purely provincial matters, the appeal to the Privy Council will still remain and you still do not suppress the right of appeal. We will still remain with as many appeals as we now have. My hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Amyot) said it was sheer nonsense that the judgments of our Court of Appeal, composed of five judges versed in the French law, should be reviewed by the Supreme Court, in which there are only two judges versed in the French law. But if that be nonsensical, is it not far more nonsensical that an appeal should be taken to the Privy Council, where there are no judges supposed to be practically versed in our law? I prefer, for my part, the lesser to the greater nonsense if nonsense there be. It is said that Quebec, as a whole, is opposed to the Supreme Court. I deny that. I say that the Supreme Court has given, on the whole, general satisfaction to the Province of Quebec. It is true that when the court was first established it met with a great deal of political opposition from the Conservative party, and when the Conservative party came into power in 1878 they came here fully determined to suppress it. But it is in the knowledge of every one that their zeal rapidly diminished from year to year, until now, when the opposition we hear is of a very meek and mild character; and if the court will be given another chance, as it undoubtedly will, it will at last give such general satisfaction that we will hear no more of those periodical cries raised against it. As to the amendment of the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), I do not think that he and

I, coming from the Province of Quebec, ought seriously to invite the interference of this Government with our judicial system. For my part, I prefer to leave the judicial system of the Province in the hands of the Provincial Legislatures, and shall vote against the amendment.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Mr. LANDRY. (Translation.) Before the motion is put to a vote, I desire to answer a few remarks which have been made by those who took part in the debate. The hon. members who addressed the House have not in the least, so far as I can see, answered the objections which we have made and which we maintain, against the existence of the Supreme Court as it is now constituted. It has been stated, Mr. Speaker—and it is the only statement we have been able to obtain from the Government—that the Bill being introduced every year, it may give them a chance to find means to do away with the objections which are formulated against the Supreme Court. Mr. Speaker, if that is the position taken by the Government on this question, they may rest assured that if the House does not at the present time approve of the principle which we now invoke, if the House pronounces now against the measure, such as is now proposed, at least the attention of the Government will, ere long, be called to this question, and they will have the advantage to decide in a final manner, sooner or later. One of the hon. members who spoke on this subject pretends that if the Bill is adopted the result will be to take away from the Supreme Court nine-tenths of the work which is now entrusted to it. I do not think that such an argument can be considered as a serious objection to the adoption of the Bill. If it is a disadvantage, at all events it will be readily admitted that this disadvantage is much smaller than those I have pointed out to the House. And, if of two evils one must choose the least, no doubt that the hon. member for Glengarry himself (Mr. Macmaster) will be glad to withdraw his objection and vote in favor of my motion. The hon. member for Glengarry has proposed the appointment of an additional judge from the Province of Quebec, and of an additional judge for the Province of Ontario. This addition would not in the least improve the present constitution of the court. This addition would not at all remedy the inconveniences which are pointed out, and would not remedy in the least the evils which are complained of in the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) has said that I came here with my *ipse dixit*; that the bar of the Province of Quebec had not made any complaint. At this remark the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) has pertinently answered by telling him that if he had consulted public opinion just a little, in the ten years during which he has been in politics, he might have discovered what is public sentiment on this point. During the elections of 1878 and the elections of 1882 we have ascertained what was the opinion of the public on this question. The hon. member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier), who has just spoken, ought to know something about it; when, in 1877, he was appointed a member of the Government and when he was a candidate for re-election in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska, he will surely remember that the great cause of his defeat was the responsibility which he had assumed by being a party to the establishment of the Supreme Court. The people of the Province of Quebec have very staunch opinions on this point, and I believe the hon. member for Montreal has, on the present occasion, spoken more as a lawyer than as a representative of the real sentiment of the electoral division which he represents. The debate which has just taken place has perfectly shown the following fact: That in some Provinces people are in favor of the maintenance of the Supreme Court because they have no Court of Appeal, while in the Province of Quebec people are against it, pre-

cisely because we have too many courts of appeal. The amendment just moved by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) is based on that motive. From this point of view, Mr. Speaker, I think that this Bill, when it goes before the committee, and perhaps at this stage of the proceedings, might be amended so as to rally in favor of its adoption the votes of every member from the Province of Quebec and those of the members from all the other Provinces. The Bill might be amended so as to apply to the Province of Quebec only; by this means the principal objection which I have heard against the Bill might be raised at once. One of the hon. gentlemen who spoke on this question—and I believe it was the hon. member for Montreal Centre—said that we ought not to lay sacrilegious hand on the Holy Ark of our institutions, and that his devotedness to their preservation compelled him to vote against this Bill. Well, Mr. Speaker, it is precisely for that reason that the present legislation is proposed; it is for the maintenance of institutions far older than the Supreme Court; it is for the maintenance of our old French laws, the continuance of which has been secured to us by the treaties, that this Bill was introduced; it is in order to shield from the action of the Supreme Court the working of our old institutions; and the reason invoked by the hon. member for Montreal Centre to pronounce against this Bill is precisely one of the strongest that he might have to vote in favor of this Bill and to give it the support of his eloquence. At all events, Mr. Speaker, the evil exists, it has been ascertained. The Government themselves admits that it does exist. The greatest number of the hon. members who are in this House to speak on this question cannot deny its existence. I ask the hon. members of this House if they have a more efficacious remedy than the one I now propose, to submit it to us and to have it adopted, and I shall willingly withdraw this Bill. All we ask, in the Province of Quebec, is that the causes of discontent now existing should be made to disappear. This is the reason why the Bill is proposed, and as long as a better Bill is not introduced in this House, we, the members of the Province of Quebec, are bound to vote for this Bill, which will ensure to us the maintenance of our institutions and our laws, as we shall vote to-night in favor of the principle of this Bill, such as it is now before the House.

Mr. ROYAL. Coming from a small Province, which stands in pretty much the same position as the Maritime Provinces, as regards the number of appellate courts of jurisdiction, I do not view this question from the point of view of the hon. gentlemen from these Provinces. I believe this question was approached in the proper spirit by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), when he stated that far from looking at it from a lawyer's point of view, it should be looked at from a common sense point of view, from the political point of view. And in fact I shall vote for the second reading of this Bill, because I believe that it contains the fundamental principle of our constitution, that is to say, the federative as opposed to the legislative union principle. Now, it is well known that amongst the lawyers the greater the number of appellate jurisdiction courts the better for them, and the worse for their clients. Well, we must not narrow down questions of such importance to such reasoning. I believe this Bill must be discussed from a higher point of view, from the point of view as to whether it contains a principle cognate of the principle which lies at the bottom of our constitution or not; whether the Canadian constitution is based on the federative principles or the legislative union principles; and it is only upon that question that I will vote for the second reading of this Bill. The tendency of the ideas of some of the hon. members who oppose this Bill has come to light during this discussion. We have heard an hon. member express his approval of the assimilation of the civil laws all over Canada. Well, if that were

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny),

to take place, I believe it would be fatal to the duration of this Confederation. I believe our system is a federative one, and I believe it will grow wider and stronger by the development of the principles of legislation which are peculiar to each Province. It is true this court was at first composed to adjudicate upon cases coming from the various Provinces, but every one sees that it is a standing grievance in our politics; every Session, or nearly every Session attempts are made to modify its constitution or to abolish it entirely. I am not prepared to suggest a remedy to this existing evil; I am not ready to say what should constitute a supreme court of Canada; in fact, the very term "supreme court" is not correct; our Supreme Court is not a final court; it does not adjudicate finally upon the cases which come before it, for we have another court always open to appeal—the Privy Council. This fact, as well as many others, leads me to the conviction that the Supreme Court is not what it should be. Of course we are not called upon to say exactly what ought to be the constitution of that court; in fact, as an hon. member of the Opposition said, there is such a thing as a policy of creation and a policy of maintenance. The policy of creation is a thing of the past, but whether the policy of the maintenance should be followed to this extent, that the court should be maintained as it is, I doubt very much. In fact, from the very words of the right hon. the leader of the Government, we are led to suppose that this burning question has more than once occupied the time of the Government of this country. I believe the two tendencies that have shown themselves during the most interesting debate that has taken place upon this Bill, may be summed up thus: That there are two currents in the public opinion or in our legislation, the federative current and the legislative current. As far as this Bill is concerned, I shall vote for the second reading, because, in my mind, it is a very good approach to what I consider the good policy of legislation that ought to take place in connection with the establishment of such courts as the Supreme Court—that is to say, the federative principle.

Mr. BELLEAU. I concur entirely in the views expressed by my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, for the reason that the Bill now before the House is quite in accordance with the spirit of the constitution. If there is a principle which has been consecrated by the British North America Act, it is that there should exist, under the Confederation, two different systems of judicature, and it has been expressed over and over again by the factors of the Confederation that that was the intention and spirit of the Act, and it has been consecrated by the very terms of the Act itself. If you look at the 94th clause of the British North America Act, you will see that the Federal Parliament has been given the power of assimilating all the laws concerning civil rights in all the Provinces of the Dominion, with the exception of the Province of Quebec; and the exception goes so far as that, while the Act says that the Federal Parliament may pass a law assimilating the civil laws of the other Provinces, and that the Provinces will have themselves to pass a law to give effect to that passed by the General Parliament, in the Province of Quebec the Legislature of that Province would have no right to take for itself the effect of the general law passed by the Federal Parliament. We thus have consecrated by the constitution two entirely different systems of judicature—one for the whole of the Provinces, except the Province of Quebec, and the other for the Province of Quebec. Now, I contend, that if this principle is consecrated by the constitution, you go directly against that principle, you go directly against the terms and against the spirit of the constitution, when you put those laws of the Province of Quebec which are out of the control of the Federal Parliament under the control of a judicial authority which has its source in the

Federal Parliament. We have heard a great many reasons given by members from the lower Provinces and the other Provinces outside of the Province of Quebec. They complain that they have not, in their own Provinces, sufficient judicial organisation. They say they are quite ready to accept the Supreme Court as it is now, as a court of provincial jurisdiction for them. Well, that may suit them very well, but that certainly will not suit the Province of Quebec; and, if these Provinces really want that the Supreme Court shall have a jurisdiction under their own laws, they have a very easy way to obtain it; they have only to avail themselves of the 94th section of the British North America Act, and I am sure that, if it was enacted by this Parliament that the Supreme Court would have jurisdiction only on subjects which belong to the Federal Parliament, those Provinces would come before this Parliament, and if they really want that court to exercise jurisdiction, would ask this Parliament to pass a general Act assimilating the laws of their respective Provinces. Then we would have the whole spirit of the Act carried out. Those Provinces would have their laws under the control of the Federal Parliament, and consequently under the control and authority of the Supreme Court. Then the Supreme Court would be, what I always understood it ought to have been, a federal court, having jurisdiction only on subjects which are under the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament. And there would certainly be a great advantage in this. Under our complex system there are numerous conflicts arising out of the division of the legislative power. Those conflicts will arise for a great many years more, and, if the Federal court were established, which would have jurisdiction only on subjects which are under the control of the Federal Parliament, the question of jurisdiction would arise on every question which came before that court; and every day on which such a question would come before that court you would have a judgment on the jurisdiction of the court itself, and consequently on the jurisdiction of the Parliament which passed the law. That would greatly help you to arrive at a principle which would define the respective jurisdictions of the Local Legislatures and the Federal Parliament. I heard it said by one of the hon. members, that the effect of passing this Bill would be to destroy altogether the existence of the Supreme Court. I think that hon. gentleman went too far. If we look at the number of cases which have been brought before the Supreme Court, we may expect a time when that court will not be adequate to the work which will be brought before it. When the court was first created, as was mentioned by the chief of the Opposition, there were hardly four or five cases each term. If you look at the last roll of the Supreme Court, you will see that there were not less than forty cases to be heard. If that increase is proportionate for the next ten or twenty years, there will be a time when that court will not be able to do the work that will present itself. So, from this point of view, I think the hon. gentleman went too far. I will not go further than what I have just said. I am, for my part, firmly convinced that in this question of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, is involved the question of the autonomy of our Province. There have been, in this House and outside of it, a great many speeches made on the subject of the autonomy of our Province. One of the most essential elements of that autonomy is our law, which is different from the laws of the other Provinces. It comes from the same source; it emanates from the customs of our people, which are different from those of the people of the other Provinces, and those customs form one of the most important elements of the autonomy of our Province; and I am surprised to hear hon. members from the Province of Quebec express a contrary opinion. Some hon. gentlemen who have expressed their opinion against the Bill pretend that the court has generally given satisfaction. Well, Sir, the court may have given satisfaction as it

is now composed, but the principle of the court is against the spirit of our constitution and contrary to the guarantee given to the Province of Quebec, that our code of laws would be kept separate from the laws of the other Provinces; and I contend that unless the Supreme Court is prevented from over-riding our laws, they will soon be so far discredited as to become useless. For these reasons, I shall vote in favor of the Bill of my hon. friend.

Mr. COURSOL. I would like to say a few words before the vote is taken on this Bill. There is no doubt, whatever, in my mind, that there is a growing feeling and desire, in the Province of Quebec, that the present constitution of the court should be changed, and its appellate jurisdiction altered to a certain extent. But, Sir, in seeking that result, and in defending the interests of the Province of Quebec, as they have been so forcibly and so eloquently defended to-night, we, the representatives of that Province, must be careful not to impose upon the other Provinces our views any more than we would allow representatives from the other Provinces to impose their opinions upon us. I have not heard a word to-night from any member of another Province in favor of altering the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as regards his own Province; and yet we have now a Bill before us, which proposes to change that jurisdiction for the whole Dominion. I believe that feature of the court is obnoxious to the Province of Quebec; but if it is to be altered in a manner satisfactory to the people of that Province, it seems to me it must necessarily affect the other Provinces, and herein I perceive a very great difficulty. I am prepared to vote for the Bill, but reserving to myself the liberty of proposing, in committee, such suggestions as may meet the difficulty I have mentioned. I presume the hon. mover of this Bill will also be prepared to make some further suggestions in committee, for I cannot believe for a moment that he would propose to enforce upon the other Provinces a court so organised as to be distasteful to them. The hon. leader of the Opposition, in his remarks to-night, has expressed no desire for a change on behalf of the Province from which he comes. He has, in his usual eloquent manner, spoken of the constitution of the court and of its defects, which he believes may be remedied, but he did not at all oppose the appellate jurisdiction of that court. Therefore, with these reservations in favor of so modifying the Bill as not to oppose the opinions of the people of the other Provinces, I shall vote for the Bill, with a view of limiting it to the Province of Quebec, if such a limitation is possible.

House divided on Mr. Landry's (Montmagny) motion for:

Second reading of Bill (No. 3) to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Dugas,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	Montplaisir,
Bécharde,	Fortin,	Quimet,
Belleau,	Gagné,	Pinsonneault,
Benoit,	Gaudet,	Rinfret,
Bergeron,	Gigault,	Riobel,
Blondeau,	Girouard,	Royal,
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Taschereau,
Coursol,	Guilbault,	Tassé,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Kaulbach,	Vauzasse,
Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York)—34.
Desjardins,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allison,	Geoffrion,	McNeil,
Armstrong,	Gillmor,	Mills,
Auger,	Gordon,	Mitchell,
Bain (Wentworth),	Guillet,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Gunn,	Mulock,
Barnard,	Hackett,	O'Brien,
Beaty,	Hall,	Orton,
Bell,	Harley,	Paint,

Benson,	Hay,	Paterson (Brant),
Blake,	Hesson,	Platt,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Pope,
Bryson,	Hilliard,	Pruyn,
Burns,	Holton,	Ray,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Homer,	Reid,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Irvine,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Ives,	Scriver,
Carling,	Jackson,	Shakespeare,
Cartwright,	Jamieson,	Small,
Casey,	Jenkins,	Somerville (Brant)
Casgrain,	King,	Somerville (Bruce)
Catudal,	Kinney,	Springer,
Chapleau,	Kirk,	Sproule,
Charlton,	Kranz,	Stairs,
Cimon,	Landerkin,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Landry (Kent),	Townshend,
Colby,	Langeller,	Trow,
Coughlin,	Langevin (Sir Hector),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Laurier,	Vail,
Davies,	Lister,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Livingstone,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Macdonald (Kings),	Wells,
Dickinson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Cardwell),
Dodd,	Macmaster,	White (Hastings),
Dundas,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wigle,
Edgar,	McCarthy,	Williams,
Fairbank,	McCraney,	Wilson,
Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Ferguson (Leeds & Grenville),	McDougald (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Fleming,	McGreevy,	Woodworth,
Forbes,	McIsaac,	Yeo.—125.
Foster,	McMullen,	

Motion negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 20th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Temple.)

Bill (No. 51) for granting certain powers to the International Coal Company, Limited.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 53) respecting La Banque du Peuple.—Mr. Girouard.)

Bill (No. 54) to confirm the union of the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, and the Congregational Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.—(Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (No. 55) to authorise the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association, to insure against fire the property of the Patrons of Husbandry wheresoever situated in Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT OF 1883.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland), in the absence of Mr. FOSTER, moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) to amend the Liquor License Act of 1883. He said: The Bill repeals the 145th section of the Liquor License Act of last Session. It is considered necessary, in consequence of a late decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, which, I believe,

Mr. COURSOL,

is to the effect that this section repeals certain portions of the Canada Temperance Act.

Mr. BLAKE. That is the section under which these numerous prosecutions in New Brunswick became abortive, I believe?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That is one of the advantages of the Liquor License Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL LAW.

Mr. OUIMET (Translation) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 57) to amend the Criminal Law of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation). The amendments which are provided for in this Bill are not very important in themselves, but they are of such a nature as to favor the carrying out of the criminal law as it exists to-day. These amendments have been prepared at the suggestion of the magistrate of the City of Montreal, and of the judges of the Quarter Sessions, who have found that the wording of the Act constantly offers difficulties in the interpretation, and especially in the application of criminal law, particularly as regards preliminary investigations, and also as regards courts of Quarter Sessions having summary jurisdiction for certain offences. This Bill also provides for the definition of certain offences which come under chapter 32 of the criminal law of 1869, giving to judges of Quarter Sessions summary jurisdiction for certain offences, and particularly offences concerning persons keeping houses of ill-fame, gambling houses and disorderly houses. Owing to the obscurity of the law, and owing chiefly to the uncertainty of the law, it has happened very often that convictions or *commitimus* have been set aside because it was found impossible to connect the law contained in this chapter with pre-existing laws. The object of this Bill is to do away with these inconveniences, and I shall give further particulars at the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DISORDERLY HOUSES.

Mr. OUIMET (Translation) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 56) respecting disorderly houses.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. OUIMET. (Translation). The object of this Bill is simply to define what must be the meaning in criminal law of the words, "disorderly house," and to provide for the punishment of persons keeping or frequenting such houses. The *Maison Bleue* is not included in that category.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the interpretation wide enough to embrace this august assembly?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

PRIVILEGE—NEWSPAPER ATTACK.

Mr. ROYAL. Before proceeding with the Government notices of motion, I beg to raise a question of privilege. The Ottawa daily *Free Press* of Monday, February 16th, has the following paragraph:—

"On Friday last a Message came down, signed by His Excellency's own hand; and it is the custom to receive this Message by all members standing and with heads uncovered. It is read in French and English; but two French members—Girouard (Jacques Cartier) and Royal, drew the distinction very fine when they remained conspicuously seated as the English version was read and rose as the French repetition was begun."

Well, Mr. Speaker, all I have to say is that this statement is utterly untrue.

Mr. GIROUARD (Jacques Cartier). This paragraph only came under my notice last evening, and I would also say that it is entirely false from beginning to end. In the past, as in the future, I shall stand when a Message is received from His Excellency, not only when it is read in my own language but when it is read in English. I have always done so in the past and shall always do so in the future.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no doubt the statements of the hon. gentlemen are correct, but perhaps it is not improper to observe that I believe it would have been quite in accord with English rules if they had remained seated during the reading of the Message. I believe the rule in England is that the House uncovers when a Message comes from the Sovereign signed by herself, but that the House does not even uncover under every circumstance when papers are laid on the Table; and I believe the English House of Commons does not rise upon the receipt of Messages, even signed by the hand of the Sovereign.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so, and I presume the reason why, from the earliest times in the Canadian Parliament, members rose was this: In England the common habit is for members to wear their hats. In the Canadian Parliament that is not so common, and in the old Province of Lower Canada, French politeness did not allow members to wear their hats at all. Therefore, as a mark of respect, and to draw a distinction between ordinary business and a Message from the Governor General, they paid that respect by rising which members of the English House of Commons pay to a Message from the Sovereign by taking off their hats.

CENSUS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 21) to provide for the taking of the census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin.—(Mr. Pope.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 2,

Mr. MILLS. I desire to call the attention of the Minister in charge to the fact that there is no limitation of the authority given. The Minister might, under this clause, undertake to take the census of the wandering Indian tribes over the entire District of Keewatin, and precisely the same thing might be said with regard to the North-West Territories. The power to take a census every five years ought to be confined to districts set out for settlement. The census must be taken with some object in view. The Indian population is not a very variable population, and there is no object to be served politically or economically by taking a census of that population. But there is an important object to be served in taking a census of the civilized people who go into districts set out for settlement. Looking at the position of Keewatin since the boundaries of Ontario have been defined—and we know what are the limits of that Province and of the North-West Territory—we know that in no part of that Territory has there been, or is there likely to be, any population going in for settlement for many years to come. The hon. Minister knows that the Government have not set out a single township, that there are no lands surveyed, that there is no provision made for settlement, and it is perfectly clear that if we are to pursue a rational course in taking the census we must confine our enquiries and our labors to districts that have been set out for settlement and where settlers have gone. It will be necessary to make an alteration in this clause, and confer upon the Government by its provisions the power to take a census

in those districts where it is important a census should be taken and not embrace an extent of country covering 3,000,000 square miles.

Mr. POPE. If there is no population, we will not, of course, take a census. I do not know whether there is any population there or not. If there is not there will be no expenditure.

Mr. BLAKE. The difficulty about the case is this: The hon. gentleman has now as much means of knowing whether there is any population there as he will possess in the future.

Mr. POPE. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; unless the hon. gentleman goes to work to ascertain by sending people over the Territory to see if there is any population there. The Department ought to know whether such is the case or not. The Department of the Interior could, no doubt, give all the necessary information. What is the hon. gentleman going to do in order to find out whether he will take a census or not?

Mr. POPE. I am going to make enquiry.

Mr. BLAKE. The enquiry should have been made before legislation was asked, and we should be told, in a general way, in what places there is going to be a census taken. Is the hon. gentleman going to take a census of the Indian tribes?

Mr. POPE. Yes; where the Indians are mixed up with the other population.

Mr. BLAKE. Are those the half-breeds?

Mr. POPE. Yes, half-breeds will be taken, and Indians in that part of the country where they are settled and becoming civilised.

Mr. MILLS. Does the hon. gentleman intend to go outside of organised districts, outside of lands surveyed and set out for settlement?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. Into the Peace River District?

Mr. POPE. If there are any settlers there, I do.

Mr. MILLS. What Territory is the hon. gentleman going to embrace? I can understand how a census might be taken with a view to giving representation in this House, or to ascertain what amount of money the Government might be called upon to expend in that country. There must be some definite object in view—some purpose to be served in taking the census, but what possible object can there be in taking the census every five years in the Peace River District for instance, or on the the Saskatchewan, or on the Nelson River, or in those districts not set out for settlement, where the country is not surveyed and settlers are not authorised to go.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman objects to any census being taken in those parts of the North-West or Manitoba or Keewatin where the country is unsurveyed.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought so. As to the question of having a census in those parts of the country which are not surveyed—

Mr. BLAKE. In unorganised districts.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman used the word unsurveyed certainly. But there are considerable groups of whites, half-breeds and settled Indians in parts of the country through which the surveyors' instruments have never gone. Then with respect to the Indian population, I take it that the census must include those Indians or half-breeds who are settled on their lands. There would, of course, be no necessity for a census of the nomadic Indians

under the treaties, because there is really a practical census of those Indians. The various bands of those Indians perhaps will be ascertained, the Census Commissioner will report those to the census organisation or whomsoever has to look after that part of the work. He will report in the first place the census of the surveyed parts of the country, then the census of all the unsurveyed districts where there are whites, or half-breeds or other settlers. He will get from the Indian Department the number of Indians in each band. But, I suppose, we cannot get, and there will be no necessity of getting, the nomadic Indians that are not included in the treaties. There may be, and I dare say there are, a considerable number of individuals in small groups scattered through the District of Keewatin, but the power is merely taken by the Bill; there will be no expense gone to if we find on enquiry at the different sources of information in the North-West that there is no considerable number to be taken. But the hon. gentleman knows that the position of a country like that alters in a summer. Take the Peace River District, for instance, this summer. The hon. gentleman has heard, no doubt, that in that region it is believed—it is almost known, I may say—that there are immense tracts of petroleum lands. Well, we hear of a petroleum boom going into that country; it may take place this summer, for we know that American capitalists have been looking at that country with a desire to get possession of it and the real or supposed wealth which is hidden in those petroleum lands. Well, there may be a rush this summer, and it is well that we should know it. The Bill is for the purpose of getting in the first place as accurate a statement of the population as possible for the political purpose of ascertaining and dealing with the question of representation, and in the second place for the material object of ascertaining the growth of the country and the various portions of the country into which immigration next summer, for instance, is directed, and therefore it will do no harm to include Keewatin.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman states that there are a few Indians scattered about Keewatin—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, and whites, too.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, if there are a few hundreds of them scattered in bands over a large portion of the North-West I think great care will have to be exercised in the question of expense. If you go to sending a man exploring over a territory of vast area and difficult of passage, searching out a few hunters or trappers or Indians, it will probably cost more than it comes to, and the end will be of no consequence, because you will not get more than three or four thousand all over the North-West. I would not be disposed to ignore the existence of infant white settlements even at remote places; and when I say settlements I do not mean isolated individuals or pioneers of settlement such as the hon. gentleman suggests. But supposing they have anything like the elements of permanence it is a matter of interest to know that there are even the rudiments of settlement in that portion of the territory. I am therefore quite ready to agree that a reasonable expense might be incurred in that direction, but I think the rule will have to be very stringently laid down with reference to that portion of the country which is not settled at present, and which is not likely to be settled soon. With reference to the Indian bands there are ample means of ascertaining all we want to know as to the numbers in these bands. There is of course a political question of some importance, although I would have supposed that might have been reached by the same sources of information from which we get other particulars, namely, as to the progress the bands are making, the progress the Indian is making in the matter of settlement, how far he is becoming a freeholder, how far he is becoming a settler and the head of a family in that sense. That, however, I should have sup-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

posed we could as well obtain from other sources; and one is a little alarmed when one hears that this enormous area of territory is to be, or may be, traversed by explorers for settlements, unless some general principle of action is laid down, and it is shown that the object of the Government is to get hold of the real centres of population, present or proximate. Speaking now as to the second section, I notice that it embraces the years of 1885 and 1886. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will explain why he takes the whole of next year as well as the remaining portion of this year to take the census. I can understand that a portion of the census in some of the outlying parts may not perchance be completed during the year. I do not know whether it is certain, but it is possible that that is so. But I think it would be very unfortunate and would deprive the census of much of its value if the organisation were not such that the census was taken practically contemporaneously over the country—that is, about the same time—I do not mean the same day—that is not the system; but that we should get an account of what the population was in those places where there is a considerable amount of population at the same time over the whole North-West. As the First Minister stated a moment ago times change in a year. One place is settled one year, and another another year, and if you take a large portion of the settlement in 1885 and another large portion in 1886 you really have not a statement of the condition of the country at any one time.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There are a few families in those districts beyond doubt. The Hudson Bay Company have perhaps twelve posts in Keewatin, at which there is one if not more families. These should be counted as a matter of course, and I would suggest to the Government that they can easily ascertain by communication with the Hudson Bay Company's agents the population of those places, for they will know every individual in them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite correct. In taking the census of such out-of-the-way places as the Hudson Bay posts all the officer will have to do will be to get from the proper Hudson Bay authorities the number of families and individuals at a given place, and those will be returned in the census as returns from Keewatin, and hence the necessity of including Keewatin. In the same way, there are a very considerable number of whites scattered along the shores of Hudson Bay. There is no necessity of sending a commissioner there. We can get a missionary to make a return of the population within his mission, by a postal messenger, for instance. That need not involve any expense, and we shall have the information for the census. Although hon. gentlemen opposite have not confidence in the Government, I can assure them that if they knew the Minister of Agriculture as well as I do, they would know that he is the most economical of mortals.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says it is important to have a census of the Hudson Bay District and of the District of Keewatin. I can understand that it would be important, in taking the census every ten years, to have the numbers of the various parts of the population; but I have not heard the Minister give any reason why it is necessary to name one of the most rocky and sterile districts in the whole Dominion, such as what remains of the District of Keewatin, in a Bill having the object of taking a census every five years. In the case of Manitoba, as well as of the Districts of Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan, which the hon. gentleman has marked out, I can understand that there is a necessity. Those districts have definite limits, and it is those districts in which population is going, and which desire representation in this House. The people going into those districts are entitled to have the census taken every five years. When the Government proposes a Bill of this sort, it is important for us to know within what limits they are going to operate; but what possible object is there in going

beyond those districts. The hon. gentleman has had a Bill carried into law forbidding people emigrating or settling in the District of Keewatin or the outlying districts; and yet he proposes to encourage settlement in these outlying districts; and for what purpose? What is the object? If it is the object of the Government to find places for a few scores of individuals, we certainly have no difficulty in understanding that; but if the Government propose a practical measure, with the purpose of giving information which is useful to the House, and of enabling the House better to discharge its duties to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, they should confine their measure to those districts into which settlers may go. As to the Indian population, the hon. gentleman knows what it is every year, and he does not require a census. It is with regard to the population going into the country, and seeking representation, and from our point of view entitled to representation in this House, that the census taken every ten years is not found to be sufficient. But there is no reason whatever for taking the census in the District of Keewatin or in those districts that lie far beyond the limits within what the hon. gentleman has provided that settlers may go.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With regard to the remark made by the hon. leader of the Opposition on the second clause, which provides for the census being taken in 1885 and 1886, I would point out that that is intended to refer only to the fall of this year and to the spring of 1886. The census cannot be taken in the winter, and 1886 is inserted so as to provide for taking the census in the spring of 1886 in those regions in which it cannot be taken next fall. But I hope that most if not all of the work can be done in 1885.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is not intended to go later than the spring of 1886?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. What period of the spring—I presume as soon as the roads are open?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I presume so.

Mr. BLAKE. Because it would add to the reliability of the whole document if the hon. gentleman would name the latest time within which the spring work should be done, so that it would be understood that it was to be done in the spring of 1886, and not in the fall and winter of 1886.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What was the cost of taking the census in Manitoba and the North-West in 1881? If the Minister has not got it, he might just bring that information.

Mr. POPE. Yes. I can assure the hon. leader of the Opposition that the census will be taken before next year's crop; we might insert, before the 1st of August.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman not see that he is likely to have the incoming settlers of the year 1886 included as to part of the country, while as to the other part he takes the census in 1885? There is no value in that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Say the 1st of July. Very few settlers will come in before that date.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know that. Is it the hon. gentleman's intention to take all the main parts in 1885?

Mr. POPE. I intend to take all the main parts in 1885. We had better say the 1st of August.

Mr. MILLS. Why not name the Districts of Assiniboia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no use of doing that.

Mr. MILLS. What is the objection?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will increase the expense of printing the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I must protest against the hon. gentleman's statement as to his colleague being the most economical of mortals. He has just proved himself to be that.

On section 3,

Mr. BLAKE. With reference to this clause I would like to know whether the decision of the Government is, notwithstanding whatever additions they may think it fit to make to the tables, to preserve the tables of information which are contained in the main census, so that we may have an accurate ground of comparison with what has been taken in the census of 1881. I quite admit there may be a reason for giving additional columns, I do not object to additional information, but I think whatever information is obtained which is of the same class as that obtained in the main census ought to be obtained in the same form for the purpose of comparison.

Mr. POPE. It is intended to adhere as far as possible to the same headings as are contained in the old census returns and to insert additional columns for any additional information.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that the eastern boundary of the District of Keewatin does not extend further eastward than the meridian of Hunter's Island, that this district will embrace a very small portion of the coast of Hudson Bay, as east of this boundary lie nearly all the Hudson Bay posts on the shore of the bay. These missionary stations and posts to which the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) referred, and which lie between the eastern boundary of the District of Keewatin and the shores of Hudson Bay, will not be embraced in this census at all.

Mr. POPE. They will be taken so far as they are in Keewatin.

Mr. MILLS. But they are not in Keewatin, and the hon. Minister himself said it was of the utmost importance they should be included.

On section 4,

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I want to propose an addition to this section. It will be in the sense of an amendment or instruction to the committee of which I gave notice. I propose:

To add after the words, "the houses and other buildings therein and their classifications, as well as dwellings inhabited, uninhabited, under construction, and otherwise," the words, "also the materials of which said dwellings are composed and the number of separate apartments in each dwelling."

I call the attention of the First Minister to the desirability of having information as to the nature of the buildings, whether made of logs, wood, brick or stone, as the case may be, and also as to whether they contain each one, two or more rooms. If the hon. Minister does not object I will propose that emendation.

Mr. POPE. Of what advantage will it be?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of very material advantage in every sense. In all the census returns taken in Europe by nations of any pretension, the description of the materials of which buildings are composed and also the number of rooms in each are obtained. It is information of the greatest possible importance, as it shows very clearly the progress made by a country from time to time. A great defect in the census of 1881 is that it does not give that information. I called the attention of the hon. the First Minister to it several times, and it is very much to be regretted that it was not put in our former census returns. If he will look at the census papers of Great Britain and

Ireland, he will find this information is always included in them. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) suggests another thing which will be also desirable, though perhaps not so desirable in the District of Keewatin as in other places, that is the number of families resident under one roof.

Mr. POPE. All I can say is that the hon. member has evidently not read the census of Great Britain, for in that census he will find nothing said about houses at all. He has got hold of something else altogether. The English census contains exactly eight columns while ours contains 172. I will read to the hon. gentleman the headings of the English census: Name, surname, family, creed, sex, age, rank, profession or occupation, where born, condition as to marriage, deaf, dumb or blind, etc. Now I will tell the hon. gentleman where his mistake is. The English census is not intended to include anything but the population, but there are statistics taken—there are 2,700 people continually engaged in taking statistics in Great Britain—of this other information as to the kind of buildings, etc. It was thought, I believe, of great importance in Ireland that they should ascertain the kind of buildings the people lived in. I think that is objectionable in this country; I can see no possible good to come of it. I am ready to take anything of any use, but can see no possible necessity for taking the number of houses, the kind of buildings, etc., the people are living in. Taking the census of Great Britain is a small matter compared with the taking of the census in Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. This is not a matter of small importance, it is on the contrary of great importance that the country should know the kind of buildings in which the people reside, the number of apartments, and the number of people that live under one roof. The hon. gentleman may or not be correct as to the statement he makes that in England it is not comprised in what is called the taking of the census, but the information is obtained in England and it is at the service of the country. The hon. gentleman does not obtain that information here, and I repeat it is of very considerable importance everywhere and of doubly great importance in the case of new countries that such information should be had. There is no one thing that shows more clearly the progress of a country than the improvement in the quality and construction of its buildings as shown from time to time. Of course, as the hon. gentleman chooses to object, I will not press the matter just now, but will simply renew the amendment and divide the House upon it when the matter comes up for concurrence.

On section 7.

Mr. BLAKE. This cannot pass under its present form. The hon. gentleman's money clauses are in a subsequent portion of the measure. Of course he is in a position to move those clauses, but the latter portion of this clause "such emoluments as are laid down in the census by the Governor in Council" must go out, because there is no money clause for it. There is no objection to the provision of the appointment of officers.

Mr. POPE. I do not see that.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman ought to see it. This section provides that the Governor in Council shall provide census officers, commissioners, etc., and the last clause provides with "such relative powers duties and such emoluments as are laid down in the census by the Governor in Council." That would be an authority by the Parliament for them to receive such emoluments as the Governor in Council shall lay down, and it is not in order that such a proposal as that should come here otherwise than from an initiatory committee. There has been a committee which has prescribed certain money clauses—the 23rd, 24th and 25th clauses. We shall reach them presently, and then they can be introduced. They provide for money to be paid to certain per-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

sons, "the several census commissioners and enumerators employed in carrying this Act into effect," but they make no provision for any other person. This clause refers to the emoluments of "census officers, census commissioners, and other employes who are necessary for the taking of the census." It is a wider clause than the 23rd, authorising the appointment of other persons for whom the money clauses do not provide at all, and therefore it would not be covered by the committee resolution.

Mr. POPE. But the intention is that I shall not take that power, but that it shall be exercised by the Governor in Council.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman wants some additional power.

Mr. POPE. No, I do not.

Mr. BLAKE. Then strike that out.

Mr. POPE. No, I shall recommend that certain remuneration be given, and it will be authorised by the Governor in Council, but I shall not have the power departmentally.

Mr. BLAKE. But the 24th clause does that sufficiently as far as the hon. gentleman has taken power by resolution.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Governor in Council shall appoint commissioners and enumerators.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no authority for what follows.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose to strike out "and other employes."

Mr. BLAKE. Very well. Then the First Minister will see that it will be wholly unnecessary, because the 24th clause deals with that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. "The Governor in Council shall appoint census officers and census commissioners."

Mr. BLAKE. No, you have no authority for census officers.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. "Shall appoint census officers and census commissioners with such relative powers and duties as are laid down for the census by the Governor in Council." Strike out the words "and such emoluments."

Mr. BLAKE. There is no objection to that at all. I suppose it is intended that these shall be the same class of officers, except under some special circumstances, as those employed in taking the general census? The same system is intended to be adopted?

Mr. POPE. The same system.

On section 16,

Mr. BLAKE. Are these the same penalties as in the general Act?

Mr. POPE. Yes, the same.

On section 17,

Mr. BLAKE. The same penalties again?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

On section 23,

Mr. BLAKE. Now we get to the committee clauses, and I hope the hon. gentleman will propose some maximum for the settled parts. I do not refer to the outlying districts.

Mr. POPE. Suppose it should turn out, as it did in British Columbia, that I cannot get persons to do the work? My maximum is \$3 and \$1 a day, but suppose I cannot get anyone to do it, I could not do anything more until I came back to this House. I will put in the maximum if the hon. gentleman thinks so, or if the House thinks so.

Mr. BLAKE. What was the hon. gentleman's experience in reference to Manitoba and the North-West? I do not refer to British Columbia.

Mr. POPE. I think in the settled parts it was about the same as in Ontario and Quebec, but in the outlying districts in the North-West, the census had to be taken in a different way, and in British Columbia I could not get any one to move at all.

Mr. BLAKE. Where are the members from British Columbia?

Mr. POPE. Here is one of them, and he knows that is so.

Mr. BLAKE. Did you not try to employ a Chinaman?

Mr. POPE. I was afraid the hon. gentleman would not be pleased with that.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has said that in the settled parts he found no difficulty—and the bulk of the enumeration, we know, will be in the settled parts—the statement of the maximum will be no inconvenience, and will be carrying out a wholesome principle.

Mr. POPE. I am willing that the hon. gentleman should fix the maximum in the settled parts, if he will bind himself to indemnify me next Session if I have to pay more.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, no; I do not think I would indemnify the hon. gentleman. I might put him in a position in which he might call for an indemnity, but I do not think I would indemnify him. He has already stated some years ago, as long ago as 1883, when he was in Manitoba, that in the settled parts of Manitoba, at any rate, he was able to get this work done for the maximum remuneration. But it is easier to do it now than it was then; there are more people in the country and more competition for the situation; railway facilities are easier, and upon the whole, the difficulties that might be supposed to exist then will not exist now. But even those words, "settled parts," leave a great deal to the hon. gentleman's discretion. It seems to be very important to adopt the principle, as far as we can, practically, of not leaving the Governor in Council the power to fix any remuneration they please, and that is all I desire to do.

Mr. POPE. There is something more in that clause. The remuneration is for every day a man likes to spend. We fix it partly by the travelling, partly by the time it has taken and partly by the day, in order to get a good day's work for a day's pay. However, I do not object to a provision that in the settled parts of Manitoba the maximum shall be \$3 for enumerators and \$4 for commissioners.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman putting it this way: That in the settled parts of Manitoba the rate shall not exceed the scale adopted for the general census of 1881. Then as to the census commissioner, there is no reason why he should have more.

Mr. POPE. He is an educator of the others, and you have to get a good man.

Mr. BLAKE. I mean more than the rates of the scale.

Mr. POPE. No; I do not think so. I shall take the census at the same rate, and shall try to keep it within those limits, if I can.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I move that the clause read this way:

That in the settled parts of Manitoba the amounts paid for remuneration shall not exceed those paid in the last census.

Motion agreed to.

Committee rose and reported.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKERSHIP.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that Bill (No. 26) to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker, be read the second time.

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

(In the Committee.)

On section 3.

Mr. ROYAL. I may be mistaken, but I do not see in the Bill the amendment that was moved and carried to the resolutions which form the basis of this Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. That applies to the chairmanship of committees. That is not in the Bill.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman will see that we have made these resolutions standing orders. One is that the chairman of committees shall speak the language with which the Speaker is not conversant. No chairman of committees can be appointed under that standing order unless the amendment is carried out. This Bill is merely for the Deputy Speakership.

On the preamble,

Mr. BLAKE. With respect to the preamble, the hon. gentleman will see the expediency of making a further recital in it. In the course of the discussion which gave rise to this Bill, I enquired of the hon. the First Minister whether the assent of the Crown had been given to the measure. I was misunderstood by a good many exponents of public opinion, as I was supposed to have said that this was necessary, as the Bill involved an expenditure of public money. Of course I did not say anything of that kind, and the hon. gentleman did not so understand me. The principle on which the assent of the Crown is required is that the office of Speaker possesses some ancient prerogatives which we are not entitled to disturb. That was the ground on which the assent of the Crown was signified in the House of Commons of England, on various occasions when proposals were made by standing order and otherwise, not merely to enlarge the functions of the Speaker, but practically to make provisions for the appointment of another Speaker. Of course this gentleman who is to fill the Chair here is to have all the authority of the Speaker, and is to be appointed without any assent or suggestion from the Crown at all, but by ourselves. When the House of Commons of England decided to act on that matter last, the assent of the Crown was signified to the standing order, but the committee upon whose representation action was taken advised a standing order and a Bill. Of course, there the case was very different from the case here. The office of Speaker was not wholly one of statutory power but it had certain inherent powers. The Bill passed in that case, recited the assent in these words:

"Whereas the House of Commons have provided, by their standing orders, for the temporary performance of certain duties of the Speaker, during his unavoidable absence, by a Deputy Speaker; and whereas Her Majesty had previously signified Her consent that the House might do therein as they should think fit;"

And so forth. I think that precedent might very well be followed. The hon. gentleman indicated that the assent of the Crown had been given, and it should be recited in the Bill, because we are settling the matter by Bill, and I repeat the assent of the Crown should be recorded in that solemn manner.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course the hon. gentleman was altogether misunderstood by the press when it was said he had stated that the assent of the Crown was required, because it involved a money grant. As a matter of fact, I had obtained the assent of the representative of the Crown in consequence of the English precedent. But it is more than

a moot point whether that assent was necessary, because the approval of the election of a Speaker in England is required by the Sovereign—the Sovereign's assent must be sought to the selection of a Speaker by the House of Commons. With us it is not so. The Speaker is elected by the House of Commons without the assent of the Crown. But still, out of respect to precedents in England, the assent of the Crown was obtained; and perhaps, if we followed the example quoted by the hon. gentleman just now, it would amount to a statement that the consent of the Crown was necessary to the appointment of a Deputy Speaker. If it is not necessary to the appointment of the Speaker, it certainly is not necessary to the appointment of a Deputy Speaker. I think we might recite the passing of the resolution.

Preamble amended by adding the words: "And whenever the assent of the Crown has been obtained to the adoption of the said resolution."

Committee rose and reported.

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) to further amend the law of evidence in criminal cases. He said: A few Sessions ago I introduced a Bill to the House making the defendant in a criminal case a competent and compellable witness. That Bill applied only to a certain class of cases, known in the language of the law as misdemeanors. The Bill was read the second time, with the sanction of the First Minister and of nearly all who addressed the House on the subject. It was referred to a Select committee, and the Committee reported in favor of the Bill. I pointed out then, as I propose to point out now, that the principle which I sought to extend, by the provisions of my Bill of 1882, was not a new principle, either in the law of Canada or the law of England. I pointed out that in 1878 the Parliament of Canada, by an Act of the Parliament of Canada, made the defendant in a criminal action for assault a competent witness; that in 1880 the principle was extended to the case of battery, and that by the election law, in all the criminal proceedings under it, the defendant is a competent witness. I pointed out that by the law of England the same principle was recognised; that in criminal proceedings under the Plimsol Act the defendant is a competent witness; that under the Election Act in all criminal proceedings against parties the defendant was made a competent witness. And now, Sir, since 1882, under the English Explosives Act, the defendant is a competent witness; and one of the learned judges in England, in giving a judgment on the trial of a person indicted under that Act, declared that the law had so far worked well. The Bill was referred to a Select Committee, as I have stated, and the committee reported in favor of the Bill. I believe it was referred to a Committee of the Whole House, but no further action was taken on it during that Session. It had the support, as I understood, and always had the support of the First Minister and of many of the leading lawyers on both sides of the House. In 1883 I introduced the Bill again, making the defendant in criminal cases not only a competent but a compellable witness, and again the Bill was read a second time and referred to a Select Committee. To the same committee were referred half a dozen Bills on that and kindred subjects. The committee saw fit to consolidate all those Bills and report one Bill to the House, and for that and other reasons the Bill did not proceed any further during that Session. In the Session of 1884 I introduced the Bill the third time, making the defendant competent to give evidence but not compellable—competent to give evidence in his own behalf, and making his wife also competent to give evidence. The Bill was discussed to

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

a considerable extent and passed the second reading by a majority of 47. It was referred to a Select Committee, who reported in favor of the Bill, which was then referred to a Committee of the Whole House, but that committee rose without reporting the Bill, and I subsequently moved that the Bill be reinstated on the Orders of the Day with a view of further consideration. That motion was, however, defeated, and by a majority of some 17 or 18. Now, the objections which were then taken to the Bill were of a fourfold character. There were practically four objections taken to the Bill by those who took part in the discussion against the measure. These objections were all summarised by the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau), and the four objections taken by other hon. gentlemen were dwelt upon by him and discussed by him at some length. The first objection was that there was no necessity for the Bill, that there were no petitions in favor of it, no expressions of opinion, so far as the House was aware, from those engaged in the administration of the criminal law of any portion of the Dominion, and there being no necessity for the Bill, it should not become law. The Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau) stated on that occasion as follows:—

"Sir, I have not spent a great deal of time with the ancients, I have not read a great deal of the past, but the little I have read in old books, in very old books, has convinced me that wisdom is not all confined to the present age, and that those who lived before us had also a large measure of wisdom, especially in cases like the one which is now under the consideration of the House. At a time when people were less troubled with politics, with railway schemes, with electricity and other things; when the progress of the physical sciences engrossed less of the attention of men—I think that in those old times men reflected as much, and perhaps more, and perhaps better, than we do upon those moral questions like the one involved in this Bill. And in the light of the wisdom of the past, I ask myself the question which was so well put, I think, by the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), when he said: 'What is the necessity for such legislation? What representations have been made by those who interpret the law in these cases? What remonstrances have been made by judges upon this question?' My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, says that seven years ago he had his opinion upon this question, and he challenged any one to say that he was not right in changing it, because, during those seven years, public opinion had also changed. Public opinion, then, was not ripe. But I would like very much to ask the hon. gentleman what causes have ripened public opinion since then? What facts have been elicited before the courts of justice which have had the effect of ripening public opinion upon this question?"

I pointed out then, Mr. Speaker, and I point out now in reply to the Secretary of State, that during the last eight or ten years public opinion in England as well as in Canada has changed on this subject, and the strong current of opinion now is, in England as well as in Canada, in the direction, I believe, of allowing the defendant in a criminal case to be examined in his own behalf, and that there is just as much reason for his examination in a criminal case—a much stronger reason, in fact—than there is in a civil action. I pointed out then, as I do now, that to allow the defendant to give evidence in a criminal case was recognised, not only by the law of Canada but by the law of England, and it was not logical to limit the cases on which a defendant should be a competent witness. It was not logical to limit the principle to cases of assault or battery, or to criminal offences under the election law or under the Plimsoll Act, or under the English Explosives Act. If it was a good principle in these cases, I say it is an equally good principle in the cases to which I seek to extend it by this Bill. Now, Sir, on at least three or four different occasions, the Attorney General of England, the Liberal as well as the Conservative Attorney General, introduced a Bill into the English Parliament embodying this principle; and on two, if not three, occasions, the Bill passed its second reading in the House of Commons, on one or two occasions without any opposition. But for some time it failed to become law, not because there was any opposition to this principle, but because it formed part of a large and complicated Bill for the codification of the English criminal law, embracing 500 or 600 sections, and because the other business before Parliament was of such a pressing character that the Attorney-General

was unable to press his Bill to its final passage. The Bill, on several occasions, was referred to the Grand Committee, and the consensus of opinion, both in the committee and in the House, was in its favor. But, Sir, things have somewhat changed since I last introduced this Bill into this House. A Bill, of which the one now before the House is an exact copy, has passed the English House of Lords, and also, I believe, the English House of Commons. That being the case, it can hardly be argued now that public opinion, at all events in England, is not ripe for this change. I pointed out, when I addressed the House in support of this Bill on a former occasion, that many of our own judges—in fact, I think all the judges I have consulted on the subject—and some other officials engaged in the administration of criminal justice in the country, were in favor of the Bill. I intimated that Judge Davis, of Middlesex, Judge Sinclair, of Wentworth, and Judge Thoms, of Huron, than whom there are no abler judges on the county court bench, were all in favor of this Bill. I referred then, as I do now, to the following remarks made by Judge Armour, of the Superior Court, to whom I sent a copy of the Bill:—

“I have perused your Bill to permit accused parties to give evidence in their own behalf. I am entirely in favor of all accused parties being entitled to give evidence in their own behalf, just as in civil actions.”

I also referred to the opinion of writers upon the subject, both in law publications and elsewhere, all clearly indicating, in my judgment, that public opinion was now quite ripe for this change—an important and a radical change, I admit—but still a change justified by our more matured ideas upon evidence in criminal cases. I referred to a valuable article that appeared in the *London Globe* on the Bill which the Attorney General had introduced into the English Parliament, and with regard to which the writer said:

“A Bill of which the Attorney General gave notice yesterday will, if passed, overturn one of the most fundamental principles of our criminal law. This is the proposal that prisoners on their trial shall be permitted to give evidence as if they were defendants in a civil action—a proposal that has constantly been made throughout an entire generation of lawyers, and as constantly opposed. It cannot be said, therefore, that the question has not been fully before the country, and that ample opportunity has not been afforded for the adequate formation of opinion. That the law of evidence with regard to this matter is in an unsatisfactory state is sufficiently certain. The recent attempt made by eminent counsel to bring a prisoner's story indirectly, and without liability to cross-examination before a jury, at any rate reduced the existing rule to a state of logical absurdity. Either the aid of counsel must be regarded as being often a positive disadvantage to an innocent prisoner, by closing his mouth, or else such aid must be a no less positive advantage to a guilty one, by enabling his story to be brought forward by an expert, and without such sanctions as an oath or affirmation implies. Of course the principal objection taken to the examination and cross-examination of a prisoner on oath is founded on the indefensible scenes with which the French criminal reports have made us familiar. But to this it may be safely answered that such scenes are the result of far other circumstances—of an inferior class of judges and magistrates, and of the practice, absolutely foreign to English ideas, of assuming the guilt of a prisoner unless he can prove his innocence in the teeth of every test capable of application. There is absolutely no fear that in this country the innocent would be put at a disadvantage by the liberty of being able to tell their own stories on oath in their own way. The principal danger of our system is that suffered by the public—the escape of the guilty, who too often get off by the simple expedient of holding their tongues. Whatever may be the details of the Attorney-General's Bill, which may or may not be worthy of approval, its principle is certainly gaining ground among those who are familiar with the working of our criminal law.”

Now, it does appear to me extraordinary how it can be argued that a defendant is a proper witness in a civil action, involving, it may be, a shilling, or it may be a million dollars, while that man's mouth is absolutely sealed where his liberty or perhaps his life is at stake. It does not appear to me that there is any principle involved in the one case that is not involved in the other. The writer in the *London Law Journal*, discussing this subject, says:

“The primary object of a criminal prosecution is to elicit the whole truth about a crime. If a prisoner is innocent it can do him no harm to be examined; it cannot diminish his chances of escape; and, if guilty, it is good that those chances should be diminished.”

The principle here laid down is one which I think cannot be successfully controverted. On the same subject the *Pall Mall Gazette* observes:

“Innocence, as a rule, has more to gain than to lose, as guilt has certainly more to lose than to gain, by telling its own story, and having that story sifted by direct interrogation; and the cause of truth would undoubtedly gain by allowing, in both cases, the story to be told.”

Now, I think what I have said on this subject should satisfactorily dispose of any objections that may be raised on the ground that there is no necessity for this law. Another objection which is taken to my Bill, and which I have no doubt will be presented again, was that it was not the law of England, and that until the principle of this Bill was adopted in England it ought not to prevail in Canada. Now, I say that is no objection at all. I contend that we ought not always to be in leading strings to England, or to any other country; if the principle is a sound principle we should adopt it, whether it is adopted in England or not. But if there were anything in this argument last Session when I presented this Bill, there is nothing in it now, because we find that a Bill, of which the one now before the House is an exact transcript, has passed the English House of Lords. Those who are sticklers for precedents in matters of that kind ought to be satisfied with the one I cite. The Bill I mention was introduced into the House of Lords by Lord Bramwell. A similar Bill was introduced into the House of Commons and has passed its second reading. Whether it has passed its third reading or not I do not know, because no *Hansard* that I could find in the Library is brought down to that period. In moving the second reading of his Bill, Lord Bramwell gave his reasons for introducing and pressing the measure through the House. I will not trouble the House with quoting what he said, but will read an extract from the late Lord Chancellor, (Earl Cairns,) speech on the Bill, and also a few words from the present Lord Chancellor. Earl Cairns said:

“It would very ill become him to offer any opposition to the Bill, for it proposed to do what was proposed to be done by the Government of which he was a member, and it was included in the large measure for the codification of the criminal law which was brought into the other House of Parliament by that Government. That measure was about to be reintroduced into the House of Commons; and he hoped the Bill now under consideration might become law as part of that larger measure, instead of being an isolated Bill. He admitted, however, that they might have to wait a long time for that larger measure, and, perhaps, it was better to deal with this pressing subject in the way now proposed. Another reason he had for supporting the Bill was that the Explosives Act, and some other recent statutes, enabled persons charged under their provisions to be examined as witnesses. He was informed that in the trial that took place under the Explosives Act this provision was brought into force, and that it acted extremely well. If it were wrong for a counsel to state to the jury the prisoner's version of what had occurred, a great hardship was inflicted on the accused; but if a counsel were allowed to give the prisoner's version, it was still more absurd that the prisoner himself should be prevented from stating it on oath to the jury.”

Such were the observations of Earl Cairns on the subject, when this Bill was before the House of Lords for its second reading. The Lord Chancellor said:

“He rose to express, on the part of the Government, entire concurrence in the object which his noble and learned friend (Lord Bramwell) had in view. The Bill about to be introduced in the House of Commons by the Attorney General was not only the same in substance with that now under consideration, but he believed it would be nearly, if not quite, the same in form. Still, he had no objection, on that account, to the course taken by his noble and learned friend, in bringing the matter before their Lordships, for in many possible contingencies the present Bill might further the object which all who agreed in its principles had in view. Even if only a few cases of injustice could be shown to arise, that would be a sufficient reason for altering the law; but in point of fact, he believed that the number of cases in which there was at least some appearance of injustice, due to the present state of the law, was constantly on the increase. Nothing could be more difficult to justify than the principle that when a man was charged with a criminal act, alleged to have been committed in the presence of a single witness, the mouth of the accuser should be opened, while the mouth of the accused was closed; and that when—as had happened in several cases—the witness was afterwards indicted for perjury, this process should be reversed. He was sanguine as to the success of this measure, because a

similar one, introduced into the House of Commons in 1878, by his hon. friend, Mr. Evelyn Ashley, passed the second reading by a considerable majority."

I will add nothing to the pointed language made use of by the Lord Chancellor and by Lord Cairns, and I shall trouble the House with very few more observations on this subject. I would, however, like to read to the House, with its permission, a letter received by me from Lord Bramwell on the subject of this Bill, and its introduction and passage through the House of Lords:

"EDENBRIDGE, KENT, 2nd January, 1885.

"DEAR SIR,—I send you a copy of the Evidence Bill which passed the Lords this Session. It is the same as they passed last Session. It is, I believe, the same as was brought in by the Government and passed the Commons last Session, with one exception, namely, in that Bill was a provision that the defendant in a criminal case, when called as a witness, should not be cross-examined as to his past career and character. This was contested in the Commons, but carried by a small majority. It is clearly wrong, and I believe contrary to the opinion of our Attorney-General. If a man presents himself as a witness, there ought to be a power to see what he is worth as such. There cannot be opposite rules for ascertaining that—one where the proceeding is criminal, another where it is not. If the question is, whether the defendant assaulted or libelled the plaintiff or prosecutor, and the defendant tenders himself as a witness, it is manifest that he should be dealt with in the same way, whether the proceedings be by indictment or civil action. No doubt it puts the defendant in an awkward dilemma if not being called or being subject to such enquiries, but I dare say there may be convictions, not because the man has committed the offence charged, but some other—not many. There is no help for it. And remember that it is hard upon a prosecutor of good character that he should be put on an equality with one of bad character. Remember also, that the prosecuting counsel may always say to the jury: My client has been asked no question to show he is untrustworthy; I could not ask such questions of the defendant. I hope you will take this view and get the Bill passed as mine stands. I think the Bill should apply to cases of felony. My opinion in its favor is based on its obvious and natural justice. It is an extension of a reform that began with us many years ago. The common law seems to have been founded on the notion that juries and others were not to be trusted with evidence open to suspicion. The modern and right notion is the other way, namely, that the evidence should be laid before them and they judge its value, instead of its being condemned before hand. This would not admit hearsay. Further, the exclusion of such tends to wrong acquittals, as the jury are always told that the man's mouth is shut.

"Yours faithfully,
"BRAMWELL."

Those who practice before the courts, especially in the criminal branch of the profession, know that that is the case. You, Sir, who have many times defended the accused in criminal cases, know that almost invariably that is one of the arguments used. The jury is told: You heard the statement of the prosecutor and the evidence of persons whom he has brought into the witness box to tell his story, while my client's mouth is closed. He who knows all about the transaction is not allowed to say a word, therefore, you must take my version of it. And what takes place? The prisoner at the bar tells his counsel his story, the counsel repeats it to the jury; the jury, therefore, get the prisoner's version from the counsel, but they get it without the solemnity and sanction of an oath. It is important the law should be amended in this respect. Another objection urged against the proposed change is the old argument, always urged against any change in the law or evidence, namely, that it will lead to perjury. Half the arguments used in the House last Session against this Bill were based on this objection. But this objection had no weight with the Legislature in dealing with the question whether plaintiffs in civil suits should be allowed to give their testimony, and not a man practising at the bar to day, not a judge on the bench, would ask to go back to the old system and exclude the evidence of parties to the litigation. Reason, common sense, logic, all point one way, and that one way is, that every person who knows anything about the transaction should be enabled to tell his story and let the jury weigh for themselves the value of the testimony. Another objection with which I desire to deal for a moment is the objection that this Bill would simply introduce into our Canadian legislation, in a vicious form, the French

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

system. My hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Chapleau) told us last Session:

"There is a strange feature in this Bill, and one which the promoter of it, perhaps, has not considered, and that is, that he proposes to adopt a mode of procedure which has been repudiated for many a year by the most eminent jurists in England. My hon. friend is opening the way to the French mode of procedure in criminal cases—the examination of the accused. He goes even further, because the French law compelling the accused to answer the magistrate in the preliminary investigation, or the public prosecutor, does not subject the accused to the humiliation or danger of giving his evidence under oath."

One cannot very well see where is the humiliation or where the danger—the humiliation especially—in the allowing a man to give his evidence under oath. My Bill is not the French system; it bears no resemblance to, nor does it approach in any way the French system. By the French system, as I understand it, a prisoner is brought before the judge for the preliminary investigation. He is examined and cross-examined, with the view, not so much of eliciting the truth as of ascertaining whether or not, out of the prisoner's own mouth, there is a sufficient admission of facts to justify the public prosecutor putting him on his trial. I pointed out the discrepancy between the two Bills and the two modes of procedure during the last Session. I draw the attention of Parliament to it again, and I point out that in the one case the prisoner is at liberty to step into the witness box and tell his own story, or to stay out of the box and keep his mouth closed, while under the French system there is no such liberty. The man is bound to submit himself to a cross-examination which, in some cases, is of the most stringent and the severest possible character. The *English Law Journal*, in discussing the French system, points out the difference between the two systems. It says:

"As to French criminal procedure, we observe that the interrogation of the prisoner is only a part of it, and that part might be adopted without adopting the whole. It is, however, just this part of the French criminal procedure which excites the most repugnance in England, and for the reason, that as applied in France, its aim seems to be less the discovery of truth than the conviction of the prisoner. We do not hold it as by any means an indisputable proposition that an innocent man ought to prefer, or would be likely to prefer, telling his whole story to a French judge to having his mouth closed, as in an English criminal court, before a judge who starts apparently from an assumption of a prisoner's guilt and continually interrupts his examination to utter ejaculations of horror over the enormity of his crime, or to exhort him feelingly to make a confession of it; the vindication of innocence is not by any means a necessity. Truth may, as it is said, resemble a torch which shines the brighter the more it is shaken, but then the shaking must be done fairly, and this is exactly the essential condition which French tribunals appear to neglect."

I think I have said enough upon that subject to satisfy the House that my Bill in no sense approaches to the French system. I say that, with all this testimony in favor of the principle of this Bill, I do not think there is any reason why it should not become law, and become law now. I do not see how there should be any substantial objections to its becoming law. Those who oppose the Bill now may rest assured that at no distant day, just as surely as daylight succeeds darkness, it will become law; but I say there is no reason why it should not become law now. The principle is recognised by the legislation of Canada and by the legislation of England. Before I conclude, I wish to bring to the attention of the First Minister an illustration which has occurred since the last Session of Parliament, a case in which the aid of the Executive had to be invoked in order that justice might be done, and in the doing of which the Executive, I think unjustly, incurred a great deal of odium. At the last assizes which took place in the county of Huron, there was a trial in which three men named Beamish were indicted for murder. The circumstances were briefly these. Three men named Mains and three named Beamish lived on adjoining farms. They were at enmity with each other. There were the father of the Beamish family and two sons and the father and two sons of the Mains family. The Mains'

appear to have been quarrelsome people, according to the evidence brought out at the trial. The old man Mains challenged the old man Beamish and his two sons to fight him and his two sons upon the following day. The Beamishes did not accept the challenge, but one of the young Beamishes, in going to his work, had to pass by the Mains' farm, and while he was so passing he was assaulted by one of the Mains'. The result was that the three Beamishes came to the rescue—the consequence was a skirmish ensued, and the result was that one of the Beamish boys used a small stick and struck the old man Mains over the head. There was no external mark as the result of the stroke, but unfortunately the stroke was given directly over an artery. The artery was ruptured and death ensued. The three Beamishes were then indicted for murder. On the trial the Mains' were the main witnesses against them, and they threw the whole responsibility upon the Beamishes, so far as they could. The mouths of the old man Beamish and his two sons were closed. They could not say a word. They were practically the sole witnesses of the unfortunate occurrence that took place; but, under the law, under the enlightened law that we have now, they could not say a word in their own justification, and the three Beamishes were convicted of manslaughter. The judge sentenced the old man to twenty years in the provincial penitentiary, one of the sons to twenty years, and the other to five years. Public opinion was aroused. It was known, as far as the circumstances could be known, that the men were improperly convicted of the grave offence. Application was made to the Executive, and the Executive pardoned the old man, who had been in the penitentiary only two weeks. The sentence of the elder son was reduced from twenty to five years, and that of the younger from five years to one. Recollect that all the public had to judge of was the verdict of the jury. They had found these men guilty, the judge passed the sentence, and they were sent to the penitentiary. Others, who were behind the scenes, knew something more about it, and, I apprehend, the Government must have known something more about it, or they would not have advised His Excellency to exercise the prerogative of the Crown in their behalf. What was the result of this executive clemency? The Grand Jury, at the last sitting, passed the following complimentary statement in reference to the matter:

"On one point this Grand Jury would approach Your Honor to gain some information respecting the commutation of sentence in the Beamish-Mains murder case, tried at the recent assize court here. This jury, not one member of whom knows what steps were taken to obtain a commutation, are of opinion that unless good reason is shown to the country for the course of clemency shown by the Executive, that there is but little use in convening juries, grand or petty, to waste their time in doing their duty as jurors, or judges passing righteous judgment upon the perpetrators of atrocious crimes, if, as in this case, where the criminals are, one of them, let loose upon the society and the sentence of others commuted in such a degree as to render the best efforts of juries and the righteous sentence of judges little else than a mockery and a farce, public justice baffled, and no life safe in a community but the convicted murderer, while here no aid has been extended or sympathy shown to the widow or the helpless orphans of the murdered man."

Such are the thanks the right hon. gentleman received for advising the exercise of the royal clemency and doing an act of justice. Then why was it necessary to interfere with the finding of the jury and the sentence of the judge? If they were satisfied that these men were guilty, they ought not to have commuted the sentence, because it was not an excessive sentence if they were guilty of manslaughter. If they exercised the executive power, it must have been upon the sole ground that the parties were not guilty. There was no other ground on which to reduce the sentence of the elder son from twenty years to five, and that of the younger from five to one, and to discharge the old man altogether. Had my Bill of 1882 passed this House and been in force, such a thing would not have occurred, and I do not believe the executive would have been called upon to exercise the prerogative of the Crown in that respect, because, if

these men had been allowed to go into the witness box and tell their own story, I believe no jury in Christendom would have convicted them. And so in regard to a great number of other cases. We know by our experience and our reading that not once, nor twice, nor ten times, nor a hundred times, but a thousand of times, have innocent men been convicted of crimes solely because prosecutors went into the box and swore the prisoners committed the offence charged. Take the case of rape. It is an offence committed in concealment, not in the public glare, not before the eyes of the public, but with only the two parties present. The one party is allowed to tell the story with such varnishing and gilding as she may choose to put upon it, but the other party, the defendant, if innocent, the party who knows all about it, who knows if any connection did take place, and was not criminal, who has the knowledge of whether he was there or not, is not allowed to say a word, or give a single explanation of how it took place or why it took place. And so with a score of other criminals cases. The prosecutor, perhaps, gives his testimony, and that testimony is unsupported and unsustained by the testimony of a single other witness, and yet, Sir, upon that unsupported, uncorroborated testimony, a judge is bound to tell the jury that if they believe the story the prisoner must be convicted. And we know that over and over again prisoners have been convicted on just such evidence. I will refer again to the case I mentioned last year that occurred in England, where an unfortunate English Church clergyman was convicted of having committed an indecent assault upon two young girls and was sentenced to transportation for five years. It was discovered afterwards that the accusation was a pure fabrication; the story was well got up, the circumstances were dovetailed together and the man was convicted. The two young girls were subsequently indicted for perjury, and upon the clearest possible evidence they were convicted, and the man was released. Released! But what satisfaction is that? Released with his reputation tarnished and destroyed. It was no compensation, after six months' imprisonment, to be released from prison with the sentence still standing against him. He got the pardon of the Crown as the Beamishes got the pardon of the Crown, and that was all. But that is no compensation, no redress, for a man who has been convicted, improperly, wrongfully, upon testimony that would not have prevailed had he been allowed to tell his own story. I present this Bill to the House in the hope that it will receive the consideration of the House. It is not a question of party, it is not a question of politics; it does not signify from which side of the House the Bill emanates, if it is sound in principle, and it has been conceded, I think, upon nearly all hands, that the principle is a sound one. It has been put in practice for some time without any objection, both here and in England. It is proposed to carry it still further in England, and, as I have said, it has passed the House of Lords there. But, apart from that altogether, I do not see any reason why the Bill should not become law in this country. Believing that it is a good Bill, believing that the principle is a sound one and must ultimately prevail, I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 37) further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy) for (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Bill (No. 38) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert) for (Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Williams) for (Mr. Mulock.)

Bill (No. 40) further relating to the Central Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Temple.)

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

House resumed consideration of motion of Mr. Cameron (South Huron) for second reading of Bill (No. 6) to further amend the law of evidence in criminal cases.

Mr. TUPPER. I think the House will agree that the pertinacity of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) is highly commendable, yet I question whether it is proper that this House should again be compelled to consider a Bill which has been thoroughly discussed during the last two Sessions, and in reference to which the sense of this House has been fairly tested. I say, Mr. Speaker, that although there are some alterations in the present Bill as compared with those which the hon. gentleman has introduced during the last two Sessions, the principle involved is to a great extent the same. This Bill, it is true, goes further and applies to all crimes—felonies as well as misdemeanors; but I think the hon. gentleman who has charge of it, in his ingenious speech, when repeating the arguments that have been used by others before him, and by himself, during the last two Sessions, did not give to the House any new reason or use any new argument why we should come to a different conclusion than the one at which we have arrived on two previous occasions. A Bill, as the hon. gentleman has stated, or a Bill not going quite as far as this, has reached, in the English House of Commons, during the last few years, a certain stage; but it has always stopped at a certain stage in the English Parliament, as this one has done in ours. It has never yet become law in Canada, nor has it become law in Great Britain. It is true that during the first part of the hon. gentleman's speech he stated that he thought it had become law in Great Britain, but I understood him to qualify that later on and to mention, accurately, as I believe, that it has only reached the second reading in the House of Commons, one of the Bills dealing with this subject, and of which this is a copy, having passed through the House of Lords. I wish to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the historical part of this question, so far as the hon. gentleman has alluded to it, because, as I understand it, he not only bases this Bill upon theories that are pretty well understood, and which have been already explained to this House, but he attempts to draw great strength from the fact that some of the law reformers of England, and, in fact, the English Parliament, are anxious to enact a similar law, and are of the opinion that these provisions should become law. The hon. gentleman is aware that so long ago as 1856, I believe, Lord Brougham attempted to enact a similar law to this in the Parliament of Great Britain. He failed, and all the learned gentlemen who succeeded him, have failed, to place such a law on the Statute Book. The question is a vexed one. We can understand, and I think laymen can understand, even from the ingenious argument of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), that there must be something wrong, that there must be a weak point in his argument, when, with the force with which he has put his case, we know that in England, where so many able men have called attention to this question, and have been unable to place such a law on the Statute Book. I say there is much to be drawn from that circumstance. If that were a necessary reform, if criminal justice was

not being administered satisfactorily; if criminal procedure in England were defective, surely there is sufficient spirit of enterprise and of reform, both in this country and in Great Britain, to have such a law speedily enacted. It is strange that a Bill of this kind should so often reach this stage. It is strange that in Great Britain, when the criminal law is attracting the attention of all grades of society, that if this were a desirable law a greater effort was not made in the English Parliament last Session to place this law upon the Statute Book. What do we find? We find that, instead of hurrying this law through Parliament, it has been discussed time and time again, and all the able law reformers who have turned their attention to the subject, while combining on the principle that in the main such a law should be enacted, cannot agree, and in fact disagree, as to what form the law should take; and there are actually three Bills before the British Parliament dealing with the subject. Not only is there Lord Bramwell's Bill, of which this is a copy, but there is a Bill treating the subject in a different manner, by the present Attorney General; and, in addition, there is an entirely different Bill from either of these—what is known as the Criminal Code Bill. These three Bills have reached the Grand Committee of the House of Commons, and the members there are not so anxious to enact this law that they will take any one of them, but they have three Bills treating on the same subject matter to consider maturely before taking any decided step. Although this Bill comes from Lord Bramwell, a jurist well known and of high standing, though now a very old man, known chiefly in connection with commercial law, a man who was trained as a merchant before he read for the bar, although it is his Lordship's wish to have this law enacted, there are many more eminent men who favor a different treatment of the subject, and men as eminent who are opposed to the enactment of any such law. We must not lay too much stress on the fact that this is Lord Bramwell's Bill; and it was quite natural that His Lordship should write a letter to the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron), hoping that the Canadian Parliament will pay him the compliment of enacting his Bill before the other Bills on the subject are considered. In England, as I have said, opinion is divided. Opinion, too, among law reformers, is greatly divided as to this Bill. If the House will permit me, I will read a short extract from the *Law Times*, of 1st March, 1884, in which these different Bills are mentioned. The *Law Times* says:

"Neither of the Bills disposes of the subject with a thoroughness beyond criticism, and a consideration of the three, side by side, will suggest a good many small points in which each might be improved. Of the three, the provisions of the Criminal Code Bill are, perhaps, the most logical, but the probable fate of the Criminal Code Bill is shrouded in mystery."

It does not appear that this is the best Bill of the three. It does not appear that this Bill will ever become law. And I would also mention that this Bill passed through the second reading by a very close shave, and in a very unsatisfactory manner. If the hon. gentleman will look at *Hansard* he will find that, when it passed through the House of Commons, there was an exceedingly small attendance of members. The Bill was not considered as it should have been considered, and the charge is openly made that it was smuggled through the House, passing, as it did, at about two o'clock in the morning. The division on a motion to adjourn gave as the numbers 20 to 99, a very small proportion of the House of Commons. But after all the discussion in England the Bill is not the law to-day. In proof of the fact that eminent men are divided on this vexed question, I need only refer, as I have done on previous occasions, to the remarks made by Messrs. Blackburn, Barry, Lush and Stephen, commissioners appointed to consider the criminal code, in their report to the House of

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Commons. When the Criminal Code Bill was sent to the House by these commissioners, dealing with many reforms, they had to qualify their opinion in connection with this question, and say as follows: "As the policy of a change of the law is so important, we are divided in opinion." That is a suggestion to us, that we must be careful in dealing with this subject, which is a question that enthusiasts in law reform have hesitated in dealing with. I again say, that it is for the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cameron) to show this House, since he failed last Session and the Session before, that there is any great need that such a law should be passed. There are certain hon. members in regard to whom it may be said that they take only a passing interest on this question, and are not so familiar with it as are members trained to the bar. But it affects every hon. member and his constituents, because, from my point of view, and it is the point of view taken by the leader of the Opposition, it is fraught with great danger to the working people, the masses of this country, and especially the uneducated, whose interests are at stake. Those who have opposed the passage of the Bill have, among their arguments, advanced this fact, that a prisoner who is uneducated may be placed in a false position before a tribunal of justice, as under the provisions of this Bill it is compulsory for the prisoner to testify; because Lord Bramwell himself admits that though it is not made compulsory in express terms, the effect of the measure is what I have stated. The hon. leader of the Opposition used the same argument, that though in the Bill it is not stated that it is compulsory on a prisoner to give evidence, yet in effect he must go into the box or take the consequence, the natural presumption of his refusing being that he is afraid to go into the box and tell his story. All members of the legal profession know that in many cases, although a client may be ever so innocent, it is necessary to keep him out of the witness box; for there being no necessity to place him there, as it might prejudice his case to be placed there, they might extract damaging evidence through the natural confusion arising in the minds of people unaccustomed to the halls of justice and the solemn forms which obtain there. I pressed that argument last Session, and I repeat it again; and I say that an uneducated man, in an ordinary case in the courts of justice, with a strong case, or in a criminal court with a clear conscience, is not himself, and the less he has to do with those courts the better exhibition he will make of himself. I say it is often impossible for an honest uneducated man to tell a story several times over, to explain and repeat a narrative over and over again, without telling it in so many ways. I appeal to my professional brethren to corroborate me in that statement. It is the every day experience in courts of law that much damage is done to a man's case in consequence of the embarrassment which he naturally feels in appearing before a court. I could cite cases still more familiar to us. I appeal to young men of my own position who feel it necessary sometimes to arise and express their opinions; and I would ask them what is their experience? I would ask them if they do not feel embarrassment, diffidence and awkwardness when they feel called upon to speak? I say, then, that if that be the case with men trained at the bar, if they feel that embarrassment here, what must be the embarrassment which a man will experience who comes for the first time into a court of justice, and who is told that if he does not get on the rack and stand a cross-examination by an able counsel, his innocence will be doubted; and having gone on the stand and made an exhibition of himself, through ignorance and not guilt, he will, no doubt, suffer the fate that men used to suffer in England, as late as the 17th century, in consequence of the practice there obtaining—a practice so abused that it was abolished—the practice of interrogating them, of seeing them racked

and tortured and worried to death by both judge and Crown counsel. And I would also ask, what power are you placing in the hands of the untrained magistracy of this country by this Bill? I call attention to this phase of the question. I say that when the hon. gentleman cites the movement towards the consummation of such legislation in England, he must remember that a very important feature comes up there. I say that in England they have a trained magistracy—that special qualifications are there required for the commissions of the peace, while in this country, as we know too well, the appointment of justices of the peace in the different Provinces is oftentimes abused; and we know that men hold the commission who should not hold it, and who, under this Bill, could exercise the power and authority most dangerous to their fellow men, especially in small communities. Take the case, for instance, mentioned by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), in which the prejudice of the people appear to be so great that in endeavoring to fortify his argument he attacked the jury system, and cited a case in which the Minister of Justice, on enquiring into the circumstances without the slightest hesitation interfered and voided a verdict. In this case, dealing with a charge of manslaughter, the jury proceeded to find a verdict of "guilty," and after the Minister of Justice had interfered, the Grand Jury of the community took the extraordinary course of drawing up and producing a document of a nature that struck me as rather odd, as a rebuke to the responsible administrators of justice, the Minister of Justice and the executive. Take that case, I say, and are you going to place in the hands of men like these such a power as is now proposed; because, under this Bill, not merely in the Supreme Courts and Superior Courts will the defendant have to be cross-examined and worried and tortured, but it applies to every hearing, to every stage of such a charge, so that he is placed in a position most embarrassing to any innocent man, particularly in the case of those who are not educated in such matters. Therefore, I say we were wise when we hesitated before saying that this Bill should become the law of the land. Further, I ask that we should still pause when we find, after all the attention the hon. gentleman has given to this matter, he comes down at every Session with a different Bill. He came down the previous Session with a measure, and after advising us that the law reformers of England were united in carrying down such a Bill, he comes down the next Session and tells us he has a better measure still, and therefore the old measure was not a proper one and should not become law. He has eliminated one clause to which I called attention, and he has substituted one which is no better. The second clause of this Bill provides that no person charged shall be compellable to be a witness. But I say this is a nugatory clause, for the witness must either testify or run great danger to his interest. The former Bill provided that the jury, forsooth, must not presume anything against the prisoner who did not come into the box as if the judge from the bench could control the opinion of a juryman's mind in dealing with such a matter as that. Now, if we are able to show that every Bill produced from that hon. gentleman's mind is defective in so important a point, if we are able to show that the law reformers of England are divided to-day as to how they shall frame a Bill dealing with the matter, I think we can afford to wait. Quoting the language of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), as I did last Session, I ask if the time is ripe for such a revolution in the criminal procedure of this country? I had the temerity last Session to refer to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). I had the pleasure of quoting, in support of my views, in discussing this subject, the language used by him, putting the matter far more concisely than I could hope to do, when he was standing in the responsible position of Minister of Justice, and when he

advised this House to throw out a Bill similar to this, introduced by Mr. Dymond, then a member of this House. I referred to his arguments; but in reply he told me, with a certain amount of indignation, that I had put a gloss over his speech which it did not deserve, and he said that when I referred to his speeches I should read the whole of them. Well, Sir, referring to his speeches, I consider life is too short to read all the speeches, or any one of the speeches, of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake). They are pleasant to listen to, and I, like other hon. members, derive pleasure in listening to the well-rounded periods of his speeches, and I admit that it is difficult, in any extract of a dozen or twenty lines from that hon. gentleman's speeches to show exactly what he does mean; because we find that he has a habit, on most occasions, to use popular language, of steering north by south, except when he is dealing with questions touching the Maritime Provinces. There is no mistaken ring then in his speeches—no mistaking his meaning when opposing any legislation, such as better terms or railway subsidies for those smaller and poorer provinces by the sea. On other subjects it is impossible, I admit, to get his exact meaning from reading so many lines of his speeches. But since I have laid stress on his speech in 1877, I will trouble the House by repeating it again, as I cannot use any argument stronger in the direction of opposing this Bill. I am sorry I do not see the hon. gentleman in the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. He is here.

Mr. TUPPER. I now see he is in the House. I ask the hon. member for West Durham not to tell me that seven years make a difference, and that things that are not right at one time become right seven years afterwards—not to give me an answer like that, but to give me an argument that will answer the argument he used then—to give me an experience that he has had since 1877 that will upset the experience he testified to in 1877. I am not opposing this Bill factiously; I am open to be convinced by the hon. member; but, before he can convince me, he must use an argument stronger than the argument he used last Session. I believe he was right, in 1877, when he said:

"He could conceive of some cases—they had occurred in his own experience in civil suits—in which an innocent man, owing to his nervous habit, great excitement at the time, or unhappy mode of giving testimony, would be placed rather at a disadvantage than otherwise."

So I say, Mr. Speaker; and am I to be told that seven years can reverse that argument? Can seventy times seven years change the force of the testimony of an authority so high, of a gentleman of such experience as the hon. member for West Durham then was? Dealing with another branch of the subject, he said:

"He thought the existing securities for the innocent were as powerful as, and perhaps more powerful than, the protection obtained by the prisoner telling his own story."

Of course, I suppose it was necessary for the hon. gentleman, in advising the House to throw out the Bill of a supporter, to do it in as pleasant a manner as possible, and he used other language which, however, does not affect the language I quote. He said that the time was not ripe for the measure; but all the arguments which have been used to-night were used then, and nothing has occurred since 1877 to lessen their force. Those same arguments, as I have stated, were ably put forward by Lord Brougham, by Jeremy Bentham, and by other reformers long before 1856 and 1877, and nothing has happened since to change the force of the experience of the hon. gentleman, which has been my own experience in courts of law, with regard to the effect of such a privilege in civil cases. Now, the hon. mover of this Bill has stated that what is true in civil cases would be true in criminal cases—that the right which he is now endeavoring to have extended to criminal cases was denied in

Mr. TUPPER.

civil cases; and the same arguments were used against that principle that are now urged against his claim. Grant that; I have an answer for him. The hon. member for West Durham is again the authority. In 1876, in discussing a criminal Bill, that hon. gentleman said:

"Rules prevailing with regard to civil cases could not be wholly adapted to criminal cases."

And they are not here. The hon. mover of the Bill says that it is illogical to say that what is proper in civil procedure would not be proper in criminal procedure. Why, his own Bill admits that you cannot deal with criminal cases in the same way as with civil cases, for it says:

"Provided that no person so charged shall be compellable to be a witness on any such hearing, nor shall such wife or husband be an admissible witness on any such hearing, without the consent of the person so charged, unless so compellable heretofore."

Sir, I ask if the argument of the hon. gentleman be sound, why should such a clause be inserted in the Bill? Why has he not gone the whole length and removed the difference between criminal and civil procedure altogether? He has not, because you cannot, as the hon. member for West Durham has well said, apply the rules to criminal cases which obtain in civil cases. Now, as I stated a short time ago, Lord Bramwell—like the hon. member for West Durham, when advising the House to reject Mr. Dymond's Bill—used this language:

"If the accused did not offer his own evidence, he would be exposed to the remark that he dared not do so."

And yet we find that this Bill provides that he shall not be compelled to do so. That is sufficient to show the weakness of the theory advanced in support of this measure. The ingenious argument used by the hon. member in charge of the Bill is entirely theoretical. It is apt to mislead, especially those who are not familiar with courts of justice. In theory, it may appear, to a great extent, to be fair, but in practice it is entirely illogical. When you come to draft these theories in a practical measure, it is then that difficulties appear, and that great differences arise in the minds of law reformers as to how this measure should be carried out. Therefore, my position is, that no matter how sound, theoretically, the principle embodied in the hon. gentleman's Bill may be, the practical view is that taken by the hon. member for West Durham, which is just as true now, that we do not require, for the protection of the innocent, any such legislation as this, neither do we require it in order to ferret out and punish crime. Holding these views, Mr. Speaker, though having expressed them perhaps at too great length, considering the number of times the Bill has been discussed, and feeling justified by the past treatment of this Bill, remembering that though it reached a second reading it was finally thrown out of this House, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Hesson, in amendment:

That this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months.

Mr. WOODWORTH. It is true, as my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) has said, that this Bill occupied the time of this House last Session, and a very free and full discussion was had upon it. It went to its second reading by a very large majority, and after that, through the want of a sufficient number of members in the House, its passage was obstructed. But the principle of this Bill was affirmed by this House by an overwhelming majority last Session. My hon. friend complains that this Session the Bill has come up in a new form. He says he objected to a certain clause of the Bill, and that clause has been eliminated from it this year. What is his complaint about, then? If his views have been met, and the clause he objected to has been eliminated, he should not take up the time of the House in objecting to the elimination of that clause. That was done in order to meet the final views—I do not use the word in an offensive sense—of my hon. friend, with reference to this Bill.

But, Sir, I think that since last Session all the objections that were then so ably and eloquently urged against this Bill have been taken away. The hon. gentleman declared that in England—the great pattern, the place to which we all look for guidance in our mode of procedure in criminal cases—no legislation on this point had taken place. Well, Sir, light has since then been thrown on this subject, and that statement can no longer be advanced. Allow me to read for a moment from the hon. gentleman's own speech on the question last Session. He said :

"I think we may, consistent with our national pride, and a feeling of admiration for our knowledge of the law, bow with great respect to the legal minds in England, and carefully follow in the footsteps of the law reformers of the United Kingdom.

Again, he said :

"Therefore, Sir, this is not such a measure of reform as ought to commend itself so highly to reformers that they should vote blindly for it, simply because it is described in that way. I appeal to those gentlemen who were in the House in 1877, and who voted for the motion to throw out the Bill at that time—I appeal to them whether they have heard an answer to the arguments then urged so strongly by the hon. member for West Durham, sufficiently to induce them to vote blindly for such legislation. Not only was this practice discouraged and departed from in England, but though some States in the Union have adopted it, it has brought a great scandal on the courts in those States."

The *Law Journal* of England, as quoted by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), advocates this measure; the judges in the Superior Court in Ontario have urged its passage; the *London Globe* and the *Pail Mall Gazette* have argued in its favor, and that, I think, is pretty good authority that this measure has created some discussion in England. But I wish to quote from the English *Hansard* the views of Lord Bramwell, whom the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) criticises as an old man. Somebody rose at one time in the House of Commons in England, I believe, and made an attack upon Pitt, afterwards Earl of Chatham, on the ground that he was a young man; it was a crime then to be called a young man. My hon. friend from Pictou has found that it is a crime in England to be an old Lord—an old Tory Lord, by the way—and to have reform views on criminal or any other procedure. Lord Bramwell, in rising to move that the Bill be now read the second time, said :

"The object of this Bill was to make a person charged with a crime a competent witness; also to enable a husband or wife to give evidence when either was charged with a criminal offence, and also to enable any one or two or more persons charged in the same indictment to give evidence. He did not propose to compel these persons to give evidence, but simply to remove the disqualifications which prevented them doing so if they wished. Only forty years ago no one who had the smallest interest in a case could give evidence in it, but this disqualification had been removed; husbands and wives had been made competent witnesses in civil cases; plaintiffs in breach of promise might be examined, and last year the Explosives Act admitted as witnesses the persons who were charged with offences under it."

He says further :

"A Bill similar to this would be introduced in the other House, but their Lordships would not have the trouble of discussing the matter twice, because if that measure came to that House he would not proceed further with his own. If, on the other hand, their Lordships should pass his Bill and send it to the other House, he should be quite willing that both Bills should be dealt with there in the manner that might be deemed best. At all events, he had given their Lordships an opportunity of discussing the question once, and this was more than could be said of many important measures last Session. In conclusion, the noble and learned Lord moved that the Bill be read a second time."

Earl Cairns rose and said :

"It would very ill become him to offer any opposition to the Bill, for it proposed to do what was proposed to be done by the Government of which he was a member, and it was included in the large measure for the codification of the criminal law which was brought into the other House of Parliament by that Government. That measure was about to be re-introduced into the House of Commons, and he hoped the Bill now under consideration might become law as part of that larger measure, instead of being an isolated Bill. He admitted, however, that they might have to wait a long time for that larger measure, and, perhaps, it was better to deal with this pressing subject in the way now proposed. Another reason he had for supporting the Bill was, that the Explosives Act, and some other recent statutes, enabled persons charged under their provisions to be examined as witnesses. He was informed that in the trial which took place under the Explosives Act this

provision was brought into force, and that it acted well. If it were wrong for a counsel to state to the jury the prisoner's version of what had occurred, a great hardship was inflicted on the accused; but if a counsel were allowed to give the prisoner's version, it was still more absurd that the prisoner himself should be prevented from stating it on oath to the jury."

Viscount Cranbrook, the Lord Chancellor, and various other noble Lords, spoke in the same strain. Now, my hon. friend has told the House that there were three Bills before the British Parliament: The first was that of Lord Bramwell; the second that of the Attorney General; and the third the Criminal Code Bill. I have already shown that the Bill introduced and passed by the House of Lords was precisely the Bill introduced in the Commons, and Earl Cairns said that the Government of which he was a member had introduced a Bill in the House of Commons. I ask my hon. friend how can he possibly tell this House that this is a question which enthusiasts in law reform alone take up, when it has passed the House of Lords in England—which, the Lord knows, is conservative enough, and the last body to be charged with an advanced reform movement. I contend that my hon. friend's reasons for voting against this Bill last Session have been entirely taken away by the events that have since transpired, namely, the passage of the Bill through the House of Lords and its introduction into the House of Commons, where, judging from the letter received by my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), from Lord Bramwell, which he read to this House, it has probably become law by this time. My hon. friend tells the House again that this Bill, should it become law, will have a damaging effect—damaging, first, to the accused who is innocent, and secondly, after you get through with that one you will unduly favor the next one. He says, as he argued last Session, when a man goes into the box with a forbidding countenance and a hesitating manner these will tell against him, and he may be convicted of a crime of which he is not guilty. But I ask you, if a man has a forbidding countenance, does he not take that with him into the dock as well as into the box, and will it not tell against him there as well? He may be as innocent of the crime with which he is charged as the babe unborn, but standing there in the criminal box, with all eyes turned upon him, occupying a most humiliating position, unable to say a word in his own behalf, I ask my hon. friend if the forbidding countenance and the receding forehead will not create as great a prejudice against him there as could possibly be created by his appearance in the witness box, and that without his being given any chance of removing it. But take that man with the forbidding countenance and the receding forehead from the criminal box, and place him on the witness stand, and if he be innocent, I venture to say that a workingman—my hon. friend referred to the ignorant workingmen—take every one of them for a jury, and we take our jurymen from them to-day, and good jurymen they make, too—but take that man and put him in the box and unseal his lips, and if he were innocent of the crime they would acquit him, although he were almost deaf and dumb, by the conscious innocence he possessed, by the consciousness of his own want of guilt, that man could make himself understood by the jury and the judge, that man could make himself understood by the Court, and would go out of that box a free man if he were innocent. Does not everybody know that that is the case, that any man, no matter how nature has warped him, no matter how appearances are against him, if he be innocent, will make his innocence known and felt, and the jury sitting there—these workingmen if you please, who are watching their fellow workingman in the box, who have all the charity for the hesitancy of manner of that man, for his worn clothes and haggard looks—can give that charity, and they can tell by his manner and by his answers to the questions whether he is the guilty or the innocent man. And what is the result, then? It is that justice is done, and it is justice that we

are after. It is not to allow the innocent to be punished, or the guilty to escape, but that justice should be done, and how can it be done unless the truth be extracted? Then my hon. friend says, it will let somebody off; some person will get off that should not. The principle of the law is that ten guilty men should escape rather than one innocent man should suffer, and if somebody did get off, there is no net so formed that some fish will not get out that perhaps should be held in. These are peculiarities known to every law. You cannot make any law perfect, but you must aim at the perfect and get the best you can; and if you place a law on the Statute Book that will allow the innocent man to escape, that will allow the truth to be extracted from a witness's mouth and justice to be done, you have made an advance in statesmanship, you have made an advance in governing your country in a proper and righteous and desirable manner. But my hon. friend tells us that, in an assault case—and this was the argument used last Session—where persons meet together and there is a fight, we will let them all come up and tell their story. That is the Canadian law to-day. My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), although in bad form to speak to-day from hoarseness, yet put the case so strongly here that it appealed to the sympathies of every man on both sides of the House, and that was the case of Mains and Beamish—these men who went out mutually and fought, the Mains' being the aggressors, old man Mains having been struck by a stick over the eye, severing an artery, from which he died. The penalty for murder, as everybody knows, is death. My hon. friends who are against this Bill say that, if death occurs, only the accusers who were in the fight should go upon the witness stand and swear; only one side of the fray shall be represented, only one of the parties shall be heard; or we will divide the parties, we will hear what the Mains' say, but you shall not hear what the Beamish's say. Although the penalty is hanging, although the penalty is death, yet we will not permit you to go upon the witness stand and swear to what you know. If it be flogging, or a week in gaol, or a fine, you can all go on the witness stand and swear to the truth of your statements. My hon. friends solemnly, gravely contend in this House that the Canadian law, in regard to evidence in cases of assault, is perfectly proper and right, but, when it comes to a felony under similar circumstances, we will only hear one side of the story, and the accused shall not go on the stand. Is it not most absurd? Where is the logic of such reasoning as that? Would not you, Sir, would not the members of this House, and would not the country say that, in case of a higher crime so much the greater the necessity of extracting the truth, of getting at the truth, no matter where it comes from, whether from independent witnesses or from the accused party. Who does not know that in this country, as in every other country, persons commit crimes or are charged with crime when only one witness can go upon the stand, and all the other witnesses are shut out by the rules of evidence? Crime is not committed in crowds, as a general thing. It is committed silently, stealthily, in the darkness of night sometimes; and when one witness is allowed to testify, and he the bigger criminal of the two, that the other man was the committer of the crime, is it not monstrous that the man charged with it shall not be allowed to go into the witness box, to be examined as you will, by the ablest counsel you can find, to tell the truth about the matter in regard to which he has been falsely arraigned, while the real criminal has been giving his evidence by the hour and swearing his life away. Yet, when the old Tory House of Lords in England has passed a Bill like this, they who oppose this Bill are afraid of this reform measure. All these arguments were made when the Bill was introduced to allow a man

Mr. WOODWORTH.

or a woman to testify in a civil suit to which they were parties. It was said that the crime of perjury would be committed. It was said that self-interest would not allow these persons to tell the truth. That is a matter you cannot legislate against efficiently—the crime of perjury. Men have to take the responsibility of that. Men have to take the responsibility in this life of their acts. All you can do is to give the opportunity, as I said before, for the fullest investigation of the matter, and he or she who commits the crime of perjury must suffer for it, either here or elsewhere, and no human legislation can reach that. I took occasion last Session to say that there was more perjury committed in making up the electoral lists in one riding in this Canada of ours than there would be under this law, if perjury be swearing with intent to tell what is not true, or to violate an oath already taken. Now, Sir, I do not intend to take up the time of the House with any further remarks, but merely to say, having given my vote for this measure last Session, giving it in the interest of the masses, as I believe, in the interests of Canada, and following in the footsteps, to use again the language of my hon. friend, of that great country to which we owe allegiance and to which we are so proud to belong, I repeat again, on the present occasion, that I believe this law, if passed, will not be a retrograde step, but will be a step of advancement towards a higher state of civilisation.

Mr. LISTER. When this Bill was last before the House, a number of hon. gentlemen felt themselves called upon to speak against its passage, and to-night I hesitated for a few moments to allow some one of those hon. gentlemen to rise again and oppose it. I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who represents Pictou (Mr. Tupper), in order to see whether he could advance any genuine argument against the passage of this Bill; and I am bound to confess, Sir, that during his whole speech I was unable to detect one single reason why the Bill of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) should not become law. One of the reasons—if we may call it so—that he urged why it should not become law was, the timidity of young men like himself who might be called into the witness box, perhaps from the prisoner's box, and from timidity prejudice his case. Now, Sir, I may say confidently, that if that was a reason why this Bill should not become law, it has fallen to the ground, because my young friend did not display that timidity and nervousness which his language would indicate. That this Bill will become law, whether it is defeated at this Session or not, there is no reasonable doubt whatever. I believe that if the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) had been in existence seventy years ago and had been then a member of Parliament, he would have been found opposing, as vigorously as he opposes this law to-day, the law which gave a man accused of crime the right to have the services of counsel; he would doubtless have thought that if a lawyer was allowed to raise his voice on behalf of a man accused of crime there was a great public danger that he would be acquitted. But, Sir, that inhuman law has been wiped from the Statute Book. I have no doubt that my hon. friend would also have been found opposing the law which gave parties to a suit the right to testify on their own behalf. That was an innovation, and in his own words, it was a dangerous innovation. We know, as a matter of fact, that while that law was in existence, by which a man was not able to testify in his own behalf, many a suitor was prevented from appealing to a court of justice because his cause could only be maintained by his own evidence. So gross was that injustice that the law of the land was changed, and to-day every suitor, every man, whether he be interested or not in the result of a case, has a right to go into the witness box, and the jury who are sworn to try that case are to judge as to his credibility. That law has been placed

upon the Statute Book. We find also that in the Parliament preceding the present one, in this very House, a law was passed by which a man charged with assault and battery, a misdemeanor under our criminal law, was allowed to testify on his own behalf. Now, Sir, if these advances have been made within the last few years, if these improvements and reforms in the laws of this country have taken place, are we not justified in demanding that the last vestige, the last remnant of these unjust laws should be removed, and that the judge and the jury should have the right to hear the facts of the case from every man, from every lip, that can testify about it? That is not the case to-day. The man who is charged with a crime is placed in the criminal's box, and his mouth is closed, whereas the man who has the most interest in convicting him, and perchance who is the only witness, that man's mouth is open, his story is told, and the result has often been, I have no doubt, an unjust conviction. Why should that man not be allowed to speak? Why should he not be allowed to tell his story to the jurors, to the judge, and before the lawyers, and if he is telling a falsehood a cross-examination would sweep the false portion of it away, would separate the grain from the chaff, and if he is telling an untruth there is no doubt that it will prejudice his case. But, Sir, if he is innocent, the manner in which he tells his story, his air of conscious innocence, will convince the men before whom he is tried whether he be guilty or not, and if he be innocent he will have what every innocent man is entitled to, an acquittal. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) has referred to charges of rape, a charge which is frequently made in this country, a charge which is easily made and hard to be defended. We know, Sir, that men have been convicted of that abominable offence upon the evidence of perjured testimony, and that there are to-day men who are lingering in prison, with their life blasted, convicted unjustly and improperly, whereas if these men could have gone into the witness box and told their story to the jury, instead of being persons disgraced forever they would now be free men and the stamp of conviction would never have been placed upon them. Shall it be said that in a free country like ours, that in a country having as intelligent a population as we have, the jury and the judge are not able to tell whether a man is telling what is true or what is false? Shall we take the chance—for it is nothing more than a chance—that an innocent man may be convicted because he is not allowed to tell what he knows? That, Sir, is the position of our law to-day, and I think it is a disgrace to this country that it has not been changed before. Now, Sir, we have the fact that it has not only engaged our attention here, but that it has engaged the attention of the Parliament of Great Britain. My hon. friend from Pictou tells us that there are no less than three Bills before the House of Commons in England, providing for making the evidence of a person accused of crime receivable in court. That shows that this important question is engaging the attention of statesmen on the other side of the water; and when this question came before the House of Lords upon a Bill which was introduced by Lord Bramwell, I think, there was not one noble Lord who dared to get up and oppose the principle of the Bill. Every man who spoke upon the Bill spoke favorably of its provisions, and the only one who had opposed it at all in the past would not take upon himself again the responsibility of active opposition. Are these not reasons why it should become the law of our land? Is this a mere adventure? Is this a mere jump in the dark? No. We have also the experience of the United States before us; we know that in every State of the Union this has been the law for years and years. Yet, if it worked badly, if justice was frustrated, will you tell me that that law would not have been repealed? Sir, that law, instead of being abolished, has been found to work beneficially, and I am safe in saying that in no Legislature in the Union

would there be found a majority of members who would support a repeal of the law as it now stands. Those are strong reasons why this should become the law in the Dominion. What is the opposition? That a man might commit perjury. In the name of common sense and reason, is a man's life, property and reputation to be lost simply because there is a chance that somebody who may be charged with a crime may commit perjury? Yet that is the argument used by hon. gentlemen who oppose this Bill. I feel that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) is entitled to the thanks of this Parliament and of the people of Canada for what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) is pleased to call his pertinacity in bringing this Bill from time to time before the House. The hon. member for West Huron, in an elaborate and exhaustive speech, which does his industry infinite credit, has gone into this question and advanced arguments in its favor that by no possibility can be refuted, and which should convince us of the propriety, yea, of the absolute necessity, of making this the law of the land at the earliest moment possible. As I stated a moment ago, this is a last disqualification. Every other disqualification has been removed. Defendants in civil actions, or those interested in any way, are entitled to give evidence, and there is but this one disqualification to remove to enable all courts to get at the whole truth in the cases before them. We must look at this matter as reasonable men and consider, not that it is in the interest of the accused, but that it will tend to promote justice. It is to promote the investigation of cases and to get at the truth and the exact truth; and if that is the case, it becomes our bounden duty, as representatives of the people, to support this Bill and make it the law of the land. It is a puerile argument, and one unworthy of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), to say that perchance a man may commit perjury, and for that reason a man charged with crime should not be allowed to testify in his own behalf. The hon. member who last addressed the House (Mr. Woodworth), said it was better that ten persons should be acquitted rather than that one should be improperly condemned; I say it is better that ninety-nine should be acquitted rather than that one should suffer the penalty of an unjust conviction. The noble Lord who spoke in the case referred to by the last speaker said there was nothing more difficult to get than a conviction on the evidence of one witness. How many cases are there in which the evidence of one witness has convicted a man; how many cases are there when that conviction would not have taken place if the law had been different? Then, I say, in this intelligent age, in view of the fact that this has been the law in the United States for forty or fifty years, in view of the fact that is now engaging the attention of public men in England, that a Bill on this subject has actually passed the House of Lords, and has passed the second reading in the House of Commons—in view of all these facts, there is nothing to prevent us from taking that step which they in England are anticipating, and which may be the law to-day, for all I know. If it is improper, I repeat, to allow a person charged with an offence to give evidence, it is improper that he should give evidence in any case at all. We have it that defendants are now allowed to give evidence in assault cases; also, under the Crooks' Act and under the Temperance Act of 1878, a man charged is a competent and a compellable witness. I can only repeat that such is the law in the United States. That such will be the law, if it is not now the law, in England; and I think this Legislature will not be discharging that duty which it owes to the public, and will not be doing that which is due to itself as an intelligent body of men, if it rejects the Bill now before the House.

Mr. BEATY. The change proposed by the Bill of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) is a very im-

portant one and must affect the public interest very largely, and it certainly will affect the interests of individuals who are charged with offences or crimes to a very great extent. The change as proposed is reduced, as I understand it, in the Bill, to the minimum of change in connection with the law of criminal evidence. It does not go to the extent of providing that any person charged with crime can be compelled to give evidence by the prosecution, but it simply admits or allows the person who is charged to give evidence in his own behalf, and in rebuttal of the charge made against him. The first section says:

"Every person charged with an offence, and the wife and husband, as the case may be, of the person so charged, shall be a competent witness on every hearing at every stage of such charge, and whether the person so charged is charged or arraigned solely or jointly with another or others."

That goes simply to the extent of allowing a person charged, in connection with the other sections, to present himself or herself as a competent witness in his or her defence. That reduces the matter down. It does not allow a court of justice or the prosecutor for the Crown to force the prisoner to give evidence either for or against himself. The prisoner is still allowed the toleration of the law, for he can state what might be called a legal lie; he can plead that he is not guilty and stand his trial on such evidence as may be presented. That enables the defendant or prisoner to give evidence in explanation of any circumstances that may be brought to bear against him in evidence. I think that is one of the most important points of this Bill, that it enables a prisoner charged with an offence or crime to give such explanation as to the circumstances and the nature of those circumstances which are brought in evidence against him as will procure an acquittal in case of innocence. I think the Bill is in the right direction. We have found, in cases of civil action, that this principle of allowing all persons to give evidence has been extended from time to time, until at the present day plaintiffs and defendants can give testimony either for or against themselves.

An hon. MEMBER. It is not so in Quebec.

Mr. BEATY. It is so in Ontario; and it is found to work so beneficially there that I do not know any judge or lawyer who would desire to repeal that law. They would consider it a retrograde movement to revert to the old law on this matter, so far as relates to civil actions. The effect upon the prisoner is one of two kinds. An innocent person who is charged with a crime will have an opportunity of denying his guilt, pledging his oath to his innocence and explaining the circumstances which are brought to bear against him in the testimony of the prosecutor or other persons. It is true a rascal, not afraid of perjuring himself, may also swear himself innocent; he may also come forward and deny the charge made against him, although he may be guilty. But that allegation may be laid against every witness brought into a witness box. Every witness who gives testimony may be said sometimes to perjure himself, as indeed they are said to perjure themselves in giving testimony for or against a friend or in favor of their own interests. That is not a fatal objection in the matter of civil actions to the reception of the defendant's testimony, or to its discussion by judge and jury. The point which is made in regard to this matter of perjury is of no greater force than it would have in relation to any other witness. The prisoner ought to be heard, if he choose to present himself. He cannot be compelled to do so as the Bill now stands, but he simply presents himself and explains the nature of the charge against him, or the facts as they may be adduced. We know that, in general, circumstantial evidence is all that is obtainable in criminal cases. I suppose there are not more than three cases out of ten, and probably less, in which such cases are not decided on circumstantial evidence. Now, would it not be of great advantage, so far as the prisoner is concerned, and to that

extent so far as the jurisprudence of the country is concerned, and so far as the public interests are concerned—would it not be a valuable thing to enable the prisoner, if he choose, to go into the box and explain those matters which are brought to bear against him by the testimony of others. I think it would, and I think it is desirable, especially in the point of view of innocent persons coming into the box, notwithstanding any embarrassment to which they may be put by reason of a cross-examination. I think every person charged with crime would like to have the opportunity of saying himself that he is not guilty. I think if I were charged with a crime my diffidence, which is of course well known, would not prevent my going into a witness box and saying I was not guilty. I would rather prefer going before the court and jury and pledging my oath that I was not guilty. If, however, a person is guilty, he can stand in his present position and say "not guilty," as he is allowed to do now, and allow the prosecution to press the charge against him. It is true that an impression may be left on the jury and the court that a person who is charged and who refuses to go into the box and exculpate himself of the crime is guilty, but I do not know that that should be of any more force in cases of that kind than it is at present. Counsel are allowed at the present time to state the defence of the prisoner, to state the facts and circumstances connected with the case, which the prisoner himself might state under oath. It has so much weight so far as it goes. Why, then, if counsel are allowed to do so, should not the prisoner himself be allowed to give the court the benefit of his knowledge of the facts, pledging his oath to the court and jury, so that they might come to a righteous conclusion. I do not know any reason why he should not; and my disposition would be, and the tendency, so far as my knowledge of criminal jurisprudence goes, would be to hear all parties under all circumstances and relating to whatever grounds. But this Bill does not propose to go so far. It does not enable the prosecution to compel the prisoner to go into the box at its option, but simply at his own option. Now, the repugnance to opening up and extending questions of this kind has been evinced all through the history of our jurisprudence. We find, that step by step, the law in relation to evidence in civil matters has gone on, until to-day, at all events, in the Province of Ontario, there is scarcely a man who understands matters of this kind who would wish to go back to the original condition of things. If that has been the effect of enlarging the power of reaching the facts of the case and seeking out the truth, why should not its application to persons charged with criminal offences produce similar results? I believe it would do so; and if the Bill becomes law, I venture to say that there is not a man in the House, who lives for five years, who will say that the law should not have been enacted. I think that the experience which would be had under the administration of a law of this kind would be such as would ratify it strongly, and that it would show, without hesitation, that it was a valuable law, and would produce good effects.

Mr. FLEMING. I do not desire to prolong the discussion on the principle of the Bill, for I have not heard that there have been any valid reasons advanced why the principle of the Bill should not be adopted. It is not such a radical change after all. It is true that a prisoner at present charged with a misdemeanor or felony, except those which have been already stated in the course of the argument, has no right to testify in his own behalf, but in the practice of the criminal courts the principle is admitted. The right of a prisoner to tell his own story is admitted in practice, when his counsel is permitted to tell his story for him. Now it never has appeared to me to be consistent with a fair trial of an issue that any one of the parties who could throw light on a transaction under investigation, is excluded from the possibility of telling his story. If any

— Mr. BEATY. *ambly*

person were endeavoring to investigate any matter he would not confine himself to hearing one side of the story. He would be a simpleton who would desire to make up his mind on any state of facts if he heard only the one side; and in a solemn trial where men's liberties, and in many cases their lives, are at stake, it surely cannot be inconsistent with justice—it must be consistent with every principle of justice—that the person most interested in the event of the trial should have the opportunity of stating his case to the tribunal before which he is being tried. The objection that the prisoner may commit perjury is of no validity, because although it may be true that a man may commit perjury to get clear of a conviction of a crime, we know it is possible for the prosecutor to commit perjury. There are sometimes greater incentives in the mind of a prosecutor to prosecute a conviction unjustly than there is in the mind of a prisoner to escape conviction. We know cases—there are hundreds of them—we have seen them in our experience, where the strongest feelings of malignity have been manifested in the minds of prosecutors—these men going into the box, actuated by such feelings, have been permitted to tell their story, and the person accused has his mouth closed. In many criminal cases, those relating to assaults against the person particularly, and even more serious crimes of that nature, the facts and circumstances may be stated by the defendant. Thus, in most criminal cases those who are most concerned in the commission of the crime are the prosecutor, on the one hand, and the prisoner, on the other; and to have one's liberty so jeopardised by permitting the prosecutor to tell his story, and permitting detectives and others to weave around him a chain of circumstances that produce almost inevitably proof of his guilt, when by a single word, by a single explanation on the part of the prisoner he may be able to show that there was an important link wanting in the chain of evidence which would demonstrate his innocence beyond the possibility of a doubt, would be a gross injustice. Now, we have not only the principle of justice involved, that would entitle the prisoner to the privilege of telling his own story, but we have the experience, in our own courts, of defendants in civil cases going into the witness box and telling their story, a privilege which has only been recently conferred upon them. We have had the same experience now for several years of men charged with assaults, or with offences under the various license Acts, being permitted to tell their own story; and nobody, in view of our experience under the different enactments, would think for a moment of going back to the old system. It seems to me, therefore, both on principles of justice and of enlightenment, and in the light of our experience in our own courts, that the Bill of my hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Cameron), ought to become part of the statute law of the country.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Tupper :

That the Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read a second time this day six months.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dugas,	McCallum.
Bell,	Dundas,	McDougald (Pictou),
Benoit,	Dupont,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Blondeau,	Gagné,	McGreevy,
Bryson,	Gaudet,	McLelan,
Burns,	Gigault,	Moffat,
Cameron (Victoria),	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Carling,	Guilbault,	Pinsonneault,
Caron,	Hackett,	Pope,
Chapleau,	Hesson,	Royal,
Cimon,	Jamieson,	Stairs,
Cochrane,	Jenkins,	Taschereau,
Costigan,	Labrosse,	Tassé,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Temple,
Cuthbert,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Daoust,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Kings),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Williams,
		Wood (Westm'nd)—55.

NAYS :
Messieurs

Allen,	Forbes,	McCraney,
Allison,	Geoffrion,	McIsaac,
Amyot,	Gillmor,	McMullen,
Armstrong,	Girouard,	McNeill,
Auger,	Glen,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gordon,	Malock,
Baker (Victoria),	Gunn,	O'Brien,
Beaty,	Hall,	Orrton,
Benson,	Harley,	Paint,
Blake,	Hay,	Paterson (Brant),
Bourassa,	Hilliard,	Prayn,
Barpee (Sunbury),	Homer,	Ray,
Cameron (Huron),	Innes,	Reid,
Cameron (Inverness),	Irvine,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Ives,	Rykert,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Jackson,	Small,
Cartwright,	King,	Somerville (Brant),
Casey,	Kinney,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Springer,
Catudal,	Kranz,	Trow,
Cook,	Landerkin,	Tyrwhitt,
Davies,	Langelier,	Vail,
De St. Georges,	Langevin,	Wallace (York),
Dickinson,	Laurier,	Watson,
Dodd,	Lister,	Wells,
Edgar,	Livingstone,	Wigle,
Fairbank,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wilson,
Farrow,	Mackintosh,	Woodworth,
Fleming,	McCarthy,	Yeo.—87.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. member for East Middlesex (Mr. Macmillan) has not voted.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). I have paired with the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Sutherland). The arrangement was that on any question that came up, he not being here, I was not to vote.

Mr. SPEAKER. By resolution of the House last Session, it was decided that members should state which way they would have voted.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). I would have voted for the Bill. I do not know whether he would or not; only, I was not to vote during his absence.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to on division, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The Bill, to the principle of which the House has now assented by a very large majority, is a Bill having relation to the criminal law, and it is one, therefore, which I think the Government ought to take the responsibility of. If, however, the Government are not disposed to do so, I suppose it ought to be referred to a select committee. As the Bill, in its present shape, has never been before this House before, perhaps the better plan would be to refer it to a committee. I therefore move :

That the Bill be referred to a select committee composed of Messrs. Woodworth, Lister, Fleming, Davies, Girouard, Beaty, McCarthy, Amyot, Hall, and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copy of the Order in Council relating to the Forestry Commission, appointing J. H. Morgan as such commissioner, and a copy of the recommendation on which such appointment was based.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Copy of the Order in Council appointing L. K. Jones secretary to the Intercolonial Railway Commission, and also a copy of the recommendation on which such Order in Council was based.—(Mr. Rykert.)

ADJOURNMENT—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—
PROGRESS ESTIMATES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways could now answer the question which I asked, and which

was allowed to stand, with reference to the progress estimates on the Canadian Pacific Railway for January.

Mr. POPE. There has been paid the eastern section, out of subsidy, \$320,336; on the central section, out of subsidy, \$114,976; on the eastern section, out of loan, \$140,300; on the central section, out of loan, \$172,800.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will see whether he can soon bring down the papers with reference to the progress estimates for February as well.

Mr. POPE. If they are not brought down I will bring them down.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 23rd February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DELAYED RETURNS.

Mr. MULOCK. Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways when he expects to be able to lay on the Table of the House certain returns that were ordered on the 6th of February; I refer to the returns showing the tolls on the Northern Railway and its branches. These returns must be in the printed schedule, and I think if so, could be laid on the Table almost at any time. It is now more than two weeks since the House passed the address, and I am deferring some action until that information is produced.

Mr. POPE. Is it the rates?

Mr. MULOCK. You will find the address in the Votes and Proceedings of the 6th of February.

Mr. POPE. I can say to the hon. gentleman that I will enquire into it and bring them down as soon as possible.

Mr. MULOCK. I would also call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to an Order of the House passed also on the 6th February, directing that certain correspondence with respect to the Washington Treaty should be laid on the Table. That correspondence, I have been told, has been printed, has been printed for years, and is at the present time in the Department; if so, there does not appear to be any reason for any delay in laying that correspondence on the Table.

Mr. McLELAN. I think there was some enquiry made about it in the Department. Some of the officials enquired of me to know what had been brought down and what had not been brought down. I think the order was for all not already brought down. I think the return is now being made up. I know there is action being taken upon it.

Mr. MULOCK. The enquiry need not involve any great time, because not a single letter has been brought down, and that need not be an excuse for delay.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 61) further to amend the Act incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 43) to authorise the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce its capital stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Curran.)

Mr. BLAKE.

EBENEZER WATSON, SARNIA.

Mr. LISTER asked, Did Ebenezer Watson, of Sarnia, on the 23rd day of January, 1882, hold an office under the Government? If so, the name of the office, does he still hold the same office? If not, why?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. From a memorandum handed to me by the Department, it appears that Ebenezer Watson on 23rd January, 1882, held the office of Indian Agent. He does not hold the same office now, he is agent for the sale of Indian lands.

Mr. LISTER. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he has not answered the question fully. Part of the question was, why he does not hold the same office.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Because he has been appointed to another office.

PROVINCIAL RAILWAYS.

Mr. SPROULE asked, Does the taking over of provincial railways by the Dominion destroy the validity of agreements entered into by those railway companies and the municipalities relative to bonuses given in aid of such roads? Have railways, which by the Act of last Session are declared to be in the interest of Canada and therefore Dominion roads, any additional powers given them by virtue of this change, whereby they are enabled to control local freight rates different from what such companies had when under provincial control?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. These are leading questions, but so far as I know the taking over of provincial railways by the Dominion—if the hon. gentleman means by it declaring any provincial railway to be a Dominion railway—does not, I think, destroy the validity of agreements. The second question involves a point of law, and I am not prepared to answer it.

MANITOBA SUBSIDY.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) asked, Has the Government of Manitoba made any claim on the Government of Canada during the past year or recently for an additional subsidy or for any financial or other aid? If so, what was the nature and extent of such claim, and has the same or any part of such claim been assented to? If so, to what extent?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Negotiations between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada have been going on for some time. A provisional agreement has been arrived at, which will be laid on the Table of the House, by Message, either to-day or to-morrow.

PORT CREDIT HARBOR.

Mr. FLEMING asked, Is it the intention of the Government to take any steps by grant or otherwise to secure repairs of Port Credit Harbor? If so, what is the nature of the steps to be taken?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. With respect to Port Credit Harbor, I am informed that an Act of incorporation was given to a company, that they built the works there, and those works are now in very bad order. The fact is the wharves and piers are rotten. The Act of incorporation provides that if the Crown should assume the harbor, it would have to pay the company their capital, \$20,000, and also 20 per cent. of the amount of stock in existence and 6 per cent on the money advanced. Moreover, I am informed that to renew the works would cost the country \$25,000. Under those circumstances the Government are not in a position to undertake those works.

IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER asked, The number of immigrants supposed to have settled in British Columbia from 1st January to 31st December, 1884?

Mr. POPE. The number reported to have settled in British Columbia is as follows: Of white people, about 9,000, and about 3,000 Chinese.

STEAMER LANSDOWNE.

Mr. VAIL asked, Did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries receive a written communication or verbal representation from the builder of the steamer *Lansdowne* or from any other person, while said steamer was in course of construction, or at any other time, informing him that the engines and boiler of the wrecked steamer *Princess Louise* were not sufficiently powerful, and consequently unsuited to a vessel of the *Lansdowne's* dimensions and capacity? Were said engines and boiler used for the *Lansdowne*?

Mr. McLELAN. There was no written communication or verbal representation from the builder of the steamer *Lansdowne* or from any other person, so far as I know. It has been reported that the engine does not possess as much power as is desired, and I am informed by experts that this can be remedied by an alteration of the propeller, which is being made so that the steamer will be fit for service.

NORTH SHORE RAILWAY.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the Government received any communication from the Government of the Province of Quebec, whereby the said Government declare themselves ready to purchase the North Shore Railway at the price of \$5,000,000, provided the Government of Canada will grant them an allowance equal to the interest at 5 per cent. upon the said sum? Has said proposition been accepted or refused? If no communication has been made precisely in the terms mentioned, has any similar communication been made, and if made, has it been entertained?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government of Canada have not received any communication of this kind or nature from the Provincial Government.

NOVA SCOTIA SUBSIDY.

Mr. KIRK asked, Has the Government fully considered the claims of the Nova Scotia Government for additional subsidy to that Province? Is it the intention of the Government this Session to introduce a measure by which Nova Scotia's finances will be placed in a more satisfactory position by increasing the annual subsidy or by any other means?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government of Nova Scotia have submitted to the Dominion Government a statement showing why, in their judgment, their case should be considered. That is now under the consideration of the Government. An answer will be prepared, probably within ten days. The answer given to them will be the reply to the latter part of the question.

RAILWAY FROM MONTREAL TO THE SEABOARD.

Order that The House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider resolution, declaring that the route for a line of railway to connect Montreal with the Harbors of St. John and Halifax, for which a Dominion subsidy was granted last Session, should be subject to the approval of Parliament (Mr. Laurier) read.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I ask the hon. member for Quebec East to postpone his motion. The plans and reports

are not quite ready to be placed before the House, and we desire that they should be in the possession of the House before any motion on the subject is proposed.

Mr. LAURIER. I cannot allow the motion to be postponed again, for the second time. It has been pending ten or twelve days. Moreover, the plans are not, I think, pertinent to the motion. I therefore beg to move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolution:—

That the route for the line of railway to connect Montreal with the Harbors of St. John and Halifax, for which a subsidy of \$170,000 a year for fifteen years was provided by the Statute of last Session, 47 Victoria, Chapter 8, should be subject to the approval of Parliament.

The Statute referred to in the motion provides that for the construction of a line of railway to connect Montreal with the Harbors of St. John and Halifax by the shortest and best practicable route, and after reports of competent engineers have been obtained, a subsidy of \$170,000 a year for fifteen years shall be allowed. The subsidy shall be granted to such company as shall be approved by the Governor in Council; and the location of the line shall be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, without any reference to or approval by Parliament. I imagine that it was not without some annoyance to themselves that the Government finally made up their minds to come before Parliament, and did come before Parliament, to ask for such power. Their action, of course, would be perfectly natural but for one fact, that the important Harbors of Montreal, St. John and Halifax are already connected by a line of railway planned and constructed by the Government themselves. We have the Intercolonial Railway, and the route of that railway was chosen exactly in the same manner as it is proposed to apply this subsidy, that is to say, it was chosen by the Government itself without any reference to Parliament, and without their choice being subjected to the approval of Parliament. It was selected out of many proposed routes, and it was selected, in the language of the Government of the day, as the best that could be secured under all the circumstances and to all intents and purposes. And if I remember aright the very objects which are urged to-day to justify the Government in this action were at that time strongly urged and strongly pressed on the Government. The desirability and even the necessity of choosing the most direct route was pointed out again and again to the Government and yet their object at the time was the very same as the object they have in view to-day. Their object was to connect the new elements of the Confederation, to bring together the Provinces of the interior and the Provinces at the seaboard, and above all things to create a trade between those different Provinces, to bring down to the ports of the Maritime Provinces, previous to their shipment to Europe, the rich productions of the west. And yet having these objects in view the Government instead of selecting the most direct route, selected on the contrary the longest and most expensive one. They contended at the time that their choice was the best that could be made, but after an experience of some years they are forced to their present action; they are forced to supplement their first choice by another route which is to connect the same points that are connected by the Intercolonial Railway. Therefore, I say, that it cannot be without some secret annoyance that the Government made up their minds to come to Parliament to ask for an appropriation to connect the harbors of Montreal and St. John and Halifax, which are already connected by the previous action of the Government. The action of the Government to-day is a positive admission that they erred in the selection they made; it is an admission that however efficient the Intercolonial Railway may have been, however useful it may have been, still it has failed to bring the trade of the west to the ports of the Maritime Provinces, and that unless a new channel is opened up for

that trade it must of necessity find its way to the ports on the American seaboard. It is not with any intention of fault finding or indulging in recrimination that I recall the fact—for recrimination would be out of place because it would not mend the errors of the past—but I recall the facts to the attention of the House because they show the paramount importance of the proposition which I lay before the House. I bring them before the House in order if possible to prevent the repetition of the same error which was committed in 1868, when the route of the Intercolonial Railway was chosen; and I bring them before the House in order that the House may be convinced how important and how necessary, I may say, that the House should keep to itself the final approval of the route to be selected under the Act. I may say, Sir, that the history of the present route of the Intercolonial Railway, illustrated as it is by the present action of the Government in asking a new appropriation to correct an error otherwise irreparable, is a conclusive argument in favor of the course which I urge for the adoption of the House. In 1868 when the scheme of the Intercolonial Railway was before Parliament a motion similar in purpose to the present one, and almost similar in language, was made by Mr. Dorion, asking what I now ask—that the choice of the Government should not be final, but should be subject to the approval of Parliament. When the Bill was before the House and was about to be referred to Committee of the Whole Mr. Dorion moved:

“That it be an instruction to the committee to amend the Bill so as to provide that the location of the line of Intercolonial Railway shall not be finally adopted without the previous assent of Parliament.”

This motion was opposed by the Government, and it was opposed for two reasons, the first one being a temporary reason which cannot be urged to-day. The first reason was that under the Imperial Act, the Intercolonial Railway was to be commenced within a certain time, and that if the choice of the Government was to be subject to the approval of Parliament the time might elapse, and that we therefore might lose the Imperial guarantee. The second reason was that the Government were well informed; that they had the interests of the whole country at heart, and would use carefully the information they could obtain, and would exercise the greatest care to make the best possible choice. These reasons prevailed, and the House entrusted them with the choice of route. Before proceeding further, I would recall the language used by the Prime Minister in answer to the motion of Mr. Dorion. He said:

“That the Government could only have one interest at heart, namely, the interest of the whole country, which was to be served by the construction of the cheapest and most direct road possible. When they had come to a conclusion as to which route was the most desirable they would submit their decision for the approval of the Imperial Government, and it must be remembered that any delay such as would be necessary to await the House's attention to the matter, would preclude the possibility of the work being commenced within the six months prescribed by the Act of Union. The House might fairly think it safe to leave the matter in their hands, who were all unbiassed by the possession of local interest in any special route, with the exception perhaps of the Minister of Customs, whose influence would not be absolutely crushing in their councils.”

These reasons prevailed. The Government said they were unbiassed, that they had nothing at heart but the interest of the whole country; they asked to be trusted, and they were trusted, and the consequence of that trust is that after a lapse of seventeen years the Government are now bound to admit that they erred in their selection, and that they have to supplement their action on that occasion by adopting another route, in order to secure what the selected route was expected to secure, but failed in securing. Now it is neither unfair nor unreasonable to assume that if Mr. Dorion's motion had been carried, and the House had reserved to itself the final choice of the road, the arguments which the Government used as a reason for their being entrusted with the selection, would have prevailed, and the nearest and most direct route for connecting the west with

Mr. LAURIER,

the Atlantic seaboard of the Maritime Provinces would have prevailed. Moreover if it was important in 1868, if there were strong reasons for the House keeping to itself the final approval of the selection of the route, I say that to-day there are reasons as strong and stronger why the House should take the course which it failed to take in 1868. The choice of the routes for this subsidy lies between two routes, one upon foreign territory through the State of Maine, and the other through Canadian territory. I desire to be neither captious nor factious, but I say that unless the House adopts the course which I suggest, and reserves to itself the final choice of that route, I fear there will be a miscarriage of justice. I fear that the Maine route may be adopted—I say adopted, not selected—not selected upon a comparison of the two, but simply adopted upon insufficient surveys. Nor do I believe that my language, strong as it may appear, is too strong; for last year, when the Government asked for this appropriation, their mind, as far as we could judge at the time, was made up in favor of the Maine line, and not in favor of the Canadian line. This appears to me to be conclusive from the language then made use of by Sir Charles Tupper, in introducing this measure. He used this language:

“Then a very strong feeling has grown up in the Maritime Provinces, and not only in the Maritime Provinces, but throughout Canada, because, I believe, that from British Columbia down through the North-West Territories, through the Province of Ontario, and in the Province of Quebec, there has been a strong and general sentiment that this great inter-oceanic line of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be incomplete if we were obliged to have our Atlantic terminus in a foreign country. I believe that sentiment is not at all confined to the Province of Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, or the Province of New Brunswick, but I believe it has taken just as deep a hold of the minds of our friends in the other Provinces almost as it has in the Maritime Provinces. Although every effort has been made to render the operation of the Intercolonial Railway as successful as possible, although more has been accomplished in the development of the country, in the development of the trade and business of the country, through the agency of the Intercolonial Railway than any person on either side of this House a few years ago supposed to be possible, still we have found we were too heavily handicapped by the distance, and that we could not—reluctantly as we were driven to the conclusion, we have been driven to the conclusion by the force of circumstances and by the practical results, that it is impossible for the ports of St. John and Halifax to compete with the nearer ports of Portland and Boston in the United States. Under these circumstances, the attention of the Government has been drawn, as I have said on one or two occasions before in this House, to the best means by which we ought to secure a realisation of that which we all desire, the Atlantic terminus being in Canadian territory as well as the Pacific terminus, and thus be placed in a position to fairly compete for the great trans-continental trade and traffic that we all know must flow over that line. Although that may involve the necessity of passing for a certain portion of that line through a foreign country, we believe that even that is a comparatively insignificant point compared with the great importance of having the ocean ports both on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts, within the borders of our own country.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly remarkable language. It is especially remarkable language in the mouth of Sir Charles Tupper, because we all remember that that hon. gentleman has always held to be something approaching treason, the mere suggestion that we might pass through foreign territory for any portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway; and yet, Sir, he came here with the statement that we have to pass through foreign territory for this line. In his speech there is no mention of any route but the foreign one, and if the mind of the Government had not been made up at that time in favor of the Maine route, if they had even contemplated that it would have been possible to find a way through our own territory, it is safe to assume that Sir Charles Tupper would have made some mention of it; but he did not do so. What he said was that it would, perhaps, be necessary to pass through foreign territory; and what other conclusion can we draw, even though no resolution was recorded, but that their mind was made up that the subsidy should be given for a line through the State of Maine? And I believe the subsidy would have been granted, in accordance with that view, to this foreign company, but for the strong agitation which was

raised against it in this House, and which has been kept up ever since. When the Bill was before the House I moved an amendment similar in terms to the motion I now place in your hands. I asked that the choice of the Government should be ratified by Parliament; but this was denied, and the motion was voted down. But in order to get their followers to vote it down, the Government promised that they would, during the recess, have surveys made of the different routes proposed. And, Sir, the opinion has been prevalent since, that although there have been surveys made during the summer, these surveys have been neither thorough, accurate nor complete. Not only so, but statements of a similar kind have been made and widely circulated in the press—not the press of the Opposition, but the Ministerial press. I will give to the House a sample of the articles which were published at that time, and which the Conservative press of the Province of Quebec have been full of during the summer. The Ministerial press, speaking of the explorations made of the different routes proposed, not in Canada, but through the State of Maine, said :

“ This exploration is not made. What is now taking place is a farce, a snare, and a sham exploration. The instructions given to the engineers are insufficient, and the engineers are the first to admit it.”

That is the statement of a Ministerial paper.

An hon. MEMBER. What paper?

Mr. LAURIER. *Le Canadien*.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. I do not understand what these hear, hears mean. *Le Canadien* is certainly a Ministerial paper. It is true, we have in the Province of Quebec two shades of blue; there is the darker hue and the lighter hue. It is true, the opinion of *Le Canadien* is supposed to be that of the light blue, but I can give the opinion of a deep blue as well—the opinion of *L'Etendard*, which is certainly as true blue as any; and you will find, Mr. Speaker, that it is quite worthy of its color, because its language is stronger than any used by *Le Canadien*. Here is what *L'Etendard* said on the 25th of July last :

“ The apprehensions of the adversaries of the Sherbrooke line would seem to be, to a certain degree, justified by the fact that Mr. Pope, Acting Minister of Railways, is said to be partial to the extent of not giving to the engineers the instructions necessary to ensure an impartial survey of the different rival routes.”

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the opinion of the Ministerial press of the Province of Quebec. The *Castor* press may differ from the rest of the Blue press on some questions of practical politics, but on this question they were of the same mind, that the instructions given to the engineers were not in good faith, and that the surveys were not thorough and accurate. But we have heard recently—not from a newspaper organ, but from a member of Parliament—that he had been informed that the instructions given to the engineers were not sufficient, and he gave an instance in illustration. He stated that he had seen information that a certain engineer had been instructed to survey a certain route, which he found very practicable until he came to a knoll that rose abruptly from the ground to a height of 400 feet. He reported this fact to the Government, and was told that the Government wanted to give up the exploration, to back out, but the engineer succeeded in finding on the other side of this knoll a better route than on the side previously followed. This has been stated by the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), and therefore the statements of the press are none too strong. It is all the more necessary Parliament should reserve to itself the final decision in the matter; it is all the more necessary that the choice of the Government should not be finally made until all the information and data have been placed before Parliament, and the reasons made apparent why one line should be adopted in preference to another. I under-

stand that our friends from the Maritime Provinces feel strongly on the subject of the short route. So do we all. It is not a question confined to them; it is a question which interests the whole of Confederation. It is a question on which we all feel strongly, but at the same time every one must admit that it will be looked upon as a misfortune if, after we have had an ample and thorough survey, we have to come to the conclusion that it is impossible to find through our own territory as good, or almost as good, a line as we can find through foreign territory. Every one will agree that it would be inexpedient to spend a single dollar of Canadian money in building a line through a foreign Country until we have satisfied ourselves, by a most thorough survey, that it is impossible to find as good a line on Canadian territory. Yet, as I have said, my impression is, and it is warranted by the facts, that when the Government brought down these resolutions upon which the Act was framed, their minds were made up in favor of the line through the State of Maine. Although at the very time that the then Minister of Railways (Sir Charles Tupper) spoke, the press—especially the press of the city which I have the honor to represent—strongly contended that it was possible to find a route as short, if not shorter, through our own territory, than could be found through the State of Maine. The plan suggested, the *tracé* of the route indicated, was that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be extended over the North Shore Railway to the harbor of Quebec; that the St. Lawrence should be bridged at Quebec; that the Intercolonial should be used to Rivière du Loup, and that from Rivière du Loup a short line might be constructed, for which there is already a charter, to Edmonton, to connect with the New Brunswick system of railways. That plan is said to be perfectly practicable. It is true it involves the building of a bridge across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, but the Maine route involves the bridging of the St. Lawrence at Montreal. Besides the choice between the two bridges there is the question of distance. The hon. Minister of Railways last year (Sir Charles Tupper) said the distance between Montreal and the harbor of St. John by the Maine route was 427 miles. This was the only route of which the hon. Minister spoke, and the figures he gave have since been controverted in the Quebec press. I am anxious and willing on this occasion to take all my arguments especially from the Ministerial press, and from the Ministerial organs I take the following figures, which show that the distance was not 427 miles, as then stated by the hon. Minister of Railways, but 479 miles, between St. John and Montreal, over the Maine line, namely :

	Miles.
From St. Martin's Junction to Mile End.....	10
From Mile End to Lachine.....	9
From Lachine to Sherbrooke, including the bridge on the St. Lawrence at Lachine.....	93
From Sherbrooke to Megantic.....	69
From Megantic to Woodstock.....	170
From Woodstock to Fredericton.....	69
From Fredericton to St. John.....	68
Total.....	479

It was further claimed that by the route over the North Shore Railway and the Intercolonial and Rivière du Loup and Edmonton, the distance would only be 466 miles, as follows :

	Miles.
From St. Martin's Junction to Petite Rivière Junction.....	166
From Petite Rivière Junction to Chaudière Junction (including the bridge over the St. Lawrence).....	6
From Chaudière Junction to Woodstock.....	176
From Woodstock to Fredericton.....	60
From Fredericton to St. John.....	58
Total.....	466

So that between St. Martin's Junction and St. John, according to these figures, the Canadian route would actually be

shorter than the Maine route. Now I do not give these figures as accurate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LAURIER. How can you give any accurate figures till you have a survey. At this time it is impossible for a man to give accurate figures, and no man will be in position to do so until we have these surveys made. Then, when we have the figures, as determined by the surveys that must take place, we will be able to show which calculation is the right one. At present we can deal only with approximate figures, and these approximate figures show that, even if the figures which I have given in favor of the Canadian line be perhaps estimated on a sanguine basis, they still show that after all the difference cannot be very great, and they show still more the necessity of having an absolute survey, which should be reported to Parliament before Parliament is called upon to take action, and especially before the choice of the Government is finally made. It is true, upon the question of mileage we cannot speak with accuracy, as we have not yet had a survey, but though we have not had a survey we can speak with something like accuracy upon the other feature of the railway, that is to say, upon the question of grades and curvatures. On this point we are all sufficiently conversant with the geography of the different localities to know that all the advantage will be in favor of the Canadian line, that is the line by the North Shore Railway, over the Intercolonial Railway and through Rivière du Loup to Edmonton, which for two-thirds, or at least two-fifths, of its distance is completely over level ground, while there would be but very little undulating ground between Rivière du Loup and Edmonton; we all know that the line through the State of Maine would be completely over a mountainous country; and this fact, without any further consideration, shows that the advantage would be altogether in favor of the Canadian route. There is also another argument to be used against the line through the State of Maine. It is not an argument I would press so much on hon. members on this side as on hon. gentlemen opposite, with whom it must carry great weight, because we have heard it applied by them over and over again, with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have heard it stated by them again and again, even during this very Session, that it was extremely objectionable that we should use the American lines on the south shore of Lake Superior, because, forsooth, if we did our immigrants would be snatched away from us by the wiles of the astute Yankee immigrant agents. If that is to be accepted as an argument in the west, it ought to hold as good in the east. If our immigrants, when they pass through American territory south of Lake Superior, are liable to be exposed to the blandishments of Yankee colonisation agents, will they not be equally subjected to the same when they pass through the State of Maine. This is not a very strong argument, I admit, but it is one that has frequently commended itself to the majority of this House. There is, however, a strong argument to be used against the line through the State of Maine. It has been stated in this House, Session after Session, that it was in the general interests of the country that the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway should be the harbor of Quebec, and that the winter terminus should be some port in the Maritime Provinces, either St. Andrews, St. John, or Halifax. Not only has it been stated here, without any contradiction by a single hon. member of this House, but it has been stated as the policy of the Government. I have had occasion before, during the present Session, to quote the language of a prominent hon. member of the Government on this matter, and I will not repeat it, but I will repeat the language made use of last year by the hon. the Minister of Public Works, because it commits the Government to the policy, that the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway should

Mr. LAURIER.

be the harbor of Quebec. This is the language which was made use of last year by the hon. the Minister of Public Works. He said:

"In answer to the hon. member for Bellechasse, I must say this: the hon. gentleman speaks as if the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not to be in the Province of Quebec. That extension is to be from Montreal to Quebec, and in the Province of Quebec, and for the benefit of the whole Dominion, but especially for the Province of Quebec. The intention is to make the harbor of Quebec the eastern terminus, in summer, of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This has been asked, the people and the press have asked it; and we have come down with these resolutions to carry it out; that is to say, we propose to give \$6,000 per mile in order that the terminus of the Canadian Pacific shall be in the harbor of Quebec."

So here is the policy of the Government in that matter. The harbor of Quebec is to be the summer terminus of the Canada Pacific Railway. Now, I ask it, if this line through the State of Maine is built, if this subsidy contemplated by the Act is to be applied to a line which is to pass through the State of Maine, what will become of the policy of the Government? Wherever the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway is put on paper, let it be put on paper in the city of Quebec. If this line is constructed, the policy of the Government becomes nugatory, and never, in reality, will the harbor of Quebec be the summer terminus, or the terminus at any other season, of the Canadian Pacific Railway. From what we know of the geography of the place, it is plain and manifest that, if the bridge is constructed at Lachine, and then a road is built to connect with the present system of railways, through the State of Maine, as soon as the freight reaches the point of junction—that is, St. Martin's Junction—it will be deviated to the American ports, and not a pound of it will go to Quebec.

Mr. IVES. You mean, it will take the shortest route if it is built?

Mr. LAURIER. If the difference was very large it would take the shortest route, but, as it is not very large, the propensities of the Canadian Pacific Railway are so well known in favor of an American road, that it will take that direction. When it is deviated over the Maine road, will the trade find its way to the Maritime Provinces? This is a consideration for gentlemen coming from the Maritime Provinces, and especially those coming from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I ask, if the trade is brought over that line to the State of Maine, will it reach the ports of St. John and Halifax? It is certain that, if the line is built through the State of Maine, it will be tapped by the American system of railways, that is to say, by the railway which runs from Portland to Bangor, and from Bangor extends northward, and then, when the trade is at the point of junction, what direction will it take? Will it be carried through the ports of the Maritime Provinces to St. John and Halifax, or will it be taken to Portland? If you look at the map, it is almost impossible to say whether it would be nearer to St. John or to Portland, but the difference would be settled by the well-known preference of the Canadian Pacific Railway for an American port. In connection with this, I may recall the attention of the House to the language of Mr. Stephen, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, at the city of Portland, in the month of October, 1882. This is what he said then:—

"Perhaps you are aware that the Canadian Pacific Railway has been at work for three years. Three years ago we made a contract to build a line of railway from Montreal to the Pacific Ocean, a distance of about 2,900 miles, and we have progressed so far that I think I am safe in saying that, within two years, or two more working seasons, the road will be complete, and a main line connecting the Pacific Railway of Montreal to the Pacific Ocean will be complete."

"In addition to that, we shall have, by January or February of this coming year, a line of railway from Montreal to Chicago, connecting at St. Louis with the Canadian railway, giving us a through road from Montreal to Chicago. That brings us under the control of the Canadian railway, and from the Pacific Ocean to Montreal, a line from Chicago, and it is not unnatural, having reached Montreal, and, as you are well aware, Montreal being only a six months' port, we should be looking to the question of reaching the Atlantic, and it is not unnatural that our

eyes should be cast upon the most direct way, and whether we shall be able to accomplish our object will depend a little upon yourselves. We think, as I said before, that Portland has great capacity in that respect, and I may say, for my colleagues and myself, we are anxious to do all we can to endeavor to get a foothold here."

This is what was said by Mr. Stephen in 1883. He and his colleagues were most anxious to get a foothold at the port of Portland. At that time Mr. Stephen was negotiating with the Ogdensburg and Portland Railway in order to get that foothold, and it was after the negotiations with that road had failed that this project of a short line took the shape which it has since taken. I do not say it took that shape because of the failure of Mr. Stephen's negotiations to obtain the connection by the Ogdensburg and Portland Railway, but it did take that shape after that failure; so it was quite a coincidence. Such being the facts, they show conclusively, to my mind, the great importance that no haste should be made in this matter, and that the choice of the Government should not be final, but that Parliament should reserve to itself the final decision to be given in this matter. And, if I am correct, perhaps we may expect such a result. Last year I made a similar motion. It was denied. The Government appealed to their supporters, and their supporters responded to that appeal and voted against the motion; but, if I am correctly informed, many of the hon. gentlemen who voted in that way did not sleep a very easy sleep afterwards, and my hon. friends the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Militia were the recipients, during the early summer, of many gentle complaints about it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No.

Mr. LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says no. One thing, however, is certain, if he has not been the recipient himself of many complaints, my hon. friend the Minister of Militia thought it wise to invite the members from that section to a pic-nic at Rivière du Loup, last summer, where a little pleasure and a good deal of politics were to be mixed up. The Premier was also to be invited to the pic-nic, and the pic-nic took place. No doubt it was a pleasant gathering, but it was not all pleasure. They thought and spoke of business, and especially of the vote given last Session, of the fact that the surveys were not thorough or accurate, and they prevailed upon the Premier, if the reports are to be believed, to say that no action would be finally taken by the Government until their choice had been subject to the ratification of Parliament. At least the Ministerial press at that time said so, and I will quote again from the paper from which I quoted a moment ago:

"The pic-nic took place on the 20th of August, and the following day the following message was sent to a Ministerial paper published in the city of Quebec:—'Sir John A. Macdonald formally bound himself yesterday to submit the different explorations to Parliament before adopting any route.' This had been denied last Session."

Whether this statement is accurate or not, we will soon know; but whether accurate or not, I believe this is the course which the Government ought to adopt, and which the House ought to adopt. Let me again recall to the recollection of the House what took place in 1868, when the first choice for the route to connect Montreal with the harbors of the Maritime Provinces was made. When Mr. Dorion asked that the choice of the Government should not be finally made before all the data, all the information, and all the surveys and reports were brought down, so that they might be discussed and the best route adopted, the Government then said: You know we are unbiassed, you know we will do for the best, and therefore you can trust us. They were trusted, and unbiassed as they were, though they had at heart, as they said, the best interests of the country, they made the very worst choice that could be made, a choice, indeed, so bad, that they are now forced to come to Parliament and ask for another appropriation in order to supplement their former deficiency. Now, these are reasons which, in my opinion, ought

to determine the House to support the motion I am about to lay before it. Neither on this occasion nor on any other would I appeal to the House through any sectional motive, through any motive which applies to one section of the country and not to another. It is true that in this matter, though I am advocating what I conceive to be in the interest of the whole country, yet the course I propose would especially benefit the city which I have the honor to represent in this House; and, therefore, while expecting the support of the whole House, I look particularly for the warm, effective, and active support of those who, with me, represent the old city of Quebec and the country of which it is the centre. I now move, Mr. Speaker:

That the route for the line of railway to connect Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax, for which a subsidy of \$170,000 a year, for fifteen years, was provided by the statute of last Session, 47 Victoria, chapter 8, should be subject to the approval of Parliament.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I regret that the hon. gentleman who has put this motion before the House did not accept the offer I made him and has not complied with the request made to him to defer proceeding with this motion until the plans and the reports of all the surveys were laid before the House, as we promised they should be. However, the hon. gentleman, of course, is at liberty, as a member of Parliament, to do as he pleases in that respect; he has taken advantage of that privilege, and I do not blame him for it. But the House will see that we are not to-day in a position to discuss this question. We have no plans, we have no surveys, we have no information whatever. The hon. gentleman himself felt the weakness of his position when he brought forward just now certain figures of distances; he said he would not vouch for those figures, as they were not official. Now, if all the information was before the House we would then be in a position to say whether this line is the shortest or the longest, and to decide which was the best. As we promised some time ago, I now repeat, that all the information will be laid before the House as soon as it can be gathered. The hon. gentleman has made a long speech, and an eloquent one, as he is accustomed to make, but I must say that I am not to-day in a position to enter into the details of the subject, in answer to the hon. gentleman. When I answer him I wish to have all the information afforded by the plans and surveys, and all the information which has been gathered by the Department of Railways from the engineers, and which is now being prepared. Under these circumstances, the hon. gentleman may be sure that if I do not answer him now it is not out of want of respect for himself. I shall take another opportunity to do so, and as the hon. gentleman has not consented to postpone his motion, I move, seconded by Mr. Caron, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. LANGELIER. I cannot allow this debate to close without addressing a few words to the House on this question. It is a question of the greatest importance, not only to the city of which I happen to be chief magistrate, but, I may say to the whole Province of Quebec—or nearly the whole Province. All the hon. gentlemen of this House who come from the Province of Quebec are aware of the circumstances under which the construction of the North Shore Railway was undertaken. It was an immense enterprise, and when the scheme was proposed many great objections were urged against it. It was stated by many of my friends, that it would involve the Province of Quebec in very serious financial difficulties. And what was the answer that was given us by hon. gentlemen sitting opposite, who share the political opinions of the Government of the day? They said that the railway would involve those heavy sacrifices of money by the Province of Quebec for only a few years, and that then it would be made a link of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It must be in the recollection of every hon. member of this House, that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway had then been decided upon for several years previous;

it was in 1875 that the construction, by the Provincial Government of Quebec, of the North Shore Railway, was undertaken. Well, we were promised distinctly, by hon. gentlemen whose opinions were supposed to have some weight with the Government, that the North Shore Railway would be made a link of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have all along been relying upon that promise, and at this moment, it is well known that the attention of the whole of that portion of the Province of Quebec, with which I am particularly connected, is engrossed with this subject. It is a subject that interests not only the city of Quebec, but it interests all those localities whose business brings them to that city, and I may say that amongst those localities is my own county. It might be supposed by some hon. members of this House that my county, judging from its name, would be interested in the Lake Megantic line. I must say it is quite the reverse. My county has no business where that road passes. All its transactions are with the city of Quebec. So it is with a large portion of the Province. But it is not only that portion of the Province which is interested; it includes all that portion of the Province east of Montreal. It is too evident to require demonstration, that if the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway passes by a bridge at Lachine through to Sherbrooke, all that portion of the Province east of Montreal will be entirely deprived of all the advantages which had been promised to it, and which it had a good right to expect, from the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have a very vivid recollection of the fine speeches made when the policy of building a Canadian Pacific Railway was inaugurated. We were made to see, in imagination, immense trains of cars coming from the Pacific Ocean, laden with all the riches of China and Japan, and passing through the Province of Quebec, to be transferred to vessels in the harbor of Quebec. Those promises were made to us by gentlemen supposed to have a great deal of influence over the policy of this country; and upon those promises, not only the North Shore Railway was built at the expense of the Province, but very large works were undertaken in the harbor of Quebec. At the present time harbor works are being prosecuted in that city, the execution of which will cost some \$3,000,000. I ask all hon. members of this House what will be the use of these works if the Canadian Pacific Railway is not to come to the harbor of Quebec? They will involve a very serious burden upon the shipping of Quebec. These works are not executed at the expense of the Government. It is true that the present and the previous Governments have advanced money to the Harbor Commissioners, but the interest on that money has been paid by the shipping of Quebec. So it is a charge upon the trade of Quebec, and it is out of the revenues from the shipping and from the trade of Quebec that the harbor works are being built. Those works will be scarcely of any use if we do not get a share of the traffic which was supposed to be brought to this country and to the Province of Quebec by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Another consideration which makes this question of great interest to our portion of the country is this: We have been made to contribute, like all the rest of the Dominion, to the heavy expenditure which has been incurred for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We have been paying, as have the people of the other Provinces, the heavy taxes which have been entailed by the additional expenditure due to the construction of the transcontinental road. Another point of great interest in connection with the subject is this: The Intercolonial Railway has cost a very large sum of money, some \$40,000,000, to the Dominion. What will become of the Intercolonial if the Canadian Pacific Railway does not connect with it? It will become merely a local road. It scarcely pays its running expenses at this moment, and its position will be

Mr. LANGELIER.

much worse if the whole traffic is diverted, as it certainly will be, from that portion of the Province of Quebec, by the construction of a bridge at Lachine, and sending all the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic through Sherbrooke to the United States. It is a general opinion, and it is one shared in by all business men of Quebec with whom I have had occasion to speak on the subject, that if a bridge is built at Lachine, the whole of the Canadian Pacific Railway traffic will go to the United States within a very short time. The hon. member for Quebec East (Mr. Laurier), quoted, a few moments ago, some remarks made by the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which afford very good grounds for the impression which exists among business men in Quebec, that if the Canadian Pacific Railway crosses at Lachine, it will go, perhaps, for some time, to Sherbrooke, but will eventually leave that line and go direct to some United States port. Another reason which has been advanced by the hon. member from Quebec East is this, and it was mentioned to me by some very competent railway engineers: They say, it is impossible for a line like the Canadian Pacific Railway to go over the chain of the Alleghanies, as it will have to do if it passes through Sherbrooke, and compete with American lines going to Boston, New York and Portland, and that it will eventually have to go to Portland. Whereas, if it came to Quebec and connected with the Intercolonial and ran through Rivière du Loup, or Rivière Ouelle, and proceeded to some port in the Maritime Provinces, such as St. John or Halifax, whatever might be the wishes of the syndicate composing the Canadian Pacific Railway, it would then be impossible for them to take the railway to the United States, but they would be compelled to leave it in the Province of Quebec. I have no private information on the subject; I have to depend, like every other hon. member, upon information I can obtain from railway authorities, and I have been talking on the subject with several very well posted railway engineers. They all say that a line through Quebec, passing entirely over Canadian territory, can be found not much longer and with lower grades than the line which is almost adopted—the line passing through Sherbrooke. The length of the line is not the only consideration. The grades are important. The grades of a line through the Province of Quebec will be exceedingly easy. Everyone who has travelled over the country can see for himself that the grades cannot be difficult. It is stated that it will be necessary to build a bridge. The answer to that objection is a very easy one. If a bridge were necessary in adopting the Quebec route, and if it could be saved by passing through Lachine, it would be a very strong objection to the Quebec route. But, unfortunately, a bridge must be built. Is there any justice in building a bridge at Lachine in order to divert the Canadian Pacific Railway to that portion of Quebec where there are already railways, and sending it thence to the United States, instead of building a bridge near Quebec. I think another consideration can be advanced. Other things being equal, I think it cannot be disputed that the Province of Quebec and the city of Quebec deserve some consideration in this matter. It cannot be forgotten that from our city started out those missionaries and explorers who travelled all over North America. There is no place on this continent, either on this or on the other side of the Rocky Mountains, that has not been visited by missionaries or explorers who had left the city of Quebec. It may, indeed, be said that all this country has been settled through the city of Quebec and through the Province of Quebec. Quebec is the oldest Province of the Confederation and deserves some consideration in this respect, supposing it affords equal advantages with other routes. It must not be forgotten that the shortest line is not always the most successful, from a business point of view. The lines that cross the country from the western States to the Atlantic seaboard are not the shortest roads. There

are many other considerations. One of the most important is the desire of those who control a line to give it the traffic and the power to secure that traffic. Fifty or 100 miles would be nothing in the hands of such a man as Mr. Vanderbilt to bring traffic to his own line, and I think the same considerations apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is going to be a very powerful corporation; it is already very powerful, and I think they could very easily find a compensation for only some 50 or 60 miles, which, I am told by engineers, is the excess of distance of the line passing through Quebec and Rivière Ouëlle, or Rivière du Loup. I say that these might be easily compensated by energy and enterprise, and by the advantage which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have in bringing traffic over their own line. Some years ago, when the contract for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was before this House, it was proposed to dispense for some time with building the line to the north shore of Lake Superior. It is in the recollection of this House that such a policy was proposed, and when the leader of the Opposition proposed temporarily to go to Sault Ste. Marie and use some of the American lines to reach the fertile portion of the North-West Territory, that proposition was voted down by a large majority, and that policy set aside. On what ground? On the ground, that as this was a great national railway it should pass entirely on Canadian territory; and in order to carry out that policy the construction of a line of some 600 miles was undertaken, at the cost of some \$20,000,000, on the north shore of Lake Superior, where there is no present local traffic and scarcely any future possibility of traffic. I ask hon. members—and I am speaking for the portion of Quebec east of Montreal—do we not deserve as much consideration as the bears and moose on the north shore of Lake Superior? If \$20,000,000 are spent to build the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of Lake Superior, because it should pass through Canadian territory, is that principle to be abandoned when we come to the Province of Quebec? Those 600 miles were built there for no other purpose than for the sake of constructing the line on Canadian territory, because it cannot be contended that there will be any local traffic in that region; it would never have entered any person's mind to build it in that region as a local, or business, or commercial undertaking, and I ask if it is good policy for that region is it not good policy in the oldest Province of the Confederation, the pioneer Province of the Confederation, I may say. It was said, a short time ago, by the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) that it would be better to postpone the motion until further information was given. I could understand such a suggestion if it were now proposed to make a final choice of a line, but such is not the proposal of the motion. The motion is only to this effect: that no line be finally adopted without being submitted to and approved by this House. We do not want any information to decide that question; we have all the information necessary to pronounce judgment on that point. What further information could any plans or reports of engineers give us? Those plans would be of immense use to us when we come finally to decide the question, if it is left to the decision of the House, but presently they are of no use whatever. The question is, whether it is better that the selection should be decided by this House, or by the Government of the day, in private conference with the syndicate of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not think there can be two opinions on that point. We know what an influence such a powerful company can exert on a Government—I do not say it would be exerted in an improper manner, but it is undoubtedly a very great influence. The policy adopted last year was—and the promises of the Government since have been in accordance with that policy—that the shortest and best line to the Atlantic seaboard would be adopted. There may be a great many opinions as to the shortest and best

line. It is quite possible that a line which might appear best to the Government in private consultation with the Canadian Pacific Railway would not be considered the best and shortest if its merits and demerits were discussed in the House. There is nothing like public discussion to bring out light, and if the matter be left to the House the greatest amount of light will be thrown on the subject. All these reports of engineers will be discussed and examined and gone into, and then the House, if it is of opinion that it is absolutely impossible to carry the line through Canadian territory, will have to give up that idea. I am quite sure that no hon. member would insist on a line which would be a practical or commercial impossibility, but we should be put in possession of all the reasons which can be adduced for or against that line, or any other line. There is another reason, why our minds should not be quite easy on this subject and I will allude to some facts which are quite public. On the 20th of July last, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin) happened to be in Quebec at the laying of the corner stone of the examining warehouse, and he took the opportunity to speak of the future of Quebec and the harbor of Quebec. He repeated there that no line would be adopted finally without the closest and most minute survey of all proposed lines, and those who were present believed that all possible consideration would be shown to the line through Quebec. On the 10th of August, Mr. Stephen, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, speaking to a reporter of the *Sun*, said that the Lake Megantic line was to be selected. This was enough, I think, to make the public mind uneasy in that portion of the Province. But that is not all. On the 19th of August there was a celebrated pic-nic at Rivière du Loup, given by the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Caron), and if we are to believe that hon. gentleman, it was composed of only the very best portion of the Conservative party. If we are to believe the papers supporting the Government, those present, as we say in French, were *triés sur le volet*, and if we are to believe those same papers, there was a distinct promise made at that time by the Prime Minister that a line through Canadian territory would be chosen, and that at any rate nothing would be done without the assent of Parliament. Well, that may have two meanings. It may mean the assent of Parliament after the line is chosen; and it may mean without the assent of Parliament previously obtained. Under these circumstances, I think the House perfectly justified in insisting that no line should be chosen before being approved by it. Such, at all events, is my impression, and such is the opinion of the people of Quebec. There is a strong impression that unless the line is selected on the approval of Parliament openly, and after a full, public discussion, the city of Quebec and the larger portion of the Province of Quebec will not obtain justice. We simply ask justice, and we think we ought to get justice. After having spent so much money in territories where there is scarcely any population, we think the interests of the oldest Province of Confederation should be considered with a great deal of care. If our interests are to be sacrificed, we think they should be sacrificed only on good grounds—on grounds that can be defended in a House like this, and not on grounds that are discussed privately, and that cannot be controverted, as they would be controverted in a full and open discussion in this House.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES. (Translation). Mr. Speaker, after hearing the two eloquent speeches which have just been heard, there are but few things left for me to say on the matter now occupying the attention of the House. But the division I represent is so deeply interested in this question that I shall venture to offer a few remarks. Last Session when the hon. the Minister of Railways submitted to the House the resolutions which have become so famous, owing to the debate to which they gave occasion, the hon.

member for East Quebec (Mr. Laurier) moved in amendment a motion which read as follows:—

"That the said resolution be not now read a second time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole with power to amend the same, by providing that the route for the line of railway connecting Montreal with the harbors of St. John and Halifax, for which a subsidy of \$170,000 a year for fifteen years, is provided, should be subject to the approval of Parliament."

The construction of the line proposed by the hon. the Minister of Railways is certainly calculated to carry off the traffic of the Pacific Railway to the United States, thus depriving the Quebec Harbor of such traffic. Therefore, the demand of the hon. member for East Quebec was perfectly just. He desired to save, from a summary condemnation, the city which he so worthily represents. It was his opinion as it is the opinion of every Liberal, that if the question was considered without passion, and without preconceived ideas, the House could not do otherwise than to accept the plan of running the Pacific through Quebec, because this line would be about the same length as the other proposed lines and altogether better suited to the general interests of the country if not to the desires of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. By refusing to vote for this motion the hon. members who were opposed to it have refused to Quebec that justice to which it was entitled, and I have reason to believe, Mr. Speaker, that certain hon. members must have regretted the vote which they had given on that occasion, when, a few days after the Session, they had to meet their constituents. What the hon. member for East Quebec asked for in his amendment was a simple act of justice, and I think that those who voted against this amendment have ignored the interest of their Province. Indeed, it was taking away from Quebec all chances and all hopes of ever realising from the Pacific Railway the full benefit which was expected from it, because, from that day it became evident that if the Montreal and Halifax route *via* Sherbrooke was adopted almost the whole of the Province of Quebec, at least that part of the Province of Quebec which lies east of Montreal, comprising over thirty counties and three or four cities, which have contributed largely to the construction of that railway, all that part comprised between Montreal and the Gulf on the north shore of the St. Lawrence would be completely isolated. A great deal could be done in that part of the country in favor of colonisation, but, unfortunately, the means at the disposition of the Local Government have not allowed us to make as much progress as we should have desired. However, it is under these circumstances that the Federal Government has asked us to vote large sums of money for the construction of the Pacific Railway. The people of the Province of Quebec have adopted that policy; the electors have consented to favor the construction of that railway on the express promise made by the present Ministry, that we should profit largely by the construction of the Pacific Railway, which was to give us the western traffic, and even that of the United States. The people have accepted that policy, if we are to judge by the last elections, but, at the same time, I wish to remind the House that it was accepted on the express promise that we should profit by its being carried out. That promise, Mr. Speaker, has been repeatedly renewed to us. It has been made by the hon. Premier during his visit at Quebec in 1880, when he told us that we should have the terminus of the Pacific Railway at Quebec; it was made by Sir Charles Tupper, who said that even should the Quebec line be the longest of any other by a hundred miles, we should have the terminus of the road at Quebec, that promise has been made by the Minister of Public Works, whose words it is useless for me to recall, for I think the press has reminded him of them often enough, finally it is the promise of the Government themselves, and only for that promise, Mr. Speaker, the people of the Province of Quebec would never have accepted that policy,

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES,

they would never have consented to the construction of the Pacific Railway. And I am not speaking on a supposition; it is a fact which nobody can doubt. In order to know what is the public sentiment in the Province of Quebec on that question, all one has to do is to read the newspapers of whatever political shade they may be. Even at the risk of inducing some hon. members to say "hear, hear," as they did when the hon. member for East Quebec was speaking a moment ago. I shall read an extract from a Conservative newspaper published at Quebec, *Le Canadien*, of the 17th of January, 1885. It said:

"In face of the immense interest we have to serve, it is absolutely necessary for us that our line of battle should offer a solid, compact front, that we should rise superior to our personal leanings or dislikes and work all together in order to attain the one great object which is to secure the Pacific terminus at Quebec."

I find in *Le Canadien* of the same date, the report of a meeting held in the county of Quebec, which is represented here by my hon. friend, the hon. Minister of Militia and Expense. Some time before the Session there was a meeting at Saint Coloman, an important parish of the county of Quebec. At that meeting were present Mr. Garneau, the representative of the county in the Local Legislature, a Conservative, M. Charlebois and M. C. Pelletier, both also Conservatives. I will take the liberty of quoting an extract of a speech made on that occasion by Mr. Charlebois, who said:

"Mr. J. A. Charlebois held that the Government ought to keep his pledge and bring the Pacific at Quebec. If Quebec is deprived of that advantage all the traffic goes to the Americans."

And at that meeting the following resolutions were adopted:—

"That during the late Session of Parliament it was expressly understood, and the Government pledged themselves to locate the summer terminus of the Canadian Pacific to Quebec."

"That it is in the interest not only of the citizens of Quebec and vicinity, but also of the Province of Quebec that this pledge should be kept."

"That the policy of the country being to make of the harbor of Quebec the summer terminal point of the Canadian Pacific, as has been proved by the declaration of the Ministry during last Session, and by the granting of a subsidy of \$6,000 per mile of railway as far as Quebec, it is necessary in the interests of the Province that that part of the line should be built immediately, and should be made available to the Province as part of the shortest line to Halifax by means of a bridge across the St. Lawrence in the neighborhood of the city of Quebec."

"That by allowing the Pacific to cross the St. Lawrence by means of a bridge above Montreal the Province of Quebec would lose most of the advantages that we should reap from the construction of our line. Our Canadian railway would thus become an American railway crossing Canadian territory, and carrying all its freight to the American ports."

"That the only way to protect Canadian interests would be to limit this line to Canadian territory."

"That the construction of this projected line of railway from Montreal to the Maritime Provinces *via* Sherbrooke and the State of Maine, would be the virtual abandonment of the compact of Confederation, namely: A national line from the Atlantic to the Pacific exclusively on Canadian territory."

"That the enormous sacrifices made by the Province of Quebec for the development of the resources of the country by building a national line, ought to be rewarded by the extension of the Pacific to Quebec and by the construction of a bridge across the St. Lawrence near Quebec."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall read an article bearing date the 30th of January last, from the *Morning Chronicle* which I believe is the organ of the Minister of Militia and Expense. Here is what it says on the question of the Pacific Railway:

"Over and over again, it has been promised that the summer terminus would be located in Quebec. The time has arrived for the fulfilment of the promise. Nothing but justice, full and ample, will satisfy the people of this city, who have for many years made such heroic sacrifices, and spent vast sums of money in the construction of important public works. The members of Parliament and of the Senate, representing this district, irrespective of party, must unite on this question, and join the Board of Trade in its eminently reasonable demands. Those demands are well expressed in the petition. The Canadian Pacific Railway Syndicate owes much to Quebec, and it will not do now for the promoters of that enterprise to ignore our just claims. The railway has always been regarded as a national, rather than as a private enterprise. It has been largely subsidised by the people's money, and when more funds were demanded at various stages in the progress of the work, the people have not been slow to respond in a way which has met with the approval of the company."

And further it adds :

"The road was destined to open up a great tract of territory, and to plant the seeds of colonisation and civilisation in a vast wilderness, it is true, but another object was unquestionably the opening up of a market for the manufactures and other products of the older Provinces comprising the Confederation.

"To that end, the Province of Quebec undertook the building of the railway from Quebec to Ottawa, at a total cost of some fourteen millions of dollars. The plan included an extension of the same line to Lake Nipissing, the point agreed on by the Dominion Parliament for the eastern terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway, thus forming the connecting link between the latter and the Intercolonial. Our city voted one million dollars for the construction of this road, the citizens feeling that the enterprise deserved a material endorsement at their hands. That endorsement was freely given, the understanding being clearly that Quebec would be one of the summer termini and the point of connection with the Intercolonial Railway."

Mr. Speaker, I think I have sufficiently explained the position to indicate what is almost the unanimous sentiment of the citizens of Quebec, and to show that the electors of Quebec are opposed to the construction of the railway from Montreal to Halifax *via* Sherbrooke. I do not hesitate to say that this Quebec line, although useful to the district of Quebec, may conflict with private interests, as it has been insinuated by some newspapers, but it will in no way conflict with the interests of other Provinces and of the Dominion at large. In order to prove my statement, I cannot do any better than to submit to the House the resolutions passed by the Quebec Board of Trade on the 20th of January, 1885, which resolutions have been sanctioned by the citizens of Quebec at a public meeting held on the 3rd of the following month of February. The resolutions set forth :

"That when the federation of the Provinces of British North America was resolved upon, the construction of a national highway entirely through Canadian territory was one of the conditions mutually agreed to ;

"That this great public work was undertaken with the view of binding solidly together the several Provinces composing the Dominion of Canada ;

"That in the pursuance of this agreement, the Intercolonial Railway has been constructed—and the Canadian Pacific Railway is being built, and to the north of Lake Superior ;

"That this policy will entail responsibilities on the people of the country ;

"That, in addition to her share in these, the Province of Quebec has assumed a further liability in the construction of the late Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, and the city of Quebec a still further one, in her subscription to the North Shore Railway ;

"That the construction of the late provincial railway was undertaken on the understanding that it would form part of our national highway, and be the connecting line between the Canadian Pacific and Intercolonial Railways ;

"That this understanding was admitted during the late Session of Parliament, in the passing of an Act providing for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to the port of Quebec ;

"That, when the people of Canada consented to assume the responsibilities incident to the creation of this national highway, it was upon the solemn assurances, repeatedly given inside and outside of the halls of Parliament, that in the development of the trade of the country, the resultant thereof, and which would build up their sea ports, they would receive far more than commensurate returns ;

"That the diversion of the traffic of our national highway from Canada to American ports would leave the people of this country with these responsibilities, but without the equivalents promised ;

"That the result would prove disastrous in the extreme, and would seriously imperil the permanency of our present political system ;

"That the most effective way to prevent this diversion is by carrying the traffic of our national highway by the north of Quebec, the most eastern point where it is possible to bridge the St. Lawrence, by shortening the mileage to the seaboard, and by reducing freight rates to a minimum ;

"That towards the close of the late Session Parliament voted a grant in aid towards the construction of a line of railway from Montreal to Halifax—as the virtual extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Atlantic seaboard ;

"That several routes have been advocated for this projected line—among others :

"1st. Montreal *via* Quebec—River du Loup and Edmundston.

"2nd. Montreal *via* Quebec and Hartland.

"3rd. Montreal *via* Sherbrooke and Canterbury.

"That routes Nos. 2 and 3 pass through the State of Maine, and No. 1 entirely through Canadian territory ;

"That during the passage of the resolutions through Parliament the Government pledged themselves to a thorough study of the country and complete instrumental surveys of all the routes advocated previous to any action being taken in the selection of route ;

"That it would appear that this thorough study and these complete instrumental surveys have not as yet been fully made ;

"That the construction of this projected line of railway from Montreal to Halifax, through foreign territory, would be the virtual abandonment of the compact entered into at Confederation.

"That its construction, *via* the south shore would lead :—

"1st. To the bridging of the St. Lawrence at Lachine.

"2nd. To the almost inevitable diversion of the traffic of the country through this bridge to the American Atlantic sea ports,

"3rd. To a breach of faith with the Province and city of Quebec.

"4th. To the final isolation of the cities of Three Rivers, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, and of almost the three-fourths of the Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia from our national highway, and to their deprivation of all practical participation in the benefits to flow therefrom ;

"That the good faith and the welfare of the people of this country are intimately bound up in :—

"1st. The loyal and firm adherence to the policy mutually agreed upon at Confederation.

"2nd. The immediate extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to the port of Quebec, as decreed last Session.

"3rd. The bridging of the St. Lawrence at Quebec to connect the Canadian Pacific to the Intercolonial.

"4th. The construction of the link from River du Loup to Edmundston, and any other line which may be found necessary, to shorten the mileage to the Atlantic seaboard.

"5th. The refusal to sanction the bridging of the St. Lawrence at Lachine as a standing menace to our sea ports ;

"6th. And, likewise, the expenditure of the funds of Canada in the construction of any line of railway through foreign territory."

We ask for the extension to Quebec, but we want a real extension. We do not merely ask a running arrangement on the North Shore Railway, but the real terminus at Quebec, and besides a connection with the Intercolonial by the construction of a bridge near Quebec, this bridge to be used as an outlet for our colonisation roads. We ask for the terminus and we have a right to it because it has been promised to us, and because it is due to us as a compensation for the sacrifices of money which we have made towards the construction of the North Shore Railway and the Intercolonial and for the improvement of the Quebec Harbour. We are entitled to it because Quebec, owing to its geographical position, its vast seaport, and its proximity to the Atlantic, offers as a terminal port, advantages against which no other city can compete. On the other hand, it would be preposterous to prefer even a line which would be shorter by a 100 miles, if that line must pass through American territory, especially if we take into account the fact that by building a bridge at Quebec we can utilise a road already constructed, which has cost \$43,000,000, and which was built wholly on our own territory. I repeat what I said a moment ago. We ask for the terminus because we are entitled to it, because it was promised to us. If the thing is impossible to-day, it was equally so last year, and then why did the Government make such a promise? Why were we given to understand that the City of Quebec would not see its hopes frustrated? Why did the Government give us to understand that Quebec, and consequently the surrounding country would have the benefit of a connection between the Pacific and the Intercolonial by means of a bridge built at Quebec? I ask it also from those who are now occupying the Treasury benches. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that when the day—I will not say the day of retribution—but when the day of election shall come, when the hon. gentlemen now supporting the Government will be called upon by their electors to give an account of their conduct in the House, when they will be charged with neglecting the best interests of their Province, I believe that more than one among them will regret the vote they have given on that occasion. This is a matter of capital interest to us. If we have not the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Quebec, we may expect that the city of Quebec will diminish in importance. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Government will alter the decision which they seem to have taken, and that they will give justice to the Province of Quebec as they have so often boasted of giving justice to British Columbia. For the reasons I have just stated I shall vote for the motion of the hon. member for East Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I did not intend to speak on this subject, and I only rise, because none of the members for the Province of Quebec on the other side of the House appear disposed to take any part in the discussion. The motion before the House asks for delay. What is the object of delay? At the very beginning of the Session, on the second or third day after it opened, I asked, in this House, for these very papers. Now, we have been here nearly a month, and why are these papers not before the House? Does it require such a long time to get two or three reports upon the surveys which have been made? I know that the report of Mr. Wicksteed, at any rate, has been before the Ministers since before the Session; that I can aver. Now, what is to be gained by a little delay in this matter? Shall I say it openly? It is a matter of \$170,000 a year for a company. And who is to get the money? And who is to get the benefit of that money during the election? That is the long and short of it. Will it go to Sherbrooke? Will it help my hon. friend there, who is at present laughing at my words? He will laugh in his sleeve if he can get the money. Let us speak plainly—it is a matter of dollars and cents among the Ministers. Well, the Province of Quebec wishes that Quebec should have its fair proportion of money spent for a few years—for what? To go to the North-West Territories? But Quebec does not expect much from the members who represent the Province of Quebec on the other side. They are ready, as they did last year, to submit to the dictates of the Ministry, and they are going to do it: *à quat' pattes les Canayens*, I say, and we are going to see it again to-day. I did not want to say one word on this matter; only I looked around to see if there was any member on the other side of the House from the Province of Quebec who was ready to rise up and speak, but I did not see one. Is this not the most important measure for that Province that has ever come up? They are going to submit like shorn lambs to the dictation of the Minister of Public Works, and we are going to have this put off till to-morrow—"old to-morrow" again. I am now speaking on the motion to adjourn the debate, and I reserve to myself the right to speak on the main motion hereafter; and I object *in toto* to any delay in order to enable the Government to have their little lobbying. It is just as well to see whether this Parliament is going to have its say in this matter or not, and whether the voice of the people of the Province of Quebec is going to be heard. That is all I wanted to say.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to explain why I consider it impossible, for my part, to assent to my hon. friend's motion that this debate be adjourned. I should be extremely sorry to ask the House to come to a decision on any question, in the absence of information that was essential or important to reach a correct decision. My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Laurier) would equally regret to take such a course; but the hon. Minister of Public Works has, in the few words he said, misconceived the nature of this question. His usual perceptive powers and quickness of apprehension have deserted him on this occasion. I think the motion has been since the 4th of the month on the Order paper, and although he has had daily opportunities of scanning it he has not correctly apprehended what the motion is; and it is entirely because the hon. gentleman has entirely misconceived it—I see he is surprised—he can hardly conceal his light at this moment—that I hope to convince himself and his supporters of the impropriety of the step they are about to take. What is our present position with regard to this question? It is that there is a law upon the Statute Book leaving the selection of the route for which this public money has been appropriated absolutely and finally to the Governor in Council. That is the condition of things as it stands to-day; and as long as that condition of things exists, absolutely and irrevocably the Governor in Council can decide this question. What is the proposition of my hon. friend. It

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES.

is to affirm that that selection by the Governor in Council should not be final, but should be subject to the approbation of this Parliament, so that we may have an opportunity of considering the proposition of the Government, as to the route for which our money is to be paid and of deciding whether the choice which they shall ask us to agree to is a sound choice or not. If my hon. friend had proposed a motion which should indicate in any way, however inferentially or vaguely, what the route should be, he would be premature, because in order to form a judgment upon that subject we want the plans and reports. If he were to propose such a motion in the present state of the affair, he would, in my view, engage in a constitutional error also; because my belief is, that there is a reasonable partition of the Executive and of the legislative function in this transaction. My belief is that constitutionally it is the function of the Executive to obtain the necessary information to make its proposal for the expenditure of public money to Parliament, including, in that proposal, those communications as to the route which are necessary in order to enable Parliament to judge of the wisdom of the proposal as a whole. We propose to you to expend so much public money, and we propose to expend it for such an object in such a direction; there is our policy. We ask of you to accept it, or reject it, or modify it. That I believe to be sound constitutional doctrine. We affirmed it, as well as we could, from this side of the House, when the choice of the Intercolonial was the question; we endeavored to have it affirmed by the House last Session when the choice of the short line route was the question. In each case the Government declared that our view of constitutional law and parliamentary right was wrong; they declared that it was for the Executive to choose and to choose absolutely, finally, and irrevocably to settle the question. They procured the assent of Parliament in both cases to that view. Upon the Statute Book to-day is a law which cedes to them absolutely, finally, and irrevocably, the choice of this route. Now my hon. friend's object is simply to affirm that, at any rate, in this case, with reference to this transaction, the choice of the Government is not to be final; it is to affirm that whatever their view may be, after having obtained all the information necessary to a sound view, they shall submit their view to us and that we shall judge whether it is such a one that the public interest would allow us to sanction or not. Now, for that purpose it is not necessary to have the plans, it is not necessary to have the engineer's reports. These will be necessary when we come to consider what the proposal may be; these will be necessary when we will have to form a judgment whether their proposal as to a route is right or wrong; but they are by no means necessary in order to come to a conclusion whether we will wrest from the Administration of the day the power which they unconstitutionally asked us to give and we unconstitutionally gave them during last Session, and whether we should re-affirm our right, to a cogent and an effective voice in the choice of the route. I mentioned this subject in the debate on the Address. I sought to obtain from the hon. gentleman opposite an indication that they were prepared to surrender to this Parliament its fair share of power in this transaction. The hon. gentleman would not answer me; it was amongst the things not worth answering; he passed it by. My hon. friend put his notice on the paper. The hon. gentleman (Sir Hector Langevin) says: Delay; it is delayed at his request, for a considerable time. He says: Delay until the plans are brought down. They are not brought down. My hon. friend brings forward his motion. The hon. gentleman again says he wants the plans first brought down. My hon. friend persists, and persists rightly, in saying that the plans are not at all essential to the decision of his motion. The hon. the Minister, without a word of argument on this question, says: I move the adjournment, because I am not

going to answer these discussions as to rights, and so forth; to what purpose are these discussions of rights, and so forth, just now? They are for one purpose—an important purpose; they are to show that the question is one of such great importance, one involving interests constitutional, interests national, interests provincial, of such great magnitude that Parliament ought to re-assume what it unfortunately surrendered last Session. That is the only purpose of this motion. The question is one of great pith and moment; it is one of great importance; it is one of great complexity. So much has been demonstrated by the speeches of my hon. friends near me; so much will not be denied by hon. gentlemen opposite; and it is a voice in the discussion of a question of that importance which we seek to restore to Parliament. If the hon. gentleman would say, across the House, that Parliament is to have a voice in the decision of the question, my hon. friend's (Mr. Laurier) object would be accomplished. That is all he asks. But the hon. gentlemen will not say so; they will not give us that indication; they may give it, perhaps, to a choice selection of their friends and supporters in some private party, and it may be mentioned in the newspapers, but this House of Commons is not to be told it. The hon. Minister, whom the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. De St. Georges) calls the Minister of Militia and Expense, may, perhaps, procure from his chief and leader, in a private caucus of this description, some declaration or assurance; but that is not a declaration or assurance with which Parliament or the country can or ought to be satisfied. What we want is a declaration on this floor, in full Parliament, as to the intention of the Administration. Can it be that hon. gentlemen opposite are going to jump from one extreme to another? Can it be that, after having declined last Session to give us the right to determine whether their choice was good or ill, they are now proposing to abandon any power to choose themselves and to pitchfork the plans and profiles and reports upon the Table, and say: There is a scramble for you; let the House of Commons decide the question now; we will not? Is that the plan at present? Is it from absolute, exclusive executive action to an entire departure from all executive action they are about to bound? If it is, I can understand the hon. gentleman wanting to throw those papers on the Table and say: Here, gentlemen, choose for yourselves; quarrel among yourselves, decide among yourselves as you please. But if what he intends to do is, having obtained these papers, to consider of them, and having considered of them, to suggest what, in his opinion, the public requires, and having so decided, to bring down a conditional or provisional Order in Council, to propose his scheme in Parliament, on which Parliament shall judge—if that be his intention, we want no delay for this motion, which is only to secure to this House the power and voice that plan would give it. But the hon. gentleman will not assent to the motion being debated or decided. He says: I will hold this matter over until the plans come down. Are they to come down with the announcement that the route has been finally settled under an Act of Parliament? And are we to be told that we are to have the empty satisfaction of censuring the Government if they have done wrong, but that the route is chosen once and for all? Is the hon. gentleman going to act upon the power he insisted on taking last Session, or not? If he is, I can understand his wanting to get rid of this motion the easiest way. If he is not, then he confesses—no, Sir, he does not confess—an open confession would be good for his soul, but he is acting on the view that he was wrong then; he is acting upon the view that he was bound to concede something more to Parliament; he intends to concede it, but he does not choose to do it openly; he desires to postpone the motion until the papers come down, and to give us, in an indirect way, that repeal of the Act of Parliament which it is fair we should have openly, clearly and

directly. My hon. friend asks for nothing for which the production of any paper is necessary, but he asks for the affirmance of the constitutional share of this House in the choice of the route for this work. That does not depend upon the plans, but upon the general principle, and it is the decision of that which hon. gentlemen opposite, without giving us the slightest assurance that they are going to yield our just rights, seek to evade or to adjourn.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken says that my hon. friend who sits near me, the Minister of Public Works, has evidently misapprehended the meaning and intention of the motion. If my hon. friend has misapprehended it, that is a very good reason why he should ask for the delay, until he has an opportunity of fully understanding what is the intention of the motion. But there is really no misapprehension in the matter at all, on the part of my hon. friend; or, if there is, it is shared with the three hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec who spoke before him. Although this motion is merely a motion to state that the decision of the line shall be subject to the approval of Parliament, the hon. gentleman who moved it feels that a debate on the whole subject is absolutely enforced by this motion. He entered into the whole subject; he discussed the whole subject; he spoke about the line; he spoke about the different lines; he spoke in favor of one line against another; he spoke about a line through the State of Maine; and so did the other two gentlemen, the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langolier) and the hon. member for Portneuf (Mr. De St. Georges). They all argued the case without having the plans before them, and my hon. friend and we all feel that, when this question comes up to be discussed, it must be discussed with these plans before the House. No matter what the form of the motion may be or what specious arguments may be used, and used by the leader of the Opposition, yet those three gentlemen feel that this question is up on this motion. That being so, we insist and we call upon our friends to sustain us in this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. gentlemen say, "hear, hear." Yes, we call upon our friends, and we would have a right to call upon our friends, to vote against the motion altogether, on the arguments which have been used by the hon. gentlemen opposite. In the first place, the leader of the Opposition says that this House acted unconstitutionally last Session, and calls upon them to reverse their unconstitutional conduct.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Does the hon. gentleman expect that the majority of this House, who gave a solemn vote last Session, are going to eat their own words, simply because these gentlemen get up? Does he expect they will do so?

Mr. CASGRAIN. No, no.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then if the hon. gentleman does not expect it, very well. Then there would be another reason why the Government might call upon this House to vote against this resolution altogether, because, according to the language of the hon. member for Megantic (Mr. Langolier), and according to that of the hon. gentleman from L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain), this is a vote of want of confidence, a direct vote of want of confidence in the Government. What said the hon. member for Megantic? If this is left to the Government, if the interests of Quebec are confided to the Government, to a Government having the confidence of the majority of this House, they will betray the interests of Quebec. There was a distinct statement by that hon. gentleman that this was a vote of want of confidence. The member for

L'Islet went further. He is behind the scenes, and knows all about it. He said \$170,000 was to be paid by the Government and was to be handed over, to be used in the next general election. If we treated those arguments as serious, and declared this a vote of want of confidence, the Government would be quite satisfied to call upon their friends to declare that they have confidence in them and to vote against the resolution. But the request of my hon. friend, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, is a reasonable one. It is simply this, that as this question is of the very greatest moment, as it is one of the very greatest importance, it is well that the whole of the papers should be down before this House, and that Parliament should then judge whether this motion is to be received or not. After the papers and the plans, and the reports are down, when every man has been fully charged with a knowledge of the whole subject, then every man can declare how he will vote, whether he thinks Parliament should vote on this question at all or that it should be left in the hands of the Government. There is no reason why this motion should be pressed now. I was going to say it was a little bit of open tactic, very pardonable, very allowable—perhaps if I were in the hon. gentleman's position, I might take the same course—but it is simply a little bit of open tactic at this moment. There will be no harm in delay; the papers will be brought down, and then we can have the full discussion on the matter; but, in the meantime, I hope the House will not be dragged prematurely into the discussion, but will support the motion of my hon. friend.

Mr. MILLS. The motion which my hon. friend (Mr Laurier) has submitted, is not a question of the route which should be adopted. If the Government had made the choice, and Parliament were called upon to say whether that choice was wise or unwise, then Parliament would require to have the plans, in order to know which route should be chosen. But that is not the position of the House on this question at all. We are in precisely the same position now as we were when this Bill was originally submitted. When it was submitted it was not thought necessary that any choice should be made nor that the Government should indicate any particular line, but the question was then, as it is now, whether the Government should have the power of choosing absolutely the line of railway, and whether Parliament should be bound by that choice or not. If the law stands as it is now and the Government make a choice, that finally disposes of the question, then all the House could do would be to censure the Government for making an improper choice. What my hon. friend proposes is, that the House shall resume those functions which it abdicated when it gave its sanction to that particular Bill. It is for the hon. members of this House to say whether they are prepared to adhere to the principle in the Bill, of which my hon. friend complains by this motion, that the Government shall decide where the road shall be located and the public money spent. We desire that Parliament shall resume the power which properly belongs to the representatives of the people, and shall give to the Government the power of making the choice, of ascertaining the relative ease or difficulty with which particular lines may be constructed, but that the Government shall not have the power to make an absolute choice, which should ultimately remain with this House. The hon. the leader of the Government has said that this House is not going to recede from the position it took last year; that it is unreasonable to suppose that the views which hon. gentlemen formed when they gave the Government power, have changed since the Bill was carried. Why, Sir, I have seen Ministers themselves change their views with regard to matters of public policy, within two hours, and certainly we may reasonably suppose that the supporters of the Government may change theirs within

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

twelve months. Sir, there is such a thing, in this country, as public opinion; public opinion has been appealed to on this question; the people have voluntarily expressed their views on it, over a very large section of the Dominion; they have indicated a view which is not consonant with the policy adopted by the Government, and they have indicated that they are not satisfied with the course taken by the Government. They are not willing that the Executive shall exert powers, or shall have conferred upon them by Parliament, powers which the people have entrusted to Parliament and which Parliament has no right to transfer to another body, however able they may be. Now, Sir, that being the case, I am prepared to vote against the proposition of the hon. Minister of Public Works for delay. I think the motion of my hon. friend is a reasonable one. I think Parliament should resume those powers which of right belong to it, and that it is not of the slightest consequence what the plans may be. It is not of the slightest consequence where it may be best to locate the route—we have nothing to do with that question. It is of no consequence to us whether the Government make a wise or unwise choice in the selection of a route; that is not a question which the House has to consider. The question which the House has to consider is this: Will it allow the Government to make choice of a line of railway and to determine where the road shall be located, without retaining to itself the power of review of that choice, and of determining whether the road is properly located by the Government or not. It seems to me, Sir, that there is no necessity for the papers. If this proposition had come before us for the first time, if the Government were now asking for, or assuming, these powers, it would not be necessary to know where a road could be located—it would not be necessary to know the different lines of projected railway. These would not be of the slightest consequence. But what is of consequence is, that Parliament shall retain those powers which have been entrusted to it by the people, and that it shall not delegate those powers to the Administration of the day. It has delegated those powers, and my hon. friend, by his motion, asks Parliament to assume those powers which it improvidently transferred to the Government some time ago.

House divided on motion (Sir Hector Langevin) to adjourn the debate.

YEAS.

Messieurs:

Allison,	Fortin,	McLelan,
Amyot,	Foster,	McNeill,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gagné,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Gaudet,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Gigau t,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Girouard,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Gordon,	Orton,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Quimet,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Paint,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Pinsonneault,
Blondeau,	Hackett,	Pope,
Bowell,	Haggart,	Reid,
Bryson,	Hall,	Royal,
Burns,	Huy,	Rykert,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hesson,	Scott,
Campbell (Victoria),	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Carling,	Homer,	Sproule,
Caron,	Hurteau,	Stairs,
Chapleau,	Ives,	Taschereau,
Cimon,	Jamieson,	Tassé,
Cochrane,	Jenkins,	Temple,
Colby,	Kaulbach,	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Costigan,	Kinney,	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Kranz,	Tupper,
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Wallace (Albert),
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Wallace (York),
Outhbert,	Langevin,	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	Lesage,	White (Hastings),
Desjardins,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Renfrew),
Dickinson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wigle,
Dodd,	Mackintosh,	Williams,
Dundas,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dupont,	McCallum,	Woodworth,
Farrow,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wright.—104.
Ferguson (Welland),	McDougall (C. Breton),	

NAYS.

Messieurs :

Allen,	Fleming,	McIsaac,
Auger,	Forbes,	McMullen,
Bain (Wentworth),	Geoffrion,	Mills,
Blake,	Glen,	Mulock,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Paterson (Brant),
Cameron (Huron),	Harley,	Ray,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Rinfret,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Casey,	Jackson,	Somerville (Brant),
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Somerville (Bruce),
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Springer,
Cockburn,	Langelier,	Trow,
Cook,	Laurier,	Vail,
Davies,	Lister,	Watson,
De St. Georges,	Mackenzie,	Wilson,
Edgar,	McCraney,	Yeo.—49.
Fairbank,		

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

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

After Recess.

THE LATE JOHN MARTIN.

Mr. CURRAN moved for :

Copies of the petition of J. Hickson, Esq., and others, relative to the continuation of the pension of the late John Martin to his widow, and all papers in connection therewith.

He said: I make this motion, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of bringing to the notice of the hon. Minister of Militia and his colleagues, as well as of this House, a case of very great hardship indeed, in the hope that something may be done toward alleviating the position of this unfortunate lady who, I think, deserves better treatment from the country than that which is now being meted out to her. The facts of the case are these: This old lady, Mrs. Martin, is now nearly eighty years of age. In 1866 her son, who was a private of the 7th Prince of Wales Regiment, was ordered to the front with his comrades, and while in the performance of his duty, contracted the disease from which he died. Subsequently, the Government allowed the amount of \$110 per annum to his father as a pension. At the time of the death of this young man, his father and mother had another son, who, unfortunately, about two years afterwards, was killed by a railway accident. The old couple were then left entirely to their own resources, and during the lifetime of the father he was enabled, by his own labors and with the addition of this pension, to provide the necessaries of life for himself and wife. About two years ago the old man died, leaving his widow, on whose behalf I am making this motion, entirely without means of support, an object of public charity, and thrown upon the world for her subsistence. She has no relatives or friends upon whom she can make any claim for support; and in view of these facts, Mr. Hickson and a number of other prominent citizens of Montreal, who were acquainted with her circumstances, addressed a petition to the Department of Militia, requesting that the pension of \$110, which had been allowed to the late Mr. Martin, might be continued to his widow. I also addressed a letter, in connection with my colleagues, to the Department, and we received the following answer, addressed to myself:—

"Sir,—With respect to the letter of Mr. Robert Hay, addressed to you and transmitted to this Department, enclosing a petition signed by Mr. Joseph Hickson and other gentlemen, praying for the continuance of the pension of Mr. John Martin, I have the honor to state that in the Order in Council of the 13th April, 1867, authorising the payment of the sum of \$110 per annum to the father of Robert Martin, there is no mention that the pension is to be continued to any other member of the family. It therefore appears that there is no provision for continuing this pension to Mrs. Martin."

That, therefore, is the state of affairs. On different occasions I have listened to the eloquent remarks of the hon. Minister of Militia, with respect to the great valor of the Canadian people. I had occasion to listen to the magnificent orations he delivered some two years ago, on the con-

solidation of the Militia Acts, in which the hon. gentleman traced in glowing language the history of all the warlike movements of this country, from the earliest time down to the present day. I saw him unfurl the flag of Carillon and wave the banner of Chateauguay. As I listened with patriotic feelings to all those effusions, both here and elsewhere, I certainly felt proud to think that our fellow countrymen had on every occasion shown themselves worthy descendants of the warlike races from which we have sprung; and it would be difficult to picture, in language more eloquent than that of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia, the great deeds of our forefathers upon all occasions. Yet it strikes me that if we are to have a continuation of that spirit, if our young men are to shoulder the musket at the call of their country, it is very poor encouragement indeed that when an application of this kind is made by a poor old lady who has sacrificed her son in the country's cause, she should be told that all we can do is to allow her to sit on his tombstone and starve. For my part, I am quite satisfied that this communication from Colonel Panet is not the last which will be received in connection with this subject, and that the Minister will take the matter into his serious consideration, and that if necessary his colleagues and the Prime Minister, whose generosity of heart is so well known, will take the matter up, and this old lady will not be allowed, at eighty years, and after her son has sacrificed his life for the country, literally to starve or to beg from door to door, as she would be obliged to do if kind friends on whom she has no claim did not provide for her wants. I hope these few remarks will be sufficient to induce the Minister to look generously at this case of dire distress, and that the proper remedy will be applied, and the continuation of the pension to this poor woman ordered.

Mr. CARON. I must say that the hon. member has been very energetic in laying before the Department the claims of Mrs. Martin. The hon. gentleman appears in his proper role as a barrister, and comes forward to protect the widow, as, no doubt, if necessary, he would protect the orphan. This is one of those cases which are frequently brought before the Militia Department. Recognising, as I try to recognise, the claims of the militia force for services rendered to their country, I feel it is necessary that the claims should be confined to the statutory enactments, so far as they control the cases, and be kept within the Orders in Council which are passed, allowing pensions to be given to those who deserve them. The case, as laid before the House by my hon. friend, is certainly one which is deserving of all the sympathy that can be extended to Mrs. Martin in her bereavement and in the straitened circumstances in which she is placed. It must, however, be remembered that the pension was given to the father of young Martin, who died, and that now it is proposed to continue the pension to the widow. I am sure I would be very happy to do so, but this is not an isolated case. Time and again applications are made to the Department, and it would be impossible to meet the claims without considerably increasing the expense of the Department. I shall be very happy to bring down the papers which have been asked for, and in regard to the appeal made by my hon. friend to the well-known warm heart of the First Minister, I shall be very happy to consider with my colleagues this application.

Motion agreed to.

WEIGHT AND MEASUREMENT OF ROOTS.

Mr. McDONALD (Kings) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence, reports, &c., in connection with the weighing and measuring of potatoes and other roots, in the Province of Prince Edward Island.

He said: I would just say, in connection with the motion, that this is a matter of considerable importance to the people

of Prince Edward Island, and also, I dare say, to the farming population of this country generally. I find, at the present time, that there is a good deal of discrepancy as to the way in which potatoes and other roots are bought and sold. In some parts of Prince Edward Island a barrel, holding about two and a-half bushels, is generally used, while in other parts of the Province a measure holding about two bushels is used. Altogether, there is a good deal of dissatisfaction amongst our farmers as to these differences, and they lead to a great deal of annoyance. I may say that the farmers generally, who take the greatest interest in the matter, speak, as a rule, in favor of weighing potatoes and other roots. I do not know that it makes a great deal of difference to the other parties, because, whether they are weighed or measured, the price will be regulated accordingly; but in some portions of the Dominion I find that they are taken by weight, and in others by a bag containing about one and a-half bushels, while in other places again they are sold by a two bushel measure, which, however, I do not think is a standard or sealed measure. Altogether, I think there should be some greater uniformity with respect to the buying of roots. I am given to understand that in the United States weighing is generally resorted to in buying potatoes and other roots, though measurement is resorted to in buying them at first hand. There has been a great deal of talk among our farming population with respect to this matter, and some of them are under the impression that they are unfairly dealt with, with respect to measurement; but I think that is rather a mistake. There is no doubt that whatever the measure is, the price will be regulated in accordance with it. However, it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of the whole country, that a uniformity of measure should be used, and I think it would be well that the matter should be finally settled by the Department under whose charge it comes, and that a uniform system should be introduced.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION PRINTING AND ADVERTISING.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved:

That the several items of charges for printing, advertising, payments for books or pamphlets, by the Department of Agriculture and Immigration, for the years 1878 to 1883, both inclusive, be referred to the committee on Public Accounts.

Motion agreed to.

PROTECTION OF FORESTS.

Mr. COCKBURN moved for:

Copy of J. H. Morgan's report upon the subject of protecting the present forests of the Dominion and of forest tree planting upon an extensive scale.

He said: If value has been received for such service as purports to have been given to the country in this matter, the money will have been well spent. I cannot say, however, without seeing the original report, what has been done, because the summary report does not indicate what parts of the country have been visited, or what sort of trees are proposed to be planted. I think the Government have taken a very proper step in enquiring into the subject of forestry and the prevention of bush fires. It is most disheartening to see extensive territories, where magnificent pines have been burned, and if anything can be done to stop this destruction of our forests, it will be a great public benefit. As a similar motion has been already made by another hon. member, I would ask leave to withdraw this one.

Motion withdrawn.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. COCKBURN moved for:

Copies of all correspondence relative to the proposal to have the waters of the Muskoka lakes connected with the proposed Trent Valley Canal.

Mr. McDONALD (Kings).

system by the construction of a short canal from Gravenhurst Bay to the waters of the Severn River.

Mr. POPE. I have no objection to this motion. All the correspondence that I know of has been with the hon. gentleman himself, and I shall be very happy to send it back to him.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD presented a message from His Excellency the Governor-General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons two approved Minutes in Council, dated respectively the 20th May, 1884, and the 23rd January, 1885, regarding the terms of the provisional settlement of the claims of the Province of Manitoba.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 23rd February, 1885.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Comparative statement of the costs of working the Intercolonial Railway for each of the years 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883 and 1884, giving for each year the cost for locomotive power under the seven (?) sub-headings given in the Minister's Report, Appendix, page 37; for car expenses under the seven (7) sub-headings given in the same report, same page; for maintenance, way, and works, under the ten (10) sub-headings given in the same report, page 38; for station expenses under the three (3) sub-headings given in the same report, same page; and for general charges under the seven (7) sub-headings given in the same report, page 39.

He said: I see the hon. gentleman has made some improvements in the classification of the various items in the Intercolonial Railway accounts.

Mr. POPE. I am a live reformer.

Mr. BLAKE. You may be a reformer, but you do not look alive. The hon. gentleman has made some improvements in these classifications, but it is necessary that we should have statements for the several years, so that we may be able to compare the cost of one year with another, in the different branches. I am the more induced to come to that conclusion by recent little investigations into the sub-divisions in the Minister's own report, and the Chief Engineer's report, which I was induced to make on reading some paragraphs in these reports with reference to the expenses of the last fiscal year. The hon. Minister reports:

"The expenditure of the year has received an exceptional increase, owing to the fact that the general offices at Moncton, destroyed by fire in February, 1883, have been rebuilt. The cost, up to the end of the fiscal year, was \$83,098.25. This has been charged to the working expenses of the road.

The chief engineer and general manager reports:

"Although the net earnings for the year (\$9,068.17) are less than those of the preceding year by \$1,479.66, it has been only by the most careful watchfulness on the part of the officers of the railway that a result even so favorable has been secured. The working expenses having been debited with the sum of \$83,098.25, expended during the year in rebuilding the Moncton offices, destroyed by fire in February, 1883, every effort had to be made to give effect to the policy of economy laid down by the Honorable Minister."

And the other day, in bringing down a return with reference to the Intercolonial Railway, the hon. gentleman alluded again to these Moncton offices—their heavy draft on the resources of the railway, and so forth. I have looked into an analysis of the work on the Intercolonial Railway for the past year, and having regard to the fact that the receipts were unfavorable as compared with the previous year, and that the mileage, &c., is almost the same—the engine mileage being the same, within a very few miles, and the train mileage also, taking into account the number of miles—as the previous year, I am not able to agree in the view of the hon. gentleman that very great economy has been established in

reference to the working expenses of the road, or that the expenditure upon the Moncton offices is, in its general result, to be attributed, as he has done, so as to produce an exceptional expenditure. The accounts show, for the years 1883 and 1884, the following expenses:—Locomotive power for the year 1883, \$767,000; for the year 1884, \$757,000, a decrease of \$10,000 in 1884; Car expenses, 1883, \$508,100; 1884, \$531,200, an increase of \$23,100 in 1884. Station expenses, 1883, \$313,400; 1884, \$325,800, an increase of \$12,400. General charges, 1883, \$167,900; 1884, \$171,700, an increase of \$3,800—or a net increase on these four headings of \$29,400 for the year 1884 over 1883. Maintenance of way and works, 1884, \$560,800; in 1883, \$532,600, a decrease, in 1884, of \$21,800. This shows that notwithstanding the decrease in earnings, there has been an increase in the working expenses, in all the items except maintenance, of no less than \$29,400 for the year 1884; while in maintenance account there is a decrease of \$21,800 or 3.88 per cent. Making all due allowances for stringent economy in the maintenance of the road, it is evident that unless there was great extravagance in the management of maintenance account in 1883, you have been starving this branch during the past fiscal year. This is not economy, but simply a postponement of repairs which will necessitate consequently, a much larger amount of repairs and a much greater expense to be made the following year. The following are the details of maintenance account:—Wages and repairing, 1883, \$297,300; 1884, \$280,100, or a decrease, in 1884, \$17,200. Rails and fastenings, 1883, \$47,800; 1884, \$18,700, or a decrease of \$29,100. Sleepers, 1883, \$64,500; 1884, \$46,900, or a decrease \$17,600. Timber, lumber, &c., 1883, \$39,100; 1884, \$38,700, a decrease of \$400. Wharves, 1883, \$11,700; 1884, \$5,600, a decrease of \$5,100. Snow ploughs, 1883, \$12,500; 1884, \$15,700, an increase of \$3,200. Miscellaneous, 1883, \$2,800; 1884, \$2,300, a decrease of \$500. Chiefs salaries, &c., 1883, \$5,200, 1884, \$3,800, a decrease of \$1,400—making, on these several particular heads, an expense in the year 1883, of \$480,900, as against \$412,800 in 1884, or a decrease of \$68,100, or 16.49 per cent. There are, however, two increases, apart from the question of snow ploughs, one the expense of clearing away ice and snow, which, of course, was a work the House could not defer, and the other, repairs to buildings, platforms, &c. Clearing away ice and snow in 1883 cost \$33,900, and in 1884 \$41,600, or an increase of \$7,700; and repairs to buildings, platforms, &c., in 1883 cost \$67,500, and in 1884 \$105,900. This last item embraces the exceptional one of the Moncton offices, \$63,000, so that notwithstanding that exceptional item, the total increase over the expenses of the year previous, on this item of repairs to buildings, platforms, &c., was only \$38,400. Omitting, therefore, the exceptional expenses at Moncton, of \$63,000, we have in the expenditure, on repairs to buildings, a deficiency of \$29,100. Thus, the deficiency in all the branches of maintenance, except clearing away ice and snow—leaving out the Moncton offices—is \$97,200, or over 20 per cent.; showing that the maintenance of way and works must have been kept at starvation point during the past year, although, having regard to the time of running, and so forth, this account should rather tend to increase than diminish year by year, unless there was an altogether exceptional expense in 1883, and the fact that there has been so very large a diminution in the expenditure for the last year in the maintenance of way and works from the preceding year is, to my mind, an indication that the hon. gentleman has been trying, I will not say to force a balance, but to create a favorable balance between working expenses and revenue, by postponing unduly the expenditure for the maintenance of way and works. This will be further elucidated by the return I ask for; because, if you have a comparative statement from year to year for a series of years, it will be easier to ascertain the normal

expenditure for way and works in each of the Departments for each year.

Mr. POPE. I will only say to the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken thus far. The road was never in a better condition than it is now, and was never better maintained than it has been this year. I am obliged to the hon. gentleman for endorsing what I said the other day, that there have been extraordinary charges to account for the increase, but the hon. gentleman and any other man who has anything at all to do with running a railway, must know that the earnings depend very much on the kind of freight carried over the road. We have carried as much freight and a larger quantity of freight, but there is a class of freight which has gone largely into the operations of this year which pays us very little indeed, and that accounts partly for the change. As to the engines, although the hon. gentleman says there is about the same locomotive power, those engines have run over a considerably longer piece of road, and so have the cars.

Mr. BLAKE. They have run about the same number of miles—1,457 more miles this year than the year before, out of some millions.

Mr. POPE. I have no objection to the motion, but I shall ask the hon. gentleman to amend it by beginning at the year 1873. You will have no objection to that? I also ask him to add after "1884," "and the mileage operated this year," which the hon. gentleman must get, in order to get anything like an exhibit such as he asks.

Mr. BLAKE. I have no objection at all to the miles operated each year being added, but, as to the date, I could not take the responsibility of asking the House to order a return for a period such as the hon. gentleman speaks of, before the road was in operation. He must move that himself.

Mr. POPE. Then I will move in amendment:

To insert after the words "for each of the years" in the said motion, the words "1874, 1875, 1876, 1877, 1878," and after the words "1884," to insert the words "and the number of miles operated in each year."

Mr. BLAKE. You are beginning before the road began. That is the advantage of having an Acting Minister of Railways.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The road was commenced in 1867.

Mr. POPE. Make the return from 1874.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Perhaps the Acting Minister will read the motion in French. I did not catch the amendment.

Mr. LANGELIER. Whilst the motion is being written by the Minister of Railways, I would call the attention of the Government to a very serious grievance which was brought under my notice last summer, in reference to the running of the Intercolonial Railway. A gentleman who was a friend of the Government told me that coal was actually being carried from Pictou to Quebec at \$16 a car, which he thought could not pay the running expenses. Thinking it would be possible for him to get rates in proportion, or, at all events, near those rates, and being desirous of carrying lumber from River Ouelle to Quebec, he tried to get something like the same rates but could never get a satisfactory arrangement. This is a serious matter, for he told me, and several friends of the Government at the same time, that he had been trying to open a new industry, which would have given employment to several hundreds of men, perhaps, but he could not get satisfactory rates. The same complaint has been made in my hearing at public meetings in reference to carrying flour. I am told that it costs less to carry flour from Toronto to Halifax than from Toronto to Quebec. I know some lumbermen who are lumbering in the lower part of the Province of Quebec, who

consider it an advantage to have their flour carried to Halifax and brought back again by the Intercolonial Railway into the Province of Quebec. This has been told me by those gentlemen themselves, and I have no doubt it is correct, from the character of the gentlemen.

Mr. POPE. Lumber is quite different from coal. It is a different class of goods and is carried at different rates.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—WORK ON THE FRASER.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Reports, plans and other information in the possession of the Department, in reference to the work on the Canadian Pacific Railway at or near Maple, a short distance above Hammond, on the bank of the Fraser, B.C.; for all reports and information in the possession of the Department, as to the condition of the work of the Government sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia, and as to the extent of work remaining to be done before the completion of the contract; also, for all correspondence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as to the taking over by them of these sections of the railway; also, for a statement of the names, salaries and period of service in that region, of the Government engineers who have been employed on the Government sections in British Columbia of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with dates at which any of them were relieved, a statement of the cause of their removal, and of their present occupation, if any, under the Government.

He said: I have been informed that at the point which I mentioned, Maple Ridge (which is Maple in the motion), which is a short distance above Hammond, a serious error has been committed with reference to the location of the line on the bank of the Fraser; that at that point there are lofty clay banks on a quicksand bottom; that a few years ago a land slide occurred at that very point, in which thirty or forty acres slid into the Fraser, changing its course; that on the opposite side of the river a farmer who was working in the field was caught by the water, hurled against a tree and killed. Slides are still occurring at this point, and in the neighborhood where the curvatures are short and sharp, and it has been found necessary to keep Chinamen employed to avoid accidents and loss of life. This statement is given to me with reference to that locality, and it is the justification which I have for asking the House to adopt this motion. Then I have received statements as to the condition of the work on the Government sections of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia, and as to the extent of work remaining to be done for the completion of the contract, which is now, according to the date, very soon due, and which seems to call for attention. The statement made is that the works are in a condition which renders it impossible that they can be so completed as really to satisfy the exigency of the contract with the contractor, or to satisfy the spirit or exigency of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. What I am anxious to avoid is that the work should be taken off the hands of the contractor in such a condition that it will be accepted by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company without reclamations upon the Government of the country for further expenditure to put it in proper condition. I think it important that we should understand that such communication is being had between the Government and the company with reference to this work that the condition which the Government accepts as satisfactory is going to be accepted as satisfactory by the company as well, so that when the Government takes the work off the contractor's hands the railway company shall take it off the hands of the Government, without making such demands as are being made in another section and, I believe, much greater demands, unless proper care is used. It is said that a great deal remains to be done, and it is said that a very great amount of reduction has taken place in the staff of Government engineers on that section, due, as I understand, to the fact that the work is so nearly complete that there is no work for them to do.

Mr. LANCELIER.

That is a very judicious and proper step, if the facts are so; but it is, as I have said, extremely important that there should be such an efficient oversight of the work in these final stages that there will be no difficulty on the part of the country with reference to the acceptance by the railway company of the work when completed. These are the subjects which are exposed in this notice.

Mr. POPE. The engineers always expressed themselves very well satisfied with the work done. The chief engineer has passed over it every year, and, of course, he will pass over it again. We have engineers there sufficient to look after the work. There is no objection whatever to the adoption of the motion.

Motion agreed to.

OCEAN MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Statement in detail of the annual cost in connection with the ocean mail service, for salaries, allowances of mail clerks and conductors, or railway post office clerks in charge of the British mails; also, for all correspondence as to the landing of the post office bags containing the British mails outward bound from Canada at Derry, and the saving or loss of time effected thereby.

He said: I have from time to time called the attention of the Government to the propriety of considering the desirability of reorganising that portion of the ocean mail service which involves the maintenance of the system of having railway postal clerks in charge of the mails on the steamers. We are, I believe, the only country of those interested in the trans-Atlantic mail service which keeps up this system. The great correspondence which takes place between Britain and the United States is handled at the terminal points. There is no provision whatever for the sorting of the mails on the voyage. The arrangements which are made are such that the sorting takes place very expeditiously at the end of the voyage in each case. The expenditure which we still encounter in regard to the transport of the mails to Britain is very large, under the contract, and there is added to it the cost of a service which, as I have said, has been dispensed with a very long time by the other countries. It does not commend itself to me as a wise expenditure of money. We are actually doing work which should be done at the end of the transit and not during the transit. I can hardly conceive, if this system is necessary in order that the mail matter may be expeditiously handled, that the two countries in the world which are most interested in rapid communication by mail, and which have, I suppose, the largest correspondence, Great Britain and the United States, should find it unnecessary to adopt the system. The other branch of the motion is with respect to the landing of the post office bags containing the British mails outward bound from Canada at Derry. It has been represented to me by business men who have crossed the water to buy goods that it happens much more often than not that they reach a point, say, Manchester, twenty-four hours in advance of the mails which have been landed at Derry, with a view to their reaching Manchester more quickly. The passengers stick to the steamer, and they arrive at Manchester frequently twenty-four hours before the mail arrives. That has been represented to me by a gentleman of the utmost respectability, to whom that incident has happened more than once, and he tells me that it is somewhat common. Such an arrangement should be made with the captain of the steamer that, on his arrival at Lough Foyle, he should be able to judge whether a saving of time would be effected by landing the mails. I do not mean to say there should be a special train. I believe there is not. I believe it depends on the regular train from Derry. That makes it easier for the captain to judge, considering the departure of the train, whether he could catch the mails or not, and how soon, in the ordinary course of rail-

and steam, the mails would reach their destination. But, however it may be, it seems an extraordinary thing that this effort to make more expeditious transport of the mails should end so frequently, as I am told it does, in the very reverse.

Motion agreed to.

SQUATTERS IN THE QU'APPELLE VALLEY.

Mr. LISTER moved for:

Return of copies of all correspondence between Mr. Taylor, M.P. for South Leeds, and Mr. Wood, M.P. for Brockville, or either of them, and the Government, respecting the claim for compensation of William McLeod, J. D. Jewitt, S. M. Stiles, John Stevenson and R. R. Coleman, or any of them, squatters in the Qu'Appelle Valley, together with copy of all reports made by the said Taylor or Wood, and either of them, respecting the said claims. Also, all correspondence between Mr. Gordon, Dominion land agent, Calgary, and the Government, and all reports made by said Gordon to the Government, respecting said claims, or any of them; also, copy of any award made in regard to said claims, or any of them.

He said: in connection with this matter I may say that I have no personal knowledge whatever of the subject matter of the motion, and I shall content myself with making a statement just as I have received it. The parties mentioned in the motion, along with others, were squatters in the Qu'Appelle Valley, on property now owned by the Bell Farming Company. According to the statement given to me these squatters went upon the land prior to the time the Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Company became the proprietors; in other words, the rights of the squatters were better in law—so they believe—than the title of the Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Company. There was some difficulty about the squatters. The company were anxious to get them off, and the squatters having gone in and selected the lands as homesteads, were desirous of staying there. Whatever their right may have been, neither the Government nor the company undertook to enforce what they conceived to be their rights in law against these squatters. Some time during the Session of 1884 a person representing these squatters came to Ottawa and was given to understand that their claims would be settled justly and fairly. On that assurance he returned to the North-West, and during the following spring the gentlemen named in the resolution appeared on the scene in the Qu'Appelle Valley. They are, of course, warm supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the statement made to me is, that they were authorised by the Government to effect a settlement of the claims of the settlers. I do not vouch for the correctness of that statement; I merely, as I stated before, give it as it was given to me. They were induced to enter into an arbitration suggested by these gentlemen, upon the distinct promise, as they say, that they would be permitted to take up other homesteads in other portions of the country, without doing any duties; that the full time that they would have to live upon the homestead would be allowed to them, and that a patent would be issued to them; further, that they would be allowed to pre-empt and would be given three years for the payment of their pre-emption. They say that on those representations they consented to the arbitration. An arbitration did take place, and I believe an award was made by Mr. Taylor, M. P. for Leeds, and Mr. Wood, M. P. for Brockville. That award, I believe, covers the points I have stated, namely, that they were to get their homesteads free, without having to live on the homestead, to be taken for for any length of time, and to have their pre-emption free; and they were also to be allowed certain damages, to which they were entitled, for improvements they had made on the place. Payment under that award was to be made at a fixed time; no payment was made. It is claimed by the settlers that the Government repudiated the arrangement made by the arbitrators, that they insist on these people having to live on the place some eight months, and on the usual and ordinary terms, so far as the pre-emption is concerned;

and further, they complain that they have not been paid the amount awarded to them. Now, whether these gentlemen were representing the Government or not, I am not in a position to say. These people hold that they were doing so, or they would not have entered into the arbitration. They supposed they were sent there in compliance with a promise made to them in the preceding Session. At all events, the award was entered into, and they say it has not been carried out according to its terms. If such is the case, I think there is no doubt that these men have not been properly dealt with. I think that the Government, on the facts being represented, will be inclined to do to these men what is right. In the case of the pioneer settlers of this country I feel that neither this Government nor any Government is justified in doing anything which is not perfectly right, and if anything has been misrepresented—I do not pretend to say that these gentlemen did so—but if these settlers misunderstood the character in which these gentlemen went out to them, I think the Government should be prepared to give effect to the understanding of the settlers. I feel that nothing more is necessary than to bring the matter to the attention of the House and the Government, in order that these people may be justly, fairly, and equitably dealt with.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to the motion, and the papers will be brought down. The House will then see from the papers exactly what took place. Neither of the gentlemen mentioned who acted as arbitrators acted as the officers of the Government, or at the request of the Government; they acted as arbitrators between the Qu'Appelle Farming Company and the squatters. Some of these men had no legal or equitable claim. They went out, believing that the company were going to have a large tract of land, and to see what they could make out of it—a very common trick in the North-West. They set up exorbitant claims, thinking that either the Government or the Qu'Appelle Company would pay them for their real or imaginary improvements. However, some of them put their cases or grievances into the hands of one of these gentlemen—the hon. member for Leeds. These two gentlemen went up there, one acting as arbitrator for the settlers, with their consent, and the other acting on behalf of the Qu'Appelle Company. They made an equitable award, I suppose, between the Qu'Appelle Company and the settlers. I have no doubt they have acted impartially, and have no reason to doubt that the award is satisfactory to most of the settlers. I believe there are only two or three of the whole of them who object, and they object because they were found not to have had either an equitable, a legal, or a moral right.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). My name having been alluded to by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), I feel called upon to offer a few words in explanation. Over a year since a gentleman named Johnson appeared in Ottawa, representing certain parties known as squatters in the Qu'Appelle Valley. At the same time, Major Bell, the manager of the Bell Farming Company, was also in Ottawa. Before that there had been disputes between certain squatters and the manager of the Bell Farming Company, it having been claimed by the squatters that they were in possession of the land there before the grant was made to the company, which statement was denied by the company. Neither party, as has been truly said, ever entered an action at law, on the one part to assert their right, or on the other, to eject the squatters from the soil. My hon. friend, Mr. Taylor, the member for South Leeds, had been acting for the squatters, three or four of them having come from the riding he represents. Major Bell, as many of you know, is an old Brockville man, and I acted in the capacity of his solicitor for some years. Well, it was proposed, either by the person acting for the squatters, or by the company, I forget which, that the questions in dispute between the company

and the squatters should be referred to arbitration. At that time the squatters selected the hon. member for South Leeds, because he had taken a very active part in trying to get for them all the concessions from the company he could, and in laying before the Government their alleged rights. I having acted for Major Bell for some years, as I have stated, he very naturally asked me if I would act as arbitrator, in the event of their not agreeing upon the terms. I consented to do so, not supposing at the time that it would be necessary for us to visit the North-West in order to settle the differences in question. I supposed that the evidence which had been taken, I think by Mr. Stephenson, the colonisation agent there, would have been used, or that the squatters would have made declarations and sent them down here, and that in that way we should have been enabled to adjudicate upon their claims. However, it was found necessary that Mr. Taylor and myself should go up there, view the premises and the improvements these men had made, see personally for ourselves the ground of their complaints, and look into, as far as we could, the rights of each of the parties. Now, Mr. Speaker, I knew nothing of the Government whatever in this transaction. I had no communication, one way or the other, with the Government or with any official of the Government; and although it is the right of any hon. member of this House to move for returns, I question whether it is the right of any hon. member to even intimate, simply on the strength of a letter from a dissatisfied party to an award, that another hon. member of this House has been connected with the Government in a transaction of this kind or any other, because that is a very serious matter. I, as a lawyer, would be very poorly qualified to represent my position as such at the bar, if I did not know that that was coming very close to the line of a violation of the Independence of Parliament Act. I had no more to do with the Government in that transaction than I had with any individual outside of this House; and the same can be said of my hon. friend, Mr. Taylor. Now, Sir, I do not know that an award was ever yet made which was satisfactory to all the parties to that award. In this case, the reference was drawn by the solicitor acting for the squatters. We had nothing to do with that; and so far as our conduct as arbitrators is concerned, when we were in the Qu'Appelle Valley, I can only say that we worked as hard, I think, as we ever did before in our lives. We viewed all the improvements those men had made; and my hon. friend, as a practical man and a farmer, was very well fitted to look after their rights, while I, though acting on behalf of the Bell Farming Company, had no object in doing anything but what was right by the squatters. I have no hesitation in saying, as a lawyer, that I do not think they had even the shadow of a legal right. I do not say that in any spirit of bias against them, for I have nothing against them; but my assertion has been borne out by every lawyer who has looked into their claims; and I venture to assert that if the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) investigates them, he will find that, with one single exception, the case of a squatter named Thompson, these men had no claim to an inch of the ground on which they lived. But we did not enter into that arbitration on any such theory. We knew that some of these men, at all events, thought that they were right, and it was in that spirit that we entered upon our duties. So far as the award itself is concerned, I am satisfied that it is a liberal one. There were a few of the squatters who had no shadow of a right whatever. They merely came into the Qu'Appelle Valley, and finding a few squatters there who did think they had a right, they joined forces with them and were quite content to remain there as squatters, standing midway between Winnipeg and the Rocky Mountains, and by complaining of their alleged grievances, injured our country. Now, I do not regret that my hon. friend has brought up

Mr. Wood (Brockville).

this question. So far as I am concerned, I am satisfied that every scrap of paper relating to our conduct in connection with it should be printed and laid before the public, then it will be found that the squatters on the Bell Farm have been fairly dealt with by the arbitrators.

Mr. LISTER. I desire to say to my hon. friend who has just spoken that I have no knowledge myself of the matters referred to in the motion. As I understand, it is the right of every man to have his grievances, or his supposed grievances, brought before the Government, and it is the duty of a representative to bring these matters before the House and the country. Now, the hon. gentleman has stated that he was not acting with the Government; that he had no communication with the Government or any official of the Government. I am bound to take his answer; but it is somewhat remarkable that the award these hon. gentlemen made provides that lands belonging to the Government shall be given to these squatters. If there was no authority for it, why was that a portion of the award? My hon. friend says it is not in good taste for me to refer to the position he occupied there. I cannot agree with him; I take issue with him on that point. While I do not charge him with having been guilty of any impropriety—I can scarcely believe he would be; I am bound to take his word for that—I say I have, at the same time, a perfect right to make this statement fully, fairly and frankly, as I think I have done.

Mr. WOOD (Brockville). If my hon. friend will allow me, I will mention now what I omitted to say when on my feet before. I never, to any one of these squatters, represented that we were acting for the Government. It never entered my mind to do so, because it would be quite contrary to the fact; and so far as the recommendation made by my hon. friend and myself with regard to these squatters, and the claim they should have to other lands, is concerned, we understood that the position the Government took was that if the squatters would settle their difficulties with the company and agree upon whatever damages the company should pay them, if any damages there were, the Government would allow them, upon other land they might take up, the time they had spent upon the land of this company. This was agreed, we understood, upon the principle that these men thought they were acting within the law, and this accounts for the fact that in the award that was made—a copy of which I have here—the suggestion was made by the arbitrators that the time these men had spent upon the Bell Farming Company's land should be allowed them. We had no interest in inserting that clause, but did so in order to assist the squatters, if we could. I may add, to show the good faith in which we acted, that it was only a few days ago this was mentioned to the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister) by my hon. friend, and the hon. gentleman would not have known anything about it had he not learned it from my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to.

SECTION B ARBITRATION.

Mr. CASEY moved for:

Copies of case submitted to the section B arbitrators by the Government and the contractors respectively; of the evidence taken before the arbitration, and of all the records of that arbitration not already brought down.

He said: The reason I think it desirable to get the copy of the case submitted by the Government, and that submitted by the contractors, is that in the agreement of submission, signed on behalf of the Government and the contractors, no particulars are mentioned, except in regard to one part of the claims, which I may briefly describe as coming under the head of re-measurement and re-classification of the work. All the claims for consequential damages arising out of the delay in the completion of section 15 and

out of reduction in the amount of work to be done on section B itself, are contained in the two letters of the contractors, dated January, 1881, and 24th of February, 1883, which are included in the papers brought down last Session. I find that the agreement of submission signed by the Government and the contractors refers to several Orders in Council as authorising the submission; first, one dated 28th March, 1881; the second, the 2nd of April, of the same year not brought down; and finally one dated 9th July, 1883, closing the matter and providing for an immediate reference. All these Orders in Council speak in the vaguest possible terms of the claims at issue and laid before them. The claims are only defined in the two letters from the contractors:

"They commenced the work under our contract in the early part of the summer of 1879, but as the contract was awarded too late for us to get in our supplies in the winter of 1878 and 1879, we were unable to make much progress until the frost set in, in the month of November of the latter year, since which we have pushed on the work with vigor, not merely in the actual performance of the building of the road, but also in making preparations to complete the construction of it within the time limited by our contract, knowing, as we did, that time was of the essence of our contract, and that it was required of us that our contract should be completed by the time therein limited. We have had to contend with difficulties of no ordinary character, and the facilities for getting our supplies, machinery, carts and men required for the successful prosecution of the work, and which we had a right to rely on under the terms of our contract, viz., the use of the road being constructed under contract 15, which, although by the terms of the contract the Government were not bound to give access by the first day of July, 1879, they were bound to do, to quote from the specifications (Number 93), 'sometime thereafter,' which means, as we are advised, within a reasonable time thereafter, and which, even up to this time, is not yet fully completed, and it is only since September last that we were permitted in any way to avail ourselves of the use of that portion of the road."

These are the complaints of the contractors as set down in their letter of 7th January, 1881. This is the claim which Sir Charles Tupper told us he had always resisted, and in regard to which he did not believe the contractors had the ghost of a claim on account of delay, because the Government had not contracted to give them access over contract 15 at any specified time, and he had persistently refused to recognise this claim. I think it strange, therefore, that he should have allowed this part of the claim to go before the arbitrators. I doubt if it was submitted to them in definite terms. It appears to have been included in the award of two of the arbitrators, and dissented from by the Government's nominee. It is possible that the arbitrators may have granted damages on a claim which was not intended to be submitted to them. It is absolutely necessary to let us see the detailed case submitted by both parties to the arbitration. If the Government case contemplates the consideration of this claim by the arbitrators, I contend they were not only acting contrary to their duty, by submitting such absurd claims to arbitration at all, but were acting contrary to the repeated declaration of Sir Charles Tupper, that he had resisted, and would resist, the grant of any damages in connection with that claim. Then the contractors go on to point out that they have got a considerable quantity of plant, which turned out not to be necessary after the reductions in rock work which were made on the road. They specify derricks, and so on. They say they had made a great deal of road to get access to their contract, and that the expense on this road was so much money lying idle and unprofitable to them, on account of the delay referred to. This is another branch of the first claim, and if one is not allowable, the other should not have been allowed. They go on to make a calculation in figures, which I need not quote in detail, but they point out that the reductions made by the Government in the quantity and quality of the work involved a reduction of \$737,500, which, with allowances for increase on cost of pile-driving and trestle-work, and taking into account a reduction on the quantity of earth work, makes a total reduction on the whole cost of the contract of \$1,173,574. This saving, this reduction,

which Sir Charles Tupper used to allude to as a saving, has almost entirely disappeared since that time. The contractors advanced it as a reason for getting damages. Sir Charles Tupper advanced it as a reason for claiming credit for the Government. Now, if we take into account the \$395,000 awarded as damages, the large proportion of the \$926,000 for which the contract for finishing the line between Port Arthur and Winnipeg was let to the Canadian Pacific Railway, which must be applied to the finishing of section B alone, and all the other expenditure for arbitration and completion of work, nearly all this large saving has vanished. The Government, in attempting to make a saving, only furnished the contractors with a claim for damages, which has almost swept away the saving itself. Then they go on for two or three pages in regard to matters upon which they feel themselves aggrieved. In the second letter they refuse to go on with the work at all except under certain conditions which they mention. The great question to be decided is whether these two letters, in all their detail, in all their contradictoriness of statement, were submitted to the arbitrators as representing the case of the contractors, or whether some carefully prepared case was submitted on their behalf, and an equally well prepared case on behalf of the Government. I doubt whether it will be found that a carefully prepared case was submitted on behalf of the Government, because, if one had been, I believe the arbitrators would have followed the lines of that case in their award, and stated how much was due to the contractors on each item, as they did in their first award, where specific questions were submitted to them. I have not only asked for the case but for the evidence taken before the arbitrators, which I think is a very important part of the record which should be submitted to this House. By a strange fatality, following many other proceedings of the Government which tended to make this case look suspicious, it was decided by the arbitrators to exclude the representatives of the press from their meetings, and to keep their meetings as secret as any of the meetings of the famous Star Chamber, and so add the only element which was needed to make the case look supremely and utterly suspicious. All the proceedings between the Government and the contractors had been shrouded in mystery, and when information was extracted, that information was vague and unsatisfactory. The final trial of the case between the Government and the contractors was shrouded in complete obscurity. Nothing was allowed to leak out to the public, except what was gathered from the general statements of the contractors or parties who had been, or were to be, examined before the arbitration. If the Government desired to cover the case with suspicion they could not have adopted a better plan than that of securing the secrecy of the arbitration. Sir Charles Tupper said last Session that it was the action of the arbitrators themselves, that they claimed that an arbitration was not necessarily a public tribunal. They may have been right in that. I do not say they were not. But the arbitration would have been made a public tribunal if the Government had requested it. The exclusion of reporters was due to the negligence of the Government in not making such request, and that negligence was due to a desire to keep the evidence which came before the arbitration from the public. They have succeeded in keeping it from the public so far; it remains to be seen whether the Minister will succeed still further, by treating this public evidence in regard to a public case as confidential, as he has some other matters. If he does so, I think there has been a considerable waste of public money, for I find that a certain firm of reporters, who are not supposed to be on the most unfriendly terms with the Government, who are not supposed to need any little attentions of that sort to make them friendly, were paid the enormous sum—for I think it is an enormous sum, under the circumstances—of \$3,300 for reporting this

evidence. I think, after spending \$3,800 for having that evidence reported, the hon. gentleman ought to bring it down.

Mr. POPE. If you will sit down you shall have the whole of it.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear that we are going to get something that we ask for. I also ask for all other records not already brought down. This, I think, will cover the items which I could not specify without technical knowledge of what passed before the arbitrators in regard to the dissent of Judge Clark and the matters in which he differed from the arbitrators.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—REPORT OF MR. VAN HORNE.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

Copies of the report of Mr. Van Horne, vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, of September last, and of Mr. S. B. Read, C. E., of the same month, with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia

And also, for copies of the reports of engineers of high standing as to the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway at the point where a temporary line has been built, referred to in the letter from Mr. Van Horne to the Minister of Railways and Canals, of 19th May, 1884, and for any report of Mr. Fleming on the subject, in the possession of the railway company.

He said: The reports to which I have alluded were made public some time ago by the company, apparently, and they were printed in the *Montreal Herald* of 27th September, 1884. The report of Mr. Van Horne is a very interesting document to the company, announcing the result of his tour of inspection, more particularly over the British Columbia section. It contains, amongst others, these paragraphs:

"From the favorable character of the work and the progress already made, I think there will be no difficulty in completing the mountain section within a year from this date, and for \$1,000,000 less than the estimate of last winter. Within the same time, the eastern section will also be completed, so that by September next a through rail connection between Montreal and the Pacific coast will be established."

Then we are particularly informed that Mr. Van Horne is happy to state, as one result of that trip, that his doubts about the value of the mountain section had been entirely removed; and after giving interesting details of the circumstances which have removed those doubts, which had unhappily existed up to that time in the mind of the vice-president and engineer of the railway company, as to the value of the mountain section, and after discussing other portions of the line, he proceeds to say:

"I do not hesitate to say that the Canadian Pacific Railway has more good agricultural land, more coal and more timber, between Winnipeg and the Pacific coast, than all the other Pacific railways combined, and that every part of the line, from Montreal to the Pacific, will pay."

Well, I will not trouble the House with the details of this, but I think it is such an interesting general report, and contains so many attractive statements, that it will be well that we should have it amongst our records. Then the report of Mr. Read, the engineer who was instructed to make a survey and inspection of the line, contains numerous interesting particulars; but the one to which I wish especially to draw attention, is that with reference to the temporary track. Mr. Read says:

"I gave some attention to the nine miles of temporary track that has been built around a tunnel, and some heavy work in the vicinity of Mount Stephen, for the purpose of saving a year's time in completing the road through to the Pacific. This part of the road has four per cent. grades and curves, of ten degrees. As far as I examined this temporary line, I found it thoroughly built, with seventy pound rails (per yard), and first-class fastenings. It will answer all purposes for traffic for years to come, without material increase in the cost of operating. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe, and other roads crossing the Rocky Mountains, have grades equal to or exceeding this one.

"I also examined the section of the proposed permanent line around which the temporary line has been built, and especially, as you suggested, Mr. CASEY.

the large rock slide immediately east of the long tunnel through a spur of Mount Stephen. All of the slide, except about one hundred and fifty feet in width, seems to have been formed from gradual accretions, as the face of the solid rock forming the cliffs south of the line has weathered and worn away. There is no evidence of any recent movement that could not be guarded against. Bushes of various kinds grow on the old and gradually accreted portion. The one hundred and fifty feet of the slide above referred to, is the track of a small stream that comes out from under a glacier about one thousand feet above the grade line. This glacier extends up Mount Stephen, nearly or quite to the summit, the upper portion being hidden from view by a projecting spur of the mountain. This small stream is gradually accumulating debris from the glacier, and in times of extreme summer heat, when the largest amount of snow and ice is being melted, a flood of water rushes down this slide, carrying with it the accumulated debris into the valley below with great force. A truss bridge one hundred and fifty feet in length can be built over this slide through which these accumulations can be passed with safety.

"But the temporary line around this place is so well built, and promises to answer present purposes so well, I should think it unwise to spend any money on the intended permanent line until the traffic really demands it."

I had supposed, from having read this in the newspapers, that there was no question as to the permanent line, as to the route which he adopted, and as to the engineering problems involved in its location; but another paper, which is referred to in the latter portion of this motion, as to the letter of Mr. Van Horne, of the 19th May, 1884, leads to a different conclusion. It is amongst these returns that were brought down in pursuance to a resolution of the House. He says this:

"Plans and profiles of the proposed line, from the summit of the Rocky Mountains down to the Columbia River, covering the most difficult work on the entire line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, have already been submitted to you.

"While this section of the line, with some modifications in places, is entirely feasible and the best that can be obtained, some important engineering questions have yet to be settled, as regards some portions of it. It has been examined by a considerable number of engineers of high standing, who, while agreeing as to the general question of the feasibility of the line, and its merits as compared with any other, differ widely as to what should be done at particular points.

"Several extensive boulder slides on the mountain sides have to be crossed, and there is some doubt as to the probability of their movement; and at Tunnel Mountain, above the line of the railway, a glacier exists, the movement and effect of which are as yet unknown, and can only be surmised. While the proposed permanent line is entirely feasible, notwithstanding the existence of the glacier and the boulder slides, the local modifications necessary to protect the line against their movement should any be found to occur, would materially increase its cost.

"This difficult section occurs at the beginning of our present season's work, and embraces a tunnel through hard rock of about 1,400 feet in length, only about eleven miles from the present end of the track, and this tunnel must be completed before the work beyond can be reached to advantage. In the opinion of the construction engineers, this would result in delaying the final completion of the line, nearly if not quite one year. The question of time being an important element in addition to the grave engineering question before mentioned, the company, at the suggestion of Mr. Sandford Fleming, who had examined the line in person and whose suggestion was approved by all of the engineers familiar with the ground, whose opinion was asked, decided upon a temporary line dropping down from the summit of the Rocky Mountains into the comparatively level valley of the Kicking Horse river, by means of a grade of 232 feet per mile, following the river valley several hundred feet below the line as located on the mountain side, and intersecting the located line again about thirteen miles from the point of divergence; and as some years might be necessary to determine the disputed questions regarding the permanent line, it was decided to make the temporary line available for operation for as long a time as might be necessary, making the gradients uniform, the curvature as light as practicable, and constructing the line substantially. This temporary line is estimated to cost about \$400,000, and the heavy gradient of 232 feet per mile will be four miles in length. A heavier gradient was used without difficulty on the Northern Pacific Railway, pending the completion of a long tunnel, and similar gradients have been used on one or more other railways crossing the western mountain ranges. This heavy gradient occurs on a section of the railway where the traffic must be very light for many years, where there will be no local traffic whatever, and where three, or at most four trains, each way per day will carry all the business to be done, so that for a number of years to come there will be no pressing need of a lighter gradient at the particular point mentioned, and it would seem that the immediate expenditure of the large amount necessary to build the permanent line at that point would be unwise as well as unnecessary, as it would not appreciably affect the transportation of freight and passengers or the cost of operations.

"Moreover, I have no hesitation in stating that the difference in the cost of constructing the permanent line at the present time, when the work must be pushed to the utmost limits and when wages are unreasonably high, as compared with doing it without pressure of time and when wages have returned to normal rates, will amount to the entire cost of

the temporary line, so that in the end the cost of the railway when fully completed will not be affected. This expedient was decided on shortly after the close of the last season's work, and the cost of the temporary line was included in the estimates of the cost of the completion of the entire permanent line as submitted by the company to the Government during the last Session of Parliament. Similar expedients for the saving of time and ultimate expense are very common on large works of this kind. The plan and profile of this temporary line will be submitted."

There are several points which are important in connection with this communication. In the first place, it appears that there is a considerable divergence of opinion on the part of numerous engineers who have been consulted, and have given opinions as to the method of overcoming the difficulties in the construction of the permanent line of the Canadian Pacific Railway at this point. In the second place, it appears that these differences of opinion are partly due to the circumstance that there are several boulder slides and a glacier, the local movement of which is not ascertained, and it will take several years to ascertain what the local movement is, so that engineers will be able properly to determine how the line may be constructed. While Mr. Van Horne assures us with great positiveness that the line is feasible, he equally assures us that it will take several years to find out the proper mode of construction, and therefore the necessity of establishing a temporary line, which, he thinks, notwithstanding the enormous through traffic which is to pass to and from the east over the Canadian Pacific Railway, will answer very well. I should not have said "notwithstanding the enormous traffic," because he says the traffic will be very light for many years, and he thinks there will be no harm in having a temporary line with a grade of 2.52 feet, which is now found to be 2.37 feet to the mile. It seems to be important to obtain the opinions of those engineers which are stated to have been obtained by the company, and which indicate different methods or suggestions as to the solution of this problem, which, however, after inspection by those engineers, Mr. Van Horne declares will take several years to solve before you can get even the data for its solution. Then we are told that the Government ought to provide for the construction of the temporary as well as the permanent line out of the loan and subsidy, because Mr. Van Horne does not presume to say that the price of the permanent line, at the rate at which work is being prosecuted, would cost much more than the temporary line if the work was gone about in a leisurely and reasonable fashion, and by prosecuting the work in a reasonable fashion, enough would be saved to build both the temporary and the permanent line. So it appears that the price which is going to be paid in consequence of hurrying through with the work is not quite clear. You find the engineers stating that \$400,000 would be saved on that small section of the railway by going a little slower, and yet Mr. Van Horne proposes that the country should pay for the temporary line because, he says, that in the end the temporary and permanent line would cost no more than the permanent line, if we put it through at the same rate as the rest of the work was prosecuted. Then you have the chief engineer considering this subject and dealing with it. He says:

"Being called upon to report upon this matter, I have the honor to state that my estimate of the probable cost of the western division of the central section did not include the building of a temporary line at any point, but was merely intended to cover the cost of the construction of the permanent line within two years. This estimate was a close one, and if the construction of the permanent line within that time be insisted upon, there will not, I believe, be any portion of the loan or subsidy available for the proposed temporary section; and if the plan now proposed is to be carried out, and if the company look to the subsidy and loan only, I see no means of doing it, unless both temporary and permanent lines can be brought within the limits of those resources. At the same time, were this temporary line in operation and the permanent line completed, save this gap of 13 miles, and were the construction of this 13 miles allowed to proceed leisurely during several years after the road is in operation, I have no doubt it could be done more cheaply by at least 30 per cent. than if pushed forward at the present time, when labor is dear and means of access costly. There is no difficulty in working a grade of 2.32 feet, and during the

construction of the Northern Pacific Railway a course was pursued similar to that now suggested by the vice-president."

He proceeds to state the instances on the Northern Pacific, and then goes on to say:

"My estimate of the cost of this 13 miles, if constructed rapidly, was \$978,000; and I have stated that if sufficient time be granted, it can, in my opinion, be built for at least 33 per cent. less, or for \$656,000. This difference, together with the rails and sleepers available for the temporary line, would enable the company to build the two lines at an expenditure within my estimate for the permanent line. If this estimate be correct, little or no loss could arise from building the temporary line, and communication from ocean to ocean would be accomplished earlier than by permanent line."

There is the statement, and upon that statement an Order in Council was passed, authorising the granting out of the loan and subsidy of payments for the construction of the so-called temporary line. Those statements are, I think, statements of high consequence. They indicate very serious difficulties in the locating of the permanent line, difficulties, it is said, not to be solved at the present time. They indicate tremendous grades for the line which is to carry the traffic over that portion of the railway for a great many years. They indicate grades—while the maximum grade on our standard railway is 80 feet—of 232, which now appears to be 237, or nearly three times as great as the maximum. They indicate, also, divergence of opinion on the part of the engineers as to the method of overcoming the permanent difficulties. They indicate an exceedingly light traffic for this portion of the line; they indicate that the rate at which the work is being pushed forward under the arrangement made by the Government has caused the cost, in this region, and under those circumstances, to be one-half as much again as if it had been proceeded with under the contract.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Returns showing:—1st. The total number of timber licenses and permits to cut timber, sawlogs, cordwood, ties, or poles, on lands not within the disputed territory, applied for and refused since 1st February, 1893. 2nd. The date of each rejected application, and the name and residence of each applicant. 3rd. The geographical location of the area applied for and not granted, and the area of the same. 4th. The offer of bonus, and Crown dues or stumpage in each or any case accompanying such application. 5th. The reason assigned for refusal in the case of each of such rejected applications.—(Mr. Blake, for Mr. Charlton.)

Returns showing:—1st. The total number of applications made and not granted, for licenses or permits to cut timber, sawlogs, cordwood, ties and poles, within the territory lately in dispute between the Provinces of Manitoba and Ontario. 2nd. The date of each rejected application and the name and residence of each applicant. 3rd. The geographical location of the area applied for and not granted. 4th. The offer of bonus, and of Crown dues or stumpage in each or any case accompanying such application. 5th. The reason assigned for refusal in the case of each of such rejected applications.—(Mr. Blake, for Mr. Charlton.)

Return giving copies of all regulations or orders issued by the Department of the Interior, concerning the sale or management of agricultural lands, timber lands, pasture lands, mineral lands and town sites, since 26th February, 1884.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing:—1st. The names of grazing land lessees who have cattle upon their leaseholds; the number of acres in each leasehold; the date of the lease; the geographical position of the area covered by each lease; the number of the lease; the number of cattle reported on each leasehold; the date when the leasehold was first stocked with cattle; and the aggregate number of acres covered by such leases. 2nd. The names of grazing land lessees who have not placed cattle upon their leaseholds; the number of acres in each leasehold; the geographical position of the area covered by each lease; the number of the lease and the aggregate number of acres covered by such leases.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Statement showing:—1st. All sales of coal lands since 23rd April, 1882; the name and residence of each party to whom sales have been made; the number of acres sold to each; the price per acre received from each; the location of the land sold; the total number of acres sold, and the total amount received from such sales. 2nd. All leases of coal lands made since 23rd April, 1883; the name and residence of each lessee; the number of acres leased to each; the payments made by each; the location of each leasehold; the total number of acres leased, and the total sum derived from such leases, the considerations paid and royalties collected; and also from all other charges, if any. 3rd. Copies of all applications, correspondence, protests, and written communica-

tions in relation to coal lands sold or leased since 23rd April, 1883.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Return showing amount paid out on account of High Commissioner to London since the creation of the office; showing separately the amount paid on account of residence, furniture, and all fittings and additions thereto, and amount of salary paid to 1st January, 1885, and all items or allowances on account of taxes, light, fuel, travelling and other expenses, including salaries of private secretary and other servants or attendants, each item separately set out, up to 1st January, 1885.—(Mr. McMillen.)

Return showing:—1. The number of Canadian voyageurs sent to Egypt last autumn under orders of the Imperial authorities. 2. Names of said voyageurs, with places of residence when enlisted. 3. The names of all officers of the Dominion forces or of the militia of Canada sent in command of said voyageurs, with place of residence. 4. The names of all officers of the Canadian militia who applied for permission to join the expedition to Egypt, or offering in any other capacity.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Return showing:—1st. The total number of applications for timber licenses or berths in the Province of British Columbia, and within 50 miles of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway; the date of such application; the place from which it was made; the name and address of the applicant; the area applied for and the geographical situation of the same; whether the application was rejected or granted, and, if rejected, the reasons assigned for the same. 2nd. The total number of applications for timber licenses or berths in the Province of British Columbia, and within 50 miles of the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, made to the Government of British Columbia and transmitted to the Department of the Interior at Ottawa; the date of such application; the place from which it was made; the name and address of the applicant; the area applied for and the geographical situation of the same; whether the application was rejected or granted, and, if rejected, the reason assigned for the same. 3rd. A summary statement showing the number of licenses or permits granted, either upon applications made at Ottawa or made at Victoria and transmitted to Ottawa, designating when the application was made, the date of the application and the name and address of the grantee. 4th. The geographical location of the area covered by each license or permit issued, and the number of square miles embraced in each, and the aggregate amount of the same. 5th. The amount of bonuses or permissions received upon each and the aggregate amount of the same. 6th. Full particulars as to the Crown dues or stampage charged or chargeable upon each license or permit issued, as to whether by percentage of values or specific charges. 7th. A statement in case of each license or permit issued, as to whether the Government had caused a survey to be made of the same and was in possession of estimates made by its own surveyors, woodsmen or bushrangers, as to the kinds, the quantity and the quality of timber upon each area covered by such license or permit. 8th. Whether, in each case where a license or permit was granted, the berth was put up at public auction, after due public notice was given, inviting tenders, and was sold to the highest bidder, or whether granted upon application or tender from the grantee, without inviting public competition. 9th. In case of application by two or more parties for the same berth, and competition between them for the purchase of the same, the name and residence of each applicant and the particulars of the tender made by each. 10th. Copies of all claims, petitions, remonstrances, letters or communications made to the Government respecting such permits or licenses, applied for or granted; also a copy of all maps or plans showing the location and areas of such licenses or permits. 11th. A minute of all assignments of such licenses or permits recorded with the Government, with the names and residence of the assignor and the assignee and the consideration in each case paid.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copy of any further commission or Order in Council, or correspondence touching the position or salary of the High Commissioner of Canada, not already brought down.—(Mr. Blake.)

Statement showing, in the case of each election which has taken place since the general election of 1878:—(1.) The date of certificate of the judge or court showing the election was void, or of the communication from members that there was a vacancy, or of the member's warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, or of any other instrument under which primary action was taken towards a new election, specifying in each case the nature of the instrument. (2.) Date of receipt by the Speaker or clerk, as the case may be, of above instrument. (3.) Date of the issue of Speaker's warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make a new writ. (4.) Date of the receipt of the Speaker's warrant by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. (5.) Date of the issue of new writ by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery. (6.) Date of despatch of new writ to returning officer. (7.) Dates named in new writ for nomination and polling respectively. (8.) Dates on which nomination and polling took place. (9.) Date of return. (10.) Date of receipt of return by Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, leases, correspondence and other documents in possession of the Government, in reference to the leasing of the piece of property in the city of Kingston known as the Tête du Pont Barracks.—(Mr. Platt.)

Return of correspondence, reports of engineers and others, in reference to the construction of a breakwater at Salmon Point, together with lists of tenders and amount of each, and all other documents in possession of the Government relative to the above mentioned work.—(Mr. Platt.)

Mr. BLAKE.

Return of correspondence, petitions, reports of engineers, light-house inspectors, and others, in reference to change in dimensions or location of the lighthouses known as "range lights," at Weller's Bay, Ontario.—(Mr. Platt.)

Return showing, in detail, all moneys paid since the 23rd day of January, 1883, for and on account of all proceedings, by way of preparation or otherwise, in the matter of the northerly and westerly boundaries of the Province of Ontario, including the expenditure of the reference of the said matter to Her Majesty's Privy Council, England, and including fees to counsel, solicitor and agents, and including all sums paid to the Hon. John O'Connor in connection with the said matter, and the sums paid for printing his report or memorandum, together with the amounts paid, to whom and when paid; also all other expenses incurred with respect to the said matter or relating thereto, with the names of all persons to whom and on what account the payments were made, and the dates of such payments respectively.—(Mr. Lister.)

Copies of all permits, liberties or other papers given to any person or persons to cut timber in any part of the territory declared by Order of the Queen in Council to be within the Province of Ontario; and of all Orders in Council, departmental regulations or orders relating to the same.—(Mr. Mills.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, leases, correspondence and other documents in possession of the Government, in reference to the leasing of the piece of property in the city of Kingston known as the Market Battery.—(Mr. Platt.)

Return:—1. Of all contested cases judged upon the merits in the Supreme Court of Canada, during the twelve months ending 1st February instant. 2. Of the dates of final arguments. 3. Of the dates of final judgment. 4. Of the divisions, when such have been among the judges, at the rendering of the final judgments.—(Mr. Curran.)

Copies of all reports, correspondence, contracts, Orders in Council and other papers, in connection with the arrangement under which public moneys have been paid by the Government to the Halifax Steam Navigation Company.—(Mr. Blake.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 24th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 62) to amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Watson.)

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Navigation Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACT.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I desire, with the consent of the House, to give notice of a resolution which I desire to add to the resolutions respecting the Civil Service Act. It is to provide for the salary of one or more superintendents of letter carriers, the salary not to exceed \$800. I find this has been overlooked. I therefore move that the House resolve itself into committee on Friday next to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that each member of the Board of Examiners appointed for purposes of the Civil Service Act, shall receive a salary of six hundred dollars per annum.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the members of the Board shall be paid such travelling expenses while engaged in their work, as may be determined by the Governor in Council.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may appoint a secretary to the Board, with a salary not exceeding one thousand dollars per annum, and a clerk having a qualified examination certificate, to assist the Board, and the latter shall be a third class clerk of the Department of the Secretary of State.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the minimum salary paid to a chief clerk shall be one thousand eight hundred dollars, with an annual increase of fifty dollars per annum, up to a maximum of two thousand six hundred dollars.

5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that when the duties of any superior officer or clerk, during his absence or by reason of his demise, but not through superannuation, are continuously performed by an officer or clerk of an inferior class, or junior rank, during a period of more than three months, the officer or clerk performing such duties may, on the recommendation of the Deputy Head, concurred in by the Head of the Department, by Order in Council, and provided that funds are available under Parliamentary vote for such payment, receive in addition to his ordinary pay the difference between such ordinary pay and the pay of the officer or clerk whose duties he has performed for the time he has performed such duties.

6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that all payments of money to permanent employes, other than salaries to be made under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and whether specifically stated or not in the estimates submitted to Parliament, shall be made only under the authority of the Governor in Council.

7. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide for the appointment of one or more superintendents of letter carriers, at a salary not to exceed \$800 each, as may be determined by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS.

Mr. McMULLEN. I beg to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that a return for which I moved last year, showing the amount paid to printing and publishing companies in the Dominion for a number of years back, has not been brought down in full.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have already laid before the House all the information that was in the Department with reference to this subject, and nearly everything which was asked for by the motion. I hope to be able to place the remainder before the House in a day or two.

Mr. VAIL. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the fact that a return laid on the Table yesterday, purporting to show the quantity of sugar imported at Halifax and Montreal, is incomplete, so far as regards Halifax, inasmuch as the quantity is simply given in bulk, without giving the vessels' names or the details for each cargo.

Mr. BOWELL. I am under the impression that the paper laid before the House contains all the information asked for, if not more than was asked for. There are two distinct propositions in the motion, and only in the second—the one referring to Montreal—are these details asked for, and in the return they are given for that port. If the hon. gentleman desires the same information with regard to both ports, he should have asked for it. I was very particular in ordering that full return should be made, especially as the fact had come under my observation and knowledge that there has been some discussion in the newspapers and among the merchants as to the relative value at which sugars are entered.

Mr. VAIL. The Minister of Customs must surely have seen that the closing part of the motion referred to both places.

Mr. BOWELL. It does not say so.

Mr. VAIL. I do not see how it can be understood otherwise, as it must be obvious that the object was to get a comparative statement, and that, therefore, the return would be of no value unless the figures were given for each cargo. I take it for granted, however, that he will have no objection to furnishing the correct information, and if not I suppose it will be open to me to move another motion, as I know he is disposed to give us all the information we require. I may say that I do not want the information for any particular purpose except to enable me to judge of the relative value of the sugars imported.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no possible objection to bringing down all the information the hon. gentleman asks for, but I leave it to the House to say whether Ministers are to attempt to fathom what gentlemen want when they place motions on the paper. If they state distinctly what they require, I am quite sure the Departments will supply the

information at once. If he requires a statement for Halifax similar to that which I have given for Montreal, I will have great pleasure in handing it to him; but in the next motion he puts on the paper I hope he will kindly state what he wants and all he wants.

THE BUSINESS OF THE SESSION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would call the attention of the First Minister to three subjects that are referred to in the Speech, upon which I should suppose by this time we should be supplied with some papers. The first is with reference to the Hudson Bay expedition, the report of which was to be laid before us. I think it is time that we should get this report. Then in the 9th paragraph, a statement is made with reference to the necessity of encouraging the speedy construction of lines of railway through the North-West Territories, and we are told that we shall be asked to aid railway enterprises by liberal grants of land. If the Government has adopted a policy on that subject I think the papers announcing that policy should be laid before us, even although the form of the parliamentary action to be asked for is not yet divulged. Reference is also made in the Speech to the exhibitions at Antwerp and London, and we are asked to consider the best means of aiding these objects. The same organs to which I referred a short time ago indicate that the Government has adopted a policy in this matter, and that commissioners have been appointed who have been engaged for the prosecution of their work for some time. I think, therefore, that the papers which would show the policy adopted, as far as possible, should also be laid before us without delay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I find on enquiry that the report respecting the Hudson Bay expedition is attached to a report of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. With respect to the grants to railways in the North-West the papers are all ready, with the exception of those relating to one road, that is the Manitoba and North-Western. That company has been urging an alteration in the terms, and that subject has been under discussion; otherwise the papers would have been brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. Are the others brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, I think we should have them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I think so. All the correspondence and Orders in Council respecting exhibitions will be brought down.

THE BUDGET.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I stated last week, in answer to the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) that I hoped to be able to make the financial statement on Friday. The estimates for next year are not completed yet, and therefore I shall have to name Tuesday of next week.

THE FACTORY REPORT.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Can the hon. Minister, or any member of the Printing Committee, say whether the Factory Report will be printed and distributed within a day or two?

Mr. BERGIN. It is being printed. It is in the hands of the printer now.

CHINESE COMMISSION REPORT.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I desire to ask the right hon. leader of the Government when we may expect the report of the Chinese Commission?

Mr. BLAKE. Ask the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I hope to have a Message with the report before to-morrow.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKERSHIP.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the third reading of Bill (No. 26) to provide for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker.

Motion agreed to on a division, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CENSUS OF THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. POPE moved consideration of Bill (No. 21) to provide for the taking of a census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin, as amended in Committee of Whole.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Before that motion is put I desire to call the attention of the House to a point to which I called their attention in Committee, respecting the desirability of acquiring information on two or three additional points—in the first place, the material of which the houses in the North-West are composed, in the second place, the number of apartments in each house, and in the third place, the number of families residing under each roof. Now, I can hardly understand why so reasonable a request, for information which every hon. gentleman in this House knows is in itself valuable, should be refused. If I understood correctly the reason offered by the Minister of Agriculture, it was partly because he considered that at the present moment there were too many lists in the schedule committed to the enumerators. On that point I shall have a word or two to say presently. But I desire to call attention to this fact, first, that this information is in itself very desirable, and in the next place, that it will, if obtained, give us a better means of testing the advance of the North-West, from time to time, than almost any other item in the census schedule which was recently laid on the Table. This is one of the very few items which, if included in the returns, it would be in the power of the enumerators to take with reasonable accuracy. In almost every other case the enumerator is obliged to depend on loose and vague statements made by the parties consulted. In this case he can with his own eye supply himself with all the information I desire him to obtain. Moreover, it can be got at a minimum cost; all that is required is to add a line or two to the census paper. True, that paper is already very large, but no serious expense can be incurred by complying with the request I make. In all other countries I know of, such information can be obtained from one quarter or another, and whether it is or is not included in the census returns is a matter of no moment; but if we are to have this information, it is only by means of the census enumerators that we can obtain it. I have always considered the absence of this class of information from the census of 1871 and 1881, a serious omission; and I desire not only to obtain it for Manitoba and the North-West Territories, but I desire that the precedent should be established, so that in taking future censuses, this very valuable item of information may form part of the regular details required by law. Now, Sir, in order that the House may know that I am warranted in saying that the census, as at present taken, abounds with a great many details which can by no possibility be accurate, I will just call attention to certain items in the census of 1881. I find there that nearly twenty pages, and something like fifteen distinct entries required to be made up all over the Dominion, are devoted to items like these: Total number of pounds of home-made butter, pounds of home-made cheese, pounds of grapes, bushels of other fruits,

Mr. SHAKESPEARE.

pounds of maple sugar, pounds of hops, and a variety of items of the same kind. Now, if accurate information on these points could have been obtained, the hon. Minister might have been justified in asking for it, and in loading down the census tables with all these details; but I put it to the common sense of every hon. gentleman in this House whether one farmer in a hundred, or in five hundred, is able to give the census enumerators the number of pounds of home-made butter or cheese he has produced, much less the number of pounds of grapes or of maple sugar. Any one who has paid any attention to the way in which such information is obtained, knows that farmers scarcely ever dream of keeping accurate accounts of these various matters. The fact is that all these details are simply guesses, and nothing more; not one of them can be depended on. They are approximations, more or less accurate, generally less accurate than more. I dare say the information would be valuable if it could be relied on; but the hon. Minister, who is a man of practical experience, knows that very few farmers keep accurate accounts, even of the quantity of grain they raise, much less of these details with which the census is encumbered. Now, I do not want to harass the Minister, but I say that it is an act of pedantry on his part to insist on getting information on such details, which he knows cannot be accurate, and to refuse to get information on the points to which I have referred. I move:

That the said Bill be not now considered, but that it be re-committed to amend clause 4 by inserting at the end thereof the following words: "the material of which each dwelling is constructed, the number of rooms it contains, and the number of families residing under the same roof."

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman says it is of the utmost importance that we should know what the houses are made of, how many rooms in each, and so forth; but it is of no consequence that we should know how many pounds of sugar are made in the country. Well, that is like a great many things the hon. gentleman has said. He says these people are guessing. It is he who is guessing. He says the quantity cannot be obtained. Why, there is not a man who makes sugar, who does not know almost to the very pound how much he makes. Is there a man who raises hops who cannot tell how many pounds he sells? Is it not ridiculous for the hon. gentleman to say that this information cannot be got directly? It is the very information you can get directly.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is not.

Mr. POPE. I think this House will agree that it is very important we should know how much sugar, how many pounds of hops are used—much more important than to know exactly what kind of timber a house is made of or how many rooms it has. Does the hon. gentleman suppose there is a farmer in the country who makes butter and cheese who does not know how many pounds of each he makes?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. POPE. The thing is perfectly ridiculous. It shows what an impracticable man the hon. gentleman is. Let the hon. gentleman condescend once in a while to dine with a farmer, to go to a farmer's house and look at him, and the farmer will tell him at once that what the hon. gentleman has said is perfectly ridiculous. I object to this work the hon. gentleman proposes. I do not see any possible good that can come from taking such information just now. If it were a question of taking a new census, I would consider the hon. gentleman's proposition; but just now when we have taken a census in the rest of the Dominion without this particular item, I think the hon. gentleman should decide to withdraw his motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Certainly not.

Amendment negatived on a division.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I propose to move :

That the said Bill be re-committed to amend the same, by adding at the end of the last clause the following words: "that it shall be the duty of each enumerator to set down in a separate column the names of all persons included by him in the population of his district, who are not at the time of the taking of the said census actually present in the said district."

Now, I want to call the attention of the House to this. During the taking of the preceding census, we, from this side, called attention to the manifestly fraudulent intention with which it was taken. The result of that census has been that we have paid \$500,000 for a document as to which we only know this, that it does not contain one single statement that can be relied upon; that in the very first statement, the most important of all, the statement of the number of people who are now in the Dominion of Canada, that census has been deliberately and fraudulently falsified, and falsified for a purpose; and that that purpose, so far as the hon. gentleman, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, and those who support him could make it, was, I believe, to deprive the Province of Ontario of its legitimate representation.

Mr. POPE. I call the hon. gentleman to order. He has no right to say that the Minister of Agriculture falsified those returns.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I say that the census was taken in a way to produce a false representation.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that the hon. gentleman stated that the Minister of Agriculture had fraudulently taken the census for a purpose. In that he is not in order.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What I say is, that that census has been taken in a way to render the statements made in it worthless. That census has been taken in a fashion which has caused several thousands of people in every Province to be put down as residents of this country who are not residents there. There may have been many purposes for that. It may have been from an adherence to an absurd and obsolete system of taking the census; and it may have been for the purpose of depriving the Province of Ontario of a large share of the representation to which it is entitled; it may have been that it was supposed that by this mode of taking the census many thousands would be counted to one or other Province, which that Province was not entitled to have, and in that way that the Province of Ontario, in which that was not so likely to happen, would be deprived of a considerable portion of its representation. But whatever may have been the object, whatever may have been the purpose, the fact remains that we have a census which cost us \$500,000, if not more, and of that census, no man who takes the trouble to analyse it, to scrutinise its tables, can affirm with certainty any proposition except that in the most important part of all, it exaggerates by thousands of people the number of persons supposed to be resident in Canada. That is the result of the system which has been adopted. From various portions of the country I have heard complaints as to the way that census has been taken. Over and over again, instances have been given to me in which men who have been absent from this country for three, five, seven, eight, and ten years, and who have no sort of intention of returning, have been put down as inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada. I say it is very unfortunate that this has been done, because it authorises very great and very deserved distrust of all the statements which are made in this census. Now, I desire, as far as possible, to prevent that fault being committed again. If the hon. gentlemen are really desirous of giving us the facts, if they really desire to show us, not those whom they imagine or whom they think ought to be in Canada, but who are in Canada—in any part of it—at the time of the taking of the census,

then they can have no objection to take the census in their own fashion, but at the same time to insert a column in which shall be stated the number of persons and the names of the persons whom they admit not to be in that part of Canada in which the census is being taken at the time it is taken. If they do not do that, then we shall know perfectly well that this census is not being fairly taken, that it is not being taken with a view of ascertaining the number of people that are here. Now, in the case of Manitoba, and the other territories, there is a double reason for this. Naturally enough, the people who suppose that they may receive additional subsidy or additional representation by virtue of this census, may be a little disposed to exaggerate their number. That is one of the points in which the enumerator is often obliged to take the statements of the head of a family without being able to satisfy himself of their perfect accuracy. By doing what I propose the Minister may secure a return according to his own fashion, if he pleases, but he will, at least, give us the means of checking this return, of ascertaining who were in the country at the time. There can be no excuse here such as was applied in other cases, that a large number of people, at the time of taking the census, might be absent in the prosecution of their ordinary avocations. That excuse cannot be applied to the Province of Manitoba. All that we demand, all that I demand, in this matter is that the Minister shall have a separate column, in which the names of those who are not at the time the census is taken residing in Manitoba shall be stated. If he declines, there can be only one inference to be drawn, and it is that this census is to be utterly incorrect, that this census, for which I presume we shall be called upon to pay a large sum of money, will be so incorrect in regard to the most important figure of it that we shall only know, as we know in regard to the census of 1881, that it does not show the number of people actually at that time residing in Canada.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman has not exercised his usual calm discretion in using the language he did in proposing this amendment. He said that this system was obsolete and effete, though it is the same which has always existed in Canada, and, I think, in the United States, and I am not sure whether it exists in England or not—no, it does not exist in England—but the position of the population in the United States is similar in almost every respect to that of Canada, and therefore this system must be considered an effective system and not at all obsolete or absurd. I do not think the hon. gentleman is justified in taking that line, especially as the system was adopted and approved of by Parliament, and I think the hon. gentleman did not exercise his usual discretion when he said not only that this was done for a purpose, but that it was done for an improper purpose, for the purpose of depriving Ontario of its proper proportion of population, and that not only were the Government and the Minister chargeable with that improper purpose, but those who supported them were also chargeable with it. In other words, the hon. gentleman charged all the members from Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and British Columbia with having entered into a fraudulent conspiracy to rob poor Ontario of its proper representation. That is the deliberate statement of the hon. gentleman. I do not think that those gentlemen in the House who were here at the time when the census was settled will admit that that charge is a correct one. With regard to the motion, the desire of my hon. friend who has charge of this Department is to have the census taken in exactly the same way as the last census was taken, to the same extent and with the same particulars, so that it will be on all fours with the census of 1881. When the next general census takes place and the whole subject is resumed, it may be that, with the progress of the country and with the in-

creased light of experience, the *de jure* system may be altered and the system adopted which now obtains in England, where there is a fixed population, where the people are not transitory to anything like the same degree as they are in Canada. The general directions which are given with respect to the mode of taking the census are shortly these:—

“The principle adopted for the registration of the population is that which is called by statista the *population de droit* or *de jure*; that is, the population legally domiciled within the territory of the Dominion, and including all persons who may be temporarily absent from their place of abode, whether at the fisheries, at sea, or in the forest, wilderness, etc.

“All persons are to be registered in the Province and particular locality in which their home, family dwelling or place of abode is situated, although they may happen to be in other parts of the Dominion, in the forest, or at sea, or in foreign parts, on the day with reference to which the census is taken.

“In order to make the details of this system of registration very clearly understood, cases that will occur in practice are furnished in the form of instruction as follow:—

“Sea-faring men or fishermen at sea on the coast, lumbermen or hunters in the forest, merchants or tradesmen, or laborers, or travellers, or students, or any others happening to be temporarily absent from home and not permanently settled elsewhere, are not to be considered as absent for the purpose of the census; but their names are to be registered by the enumerator as being present. Therefore, the names of seamen at sea, college students and school children, of the sick in hospitals, of inmates temporarily present in educational, charitable, or penal institutions, are to be taken down in their own Provinces, at their own domiciles or homes, and not at temporary abiding places or institutions. In other words, all living members of one family are to be registered as being present at the family abode, unless they are settled in homes of their own, or have left the country with the intention not to return.”

This system, I think is the one best adapted to our scattered and transitory population, and I think it would be a great mistake to have the census taken on any other principle, introducing new particulars, from that which obtained in 1881. We want the census, in the first place, for the purpose of comparison, and, secondly, for the purpose of ascertaining the scattered population in the North-West, and I think the people of the North-West will feel that, instead of it being the desire of my friend to exaggerate the population there, he is trying to diminish the actual number of people in the North-West by the course he is taking. I hope the hon. gentleman's amendment will not be carried.

Mr. BLAKE. I am unable to agree in the reasoning of the hon. gentleman, or in the accuracy of his historical retrospect of the adoption of this system. I recollect very well when the first Census Act was passed providing for the census of 1871. I recollect enquiring across the floor—I think it was I who made the enquiry, but, at any rate, I recollect an enquiry being made as to the principle upon which that census should be taken, the *de facto* or the *de jure* system. I recollect the hon. gentleman himself, then as now the First Minister, answering that it would be taken on the *de facto* system, which he thought the proper system; and that measure passed on the faith of that statement that the census would be taken on the *de facto* system. But, when we came back, we found that it had been taken on the *de jure* system. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman made the statement in good faith, that it was his intention to have it taken on the *de facto* system, but, without further consulting Parliament, he changed his mind and had it taken on the *de jure* system and that is how we got into the way of the *de jure* census. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that this amendment involves a departure from the *de jure* system. I entirely agree with him that having had our census of 1871 and that of 1881 on the *de jure* system, and this being one for the purpose of comparison, the same general principle ought to apply; otherwise I should advocate a census on the *de facto* system. But we called the attention of the Government, on the last occasion of the dis-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

cussions in Parliament, to the importance of securing this additional information in that sense. Now, nothing that my hon. friend proposes is to make this census less accurately one capable of being compared with the results of the census of 1881. He does not propose that the principle shall be altered in the slightest degree; he does not propose that the column shall be changed, that the instructions shall be changed, that anything shall be done except to provide this additional information not provided by the census of 1881, and what those of us who have given attention to that subject know to be the facts of the census of 1881, and know to be essential—this additional information as to the number who are taken as inhabitants of the district and who are not within the district. I have had it from men in various parts of this Dominion, to whom the enumerators applied, that they were asked: Well, how many children have you? So many. Well, are they here? No. A son, two sons, a daughter, two daughters, are away. Where away? In the States. How long away? Ten, fifteen, twenty years. Well, do you think they will never return? Oh! I can't say they will never return. I hope to see my son again, I hope to see my daughter again. Down they went, although it was quite certain that if they did return they would return only as visitors to the parental home, although they had adopted a new residence. Now, I have had that statement made to me over and over again by respectable individuals whom I saw, and who voluntarily communicated the fact to me in particular districts. Gentlemen who had taken pains to ascertain found that in the census district with which they were connected, numerous instances of this kind occurred, cases in which the party who was counted had in no case been less than ten years, and in some cases, twenty years away. All that is asked is that we shall have this check upon the operations of the enumerator, and this piece of information for the public—how many men and women, what percentage of the whole numbers whom you count as residents of the districts are, in fact, at that time, non-residents; that is all. The very circumstance that the enumerator is called upon to give this statement will be an important check; it will be an important lever towards accurate enumeration. He will be told that if he reports a very large percentage on the total number as belonging to a district who were not present, when the visit was made, this fact will cast suspicion upon his enumeration, and he will be disposed to be more rigid than the enumerators were formerly as to whom he shall count. These instructions were offered for his guidance when the last census was taken. They are admirable instructions; the hon. gentleman has read them to us, but we know they were not complied with. We know that these instructions which dealt with men who were temporarily absent on a fishing voyage, with the girl at a boarding school, were extended by the enumerators to cases of persons who were not in that position, but were in the position I described a little while ago. While we cannot ascertain that while you cannot call upon the enumerator to state the duration of the absence of each person whom he counts, you can take that broad and general test of how many of all you count are actually there—what proportion are there and what proportion are away. I say that is an easy thing to be done. It does not add to the cost, it does not add to the complexity, but it will add to the accuracy and value of the census very much.

House divided on amendment of Sir Richard Cartwright:

That the said Bill be recommitted to amend the same, by adding at the end of last clause the following words: “That it shall be the duty of each enumerator to set down in a separate column the names of all persons included by him in the population of the district, who were at the time of the taking of said census actually present in the said district.”

YEAS:
Messieurs

Allen,	Edgar,	McIsaac,
Armstrong,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Auger,	Fleming,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Forbes,	Mulock,
Bécharé,	Geoffrion,	Peterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gler,	Rav,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Rinfret,
Burpee (Sunbury),	Harley,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Huron),	Holtou,	Scrifer,
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Somerville (Brant),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Springer,
Casey,	King,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Vail,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Charlton,	Langelier,	Weldon,
Cockburn,	Lister,	Wells,
Cook,	Livingstone,	Wilson, and
Davies,	Mackenzie,	Yeo.—62.
De St. Georges,	McCraney,	

NAYS:
Messieurs

Abbott,	Dupont,	McLelan,
Allison,	Farrow,	McNeill,
Amyot,	Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,
Bain (Soulanges),	Fortin,	Mitchell,
Baker (Victoria),	Foster,	Moffat,
Barnard,	Gagné,	Montplaisir,
Beaty,	Gaudet,	O'Brien,
Bell,	Gigault,	Quimet,
Belleau,	Girouard,	Paint,
Benoit,	Gordon,	Pinsonneault,
Benson,	Grandbois,	Pope,
Bergeron,	Gnilbault,	Pruyn,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Reid,
Billy,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Blondeau,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bossé,	Hall,	Royal,
Bourbeau,	Hesson,	Rykert,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Scott,
Bryson,	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Homer,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Carling,	Ives,	Stairs,
Caron,	Jamieson,	Taschereau,
Chapleau,	Jenkins,	Tassé,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,
Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Temple,
Colby,	Kinney,	Tilley,
Costigar,	Kranz,	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Landry (Kent),	Tupper,
Coursol,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Cuthbert,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
Daoust,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Dawson,	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Desaulniers (St M'rice),	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wigle,
Desjardins,	McCallum,	Williams,
Dickinson,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wood (Brockville),
Dodd,	McDougall (C. Breton),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dundas,	McGreevy,	Wright.—120.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. MILLS. I beg to move in amendment:

That the said Bill be recommitted, so as to provide that the census be taken in the Province of Manitoba, and in the Districts of Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

I need not detain the House with any observations. I called the attention of the House to that subject when the Bill was before us for a second reading. Hon. gentlemen will know that the North-West Territory embraces about two million square miles, and the District of Keewatin is of very considerable extent. I mentioned the other day, and I repeat it now, that there are no settlements in the District of Keewatin, and there are no indications that there will be any settlement there for years to come; that the districts I have mentioned are districts within which the Government have for some years been carrying on surveys, through which a railway runs, and where any projected lines of railway that may be undertaken for some time to come will be found. It embraces the whole country known as the

fertile belt. It seems to me that if the Government are anxious to ascertain the population of the North-West Territory for practical purposes oftener than once in ten years, they should confine their operations to those districts where settlement is going forward. I have in my hands here a map showing those districts where they are going forward. There will be ample room for the work which the Government proposes to undertake within these particular limits. The districts not embraced, that is, the territory lying north of the fertile belt and the whole Keewatin District, are districts to which no settlers have gone in, where no population will be found except, perhaps, a few trappers who are engaged in trading, and the Indians, who are of nomadic habits. It seems to me that the proposition is a reasonable one. It is consistent with the duties this House owes to the public, because it embraces the whole territory, within which it is desirable the work should be done which the Government have brought under the attention of the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This matter was discussed when this Bill was before the House before. The officials will make enquiry in the vicinity of Winnipeg and thoreabouts, and if there are no people in Keewatin there will be no census; if there are any white people or half-breeds they will be taken.

Amendment (Mr. Mills) negatived on a division.

Bill read the third time and passed.

MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO

Order for the House to go into Committee on Bill (No. 11) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario (Mr. Allen) read.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think there was a sort of suggestion thrown out by the leader of the Opposition that this Bill should be postponed for some considerable time.

Mr. BLAKE. It was thrown out from the other side. The hon. gentleman threw it out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I received to-day a deputation of a number of shipowners, of large shipowners, who are alarmed at the effect which this Bill would have if it became law. They had a meeting last week in Toronto, and the Toronto association appointed a respectable and influential body of representatives to protest against this Bill. I desire that all the objections to the measure shall be set out, and then fully considered. I hope the hon. member will not press the Bill, because there is no hurry about it.

Mr. ALLEN. Let the Order stand.

WHARVES AND DOCKS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Mr. TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 18) respecting wharves, docks and piers constructed in navigable waters. He said: This Bill, of which I have charge, is, as I stated on a previous occasion, of considerable interest and importance to the shipping interest of the Dominion and to our mercantile people. It deals with a question hitherto untouched by our legislation, and affects particularly that kind of property of which there is so much in the Dominion, namely, wharf property, and the rights of owners to grants of water lots in navigable waters. According to the law as it now stands and the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada in several cases, there is no legislation by which the owner of a grant of a water lot can erect on that water lot a wharf. The law lays down that a wharf built in such waters can be deemed an obstruction, and is an obstruction to navigation, all the Queen's subjects having a right to navigate without interruption navigable waters.

So that the different wharves and structures in the harbors of this country are at present in such a position that they are liable to destruction, and the owners have no redress. This subject, being one of great importance, I propose that this Bill be read the second time and carefully considered by a Select Committee, because I am aware that great caution must be exercised, and I must confess that the clauses have not been so carefully considered as is desirable in a Bill dealing with such an important subject as this treats. After the Bill has been read a second time, I shall move that it be referred to a Select Committee, which I am prepared to name, so that the whole subject, and the different decisions affecting it, which have been given by our own courts, may be carefully considered, and some measure arrived at which will satisfactorily deal with the question. In Massachusetts the subject was dealt with long ago, when that State was a British colony; and there, I believe, there was power vested in a local authority delegated by the Legislature, by which the local authority or superintendent decided how a wharf should be built or a dock constructed. And by dock, as stated in the Bill, I mean what we generally understand in Canada as a dock—water between different wharves, in which ships lie from time to time. This Bill is drafted somewhat after the Bill dealing with the erection or construction of booms in navigable waters, and provides for the filing of a plan of any proposed wharf or dock, the same to be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council; and it proposes in respect to those wharves already erected and standing, as I say, without any legislative authority and therefore existing by mere sufferance, to legalise them for a year, as in the case of the Boom Bill of 1883. If those different wharves are not approved within a year, they will be treated in the same way as booms in a like position are treated under the Boom Bill. This Parliament has dealt with the question of obstruction in navigable waters in the Boom Bill of 1883, and last Session the subject was also touched upon in the amendments to the Public Works Act, chap. 16, Act of 1884, where the right of supervision was vested in the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine in regard to the foreshore. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Mr. KAULBACH. I hope this Bill appearing for its second reading, is not intended to have a retrospective effect, or that it will in any way interfere with the rights of private parties, rights to lands and lands covered by water, vested in them by the Local Legislatures of the different Provinces previous to the passage of the Act known as the British North America Act of 1867.

Mr. DAVIES. So far as this Bill deals with the construction of wharves and piers in those portions of the navigable waters which the Supreme Court of Canada, by its decisions, have determined to be under the control of the Dominion Government and the Dominion Parliament, I have no objection to it. But so far as it attempts to legislate away existing vested rights in wharves and piers which have been legally built by the authority of local statutes, and in waters where the Dominion authorities have not sole control, I do object. The matter is a very important one, for perhaps the line where the provincial jurisdiction ends and the federal jurisdiction begins is not very clear. I think the hon. gentleman is right in referring the Bill to a Select Committee, for in its present form it is one which can never be consented to. For instance, many of these wharves and piers were built 70 or 80 years ago under a local statute and they are perfectly legal. They do not interfere with navigation, and at any rate they are essentially necessary, and to say that it should be within the power of the Dominion executive to declare them illegal structures, or to interfere with these vested rights, would be monstrous. I understand that the leader of the Govern-

Mr. TUPPER,

ment himself does not assent to such a proposition; but I believe that under the Bill that would be the effect, and that no matter under what authority the wharf was constructed, if the Dominion Government does not approve of it, it becomes a nuisance. So far as the Bill legislates in that direction I am strongly opposed to it, but so far as it is prospective in its operations, and is confined to waters over which the Dominion Government has control, I think its object may be a good one. If I vote for the second reading, it must be with the distinct understanding that I oppose the retrospective character of the Bill and those clauses which interfere with vested rights.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is quite right, as the Bill is one which will not interfere with the legislative action of the different Provinces. It is of a similar character with an Act passed in 45 Victoria respecting bridges over navigable rivers, and also 48 Victoria, chapter 43. I quite agree with the proposition of my hon. friend, the promoter of the Bill (Mr. Tupper), that it should go to a Special Committee, and I think my hon. friend from Charlottetown (Mr. Davies)—

Mr. TUPPER. I have the hon. gentleman's name on the committee which I intend to propose.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry the Government does not think proper to take charge of this measure as it is a much more important one of necessity than the analogous one to which the hon. gentleman refers, with reference to booms in navigable waters. Its application is much more extended, and yet the Government thought the other measure important enough to bring it down as a Government Bill. Of course that does not prevent its being within the competence of the hon. gentleman to introduce it to the attention of the House—I am not raising that question—but I think a measure which affects such a number of existing interests of one kind and another should be dealt with on the responsibility of the Government, and I should like to have seen the hon. gentleman offer to take charge of this Bill. If there have been, as I believe there have been, in various localities throughout Canada, wharves or piers, or what we sometimes call docks—because that word is oftentimes in the West applied to the wharf instead of to the water-space between two wharves—erected for whole generations without formal or legislative or executive authority—and if all are to be placed in this precarious position, that the right of the present proprietors is to be subject to their bringing in their maps and plans within twelve months, and getting the assent of the Governor in Council, I am afraid there may occur a vast amount of utterly unnecessary expense to multitudes of persons. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman's Bill is intended to render lawful wharves and piers which are at present lawful.

Mr. TUPPER. No, it is not.

Mr. BLAKE. Quite so; I was speaking of the hon. gentleman's intention, and not what the hon. gentleman has done. But mark this; it being now the statement of the promoter of the Bill, that he does not intend to ask us to make unlawful those which are lawful, the first section applies only to those which are unlawful at this day. To what end, therefore, shall you provide that:

"No wharf, dock, or pier, shall be constructed or maintained (except only as provided by section 4), etc."

At this moment, all the wharves and piers which this Bill can at all affect must be wharves and piers which can be dealt with as nuisances, which are unlawful now; and why then declare that twelve months from date, they shall become nuisances and shall not be maintained? It must be to facilitate the proceedings for their destruction, for their abatement, and render it easier that the ancient wharves or piers in respect of which there might be some presumption, or at any rate an extreme disinclination on the part

of a jury or tribunal to deal with adversely and deal with them on the same footing as if they had been erected a year or two ago. I think that would be an unfortunate state of things. My impression is that in the vast majority of cases to which the Bill applies, it will be found that no harm is done to navigation and no disturbance will take place, by the proprietors of the wharves or piers. But if you are to expressly declare that their title is bad, if you are to negative the legality of their maintenance, you call on them to come in here and bow down to my hon. friend before me and prepare plans, and then, if he thinks proper, they must go down. Then my hon. friend objects that the fourth clause may be construed as rendering unlawful those which are at present lawful. Of course this would be a monstrous proposition except on the ground of great public interest—this interference with the rights of individuals, of which the hon. gentleman has shown himself so great a champion in a controversy which I shall not mention at this moment, and thereby disturb the harmony of the occasion. I do not know what is the purpose for which the hon. gentleman proposes to give the power which is to be given by section six, to charge tolls. If the wharf or dock is lawful, or is to be made lawful under this Act, then in common law the right which may follow from the ownership of the lawful dock or wharf to charge tolls will exist irrespective of the Act. But it is possible that they may be given a new right in favor of the individual as against the public as to terms on which the wharf would be used, which would be improper. The clause, therefore, as it strikes me at this moment, is unnecessary for the protection of the owner of the wharf or dock in his exercise of the common law right, because that is enough; and if any circumstances now exist which disable him by usage or otherwise, from taking such tolls as he has the right to take, I do not see that we should say he should be given the right. I throw out these ideas to show that difficulties and complications may arise, and that the Bill is one which should properly come under the responsibility of the Administration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not at all prepared to dispute the arguments of the hon. gentleman in support of his contention that this Bill deals with a subject to be taken charge of by the Government. Still, my hon. friend, on his own responsibility as an independent member of Parliament, introduced this Bill without any previous concert or communication with the Government, and the Bill being before the House, the House had better deal with it. The Bill will go to a committee, where it can be carefully considered, and when it returns from the committee it will be then for the Government, as it will be their duty, to consider whether they ought not to give a decided opinion on the Bill as reported.

Mr. WOODWORTH. This Bill deals with interests so great and of such mammoth proportions that I agree with the observations made on the other side of the House, in favor of the Government taking it under their charge. In my own county there are some 15 wharves which are more or less public. I applied to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, which, under the Act of 1877, deals with this class of public works, and I found a great deal of trouble in inducing the Government to take over these wharves and make them Dominion wharves to all intents and purposes. They are built under the authority of the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, from which they have received from time to time very large amounts of aid. My hon. friend opposite, who led the Government of Nova Scotia for a number of years, knows that the estimates every year contain appropriations for these wharves; so that they have become vested rights, and for this Parliament to touch them in any way injuriously affecting their interests, would arouse a great deal of complaint among the people of Nova Scotia. It is a very

delicate subject, which calls for the exercise of great care by this House that the vested rights of no corporation or quasi corporation are affected hurtfully by this Bill. I think the law officers of the Crown should look into this matter very carefully, and see that it is not dealt with in a higglety-pigglety manner, and the authoritative declaration of the Government should be had before any Bill like this is allowed to become law.

Mr. WELDON. According to my observation, this is one of the most important Bills ever brought before this House. If passed, it would very seriously interfere with all the owners of property bordering on the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Bay of Fundy, where there are high tides. We know that wharves to be useful at all must be up to low water mark, or even beyond it. Many of the lands on the Bay of Fundy, are granted down to low water mark. In the City of St. John the wharves are built to the harbor line, which is fixed by the law of the Province of New Brunswick, and extends out below low water mark. The effect of this Bill would be to compel all these owners before the end of twelve months to get their wharves legalised. There is a distinction between wharves and booms. In the case of booms a conflict of authority has arisen between the Dominion and Local Legislatures as to the granting of powers to boom rivers, and we know that booms which entirely cross a stream, must necessarily, to a certain extent, temporarily impede navigation. Wharves, however, are different; they do not necessarily obstruct navigation, although it is a principle of law as laid down by my hon. friend, that a party has no right to build a wharf below low water mark where it may interfere with navigation. I quite endorse the remark of the hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth) that this is a matter which ought to be dealt with by the Government. With regard to the question of tolls, in many cases, wharfage and other tolls are regulated by the Local Legislature, and the effect might be very serious if the Parliament gave power to wharf owners to impose reasonable tolls. The effect might be simply to leave the different wharf owners to charge what they please, or what might be considered reasonable or unreasonable in the view of the owner of the vessel or the owner of the wharf. Perhaps there would be no objection to establishing some supervision over wharves in waters over which this Parliament has jurisdiction; but it seems to me that to pass a retroactive measure, affecting wharves which have been built for upwards of sixty or eighty years, would be fraught with great danger and hardship.

Mr. VAIL. I am glad to see that the importance of this Bill is fully acknowledged by the House, and I do not think too much has been said as to the desirability of getting this question settled, because, as has been said, it is very difficult to see where the jurisdiction of the Dominion ends and the jurisdiction of the several Provinces begin. In Nova Scotia, so far as I understand the matter, the local authorities have claimed the right to grant water lots in the harbors and on the shores outside of the harbors. The question has been raised as to the right of the Provinces to grant water lots within the harbors; and I believe the Dominion Government itself has been somewhat doubtful on that question, because, if I am correctly informed, only a little over a year ago the Dominion Government applied to the Local Government of Nova Scotia for the grant of a water lot in the harbor of Halifax. This shows that the question is an unsettled one at present, and I am very glad that we are to have some legislation which will settle this important question. I hope, whether this Bill goes to a committee or whether the Government take charge of it, the right will not be given to the Dominion Government to interfere with the wharves and piers on the shores of the bays of Nova Scotia, at all events. We have bays from five to ten miles in width,

some of them having fifteen or twenty piers on their shores, and it cannot be held for a moment that any pier that could be built in waters so extensive as those would at all interfere with navigation. It is quite right the Dominion should have complete control over all matter affecting navigation, and so long as they have the control over harbors and the water lots within the limits of what are still known as the harbors of Nova Scotia, I think it is quite proper for them to leave the others in the hands of the Local Governments. I hope the committee appointed to examine this Bill and remodel it, will take into consideration the important effects it will have, if left in its present shape, on the shores and bays of Nova Scotia, outside of what are considered at present as harbors.

Mr. TUPPER. I am glad to notice the unanimity of hon. members with regard to the importance of the principle involved in this Bill. The hon. member for King's, when he understands the causes that have led to its introduction, will be one of the warmest supporters of this measure. As I have said, it is not framed with that care and caution such a Bill requires, and is justly open to the criticisms passed upon it by the leader of the Opposition, and the hon. member for Queen's, and the hon. gentlemen who followed, in regard to the manner with which the idea which I have in view is embodied in the different clauses. My object is not to interfere with the legislation anterior to 1867. I know that in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick there is legislation dealing with this subject before 1867. That demonstrated the necessity now, since our courts have decided that such legislation is useless to support rights acquired since, for this Bill. The hon. member for King's will find on further enquiry that it is in the interest of every man who owns at present a water lot below low water mark. There is no desire to interfere with vested rights; on the contrary, my object is to secure them, to enable owners to recover dockage dues or wharfage dues because the courts have decided they cannot do so unless the wharves are sanctioned by proper legislation, unless the property they use is protected by proper legislation; some legislation is therefore desirable. The criticisms with regard to the fourth section are correct; the Bill does not sufficiently exempt from its operation those rights about which there is no dispute, that is the rights acquired under legislative authority previous to 1867; and in regard to the sixth and last clause to which attention was called, the clause dealing with collection of tolls and dues, I quite concur that where you have built and own a wharf you have authority by law to collect, for the use of the wharf, a fair and reasonable toll. This clause was inserted by me because a similar declaratory clause, as it were, is found in different English Acts regulating the rights of owners of wharfs and property of this character. It is, I take it, merely declaratory, and nothing more. I am very glad to find that the important principle involved has drawn the attention of hon. members, and is likely to be followed by legislation which I am sure all proprietors of wharves are anxious to obtain.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. TUPPER moved:

That this Bill be referred to a Select Committee composed as follows:—Messrs. McCarthy, Wood (Brockville), Cameron (Huron), Mulock, Davies, Weldon, Ouimet, Bossé, Laurier, Laugelier, Girouard, Townsend, McIsaac, Woodworth and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON.

Mr. TUPPER moved the second reading of Bill (No. 42) to amend the Act respecting offences against the person. He said: I introduce this Bill at the suggestion of one of the judges of the county courts of Nova Scotia, and, as the House

Mr. VAIL,

will see, it is a substitution of a clause for the forty-third section of the Act passed, 32-33 Vic. The object of my amendment is to make this statute conformable to the English statute dealing with this subject. The main alteration is that justices of the peace are vested with the jurisdiction to award compensation in cases of common assault or battery. Hitherto clothing was often destroyed or damage done by these offenders, and a justice of the peace could only impose a fine. This enables the Justice of the Peace to do what I think he ought to be able to do, award compensation not to exceed ten dollars. That is similar to the provision of the English Act dealing with this subject, and therefore there is a further amendment introduced, making this a matter cognisable by two justices, instead of one as heretofore, because of the additional jurisdiction which is vested in the magistrate's court, this power of awarding compensation. There is also the omission of the power which obtained in the old Act, but is not in the English Act, of praying the magistrate to proceed summarily. The English Act leaves it in the hands of the court below, either to proceed summarily or to send the matter to a higher court. It is desirable, I think, to have a clause framed conformably to the English Act, so that we may have the benefit of English decisions in connection with it from time to time. There is also another alteration which is similar to the one I proposed in another Bill, enabling the justices to include in the conviction the order, not only for the fine and the costs, but also for the charges of conveying the offender to the place of confinement. The form of conviction includes that, and the justices invariably follow the printed form, but it has been held on *certiorari* that the conviction could be quashed because these two last lines are not authorised by the Act.

Mr. DAVIES. So far as the amendment of the hon. gentleman is concerned which merely alters the section enabling a person who has been fined to be imprisoned for the costs and charges of conveying him to prison as well as the costs of the cause, I have no objection, but there is one clause in the Bill of the hon. gentleman which I think may give rise to no little difficulty. For an assault now a man is fined, and that fine goes to the Crown. None of it goes to the prosecutor in the nature of damages, and there is a part of the assault section which prohibits a prosecutor from suing in a civil action if he once prosecutes in a penal action. That, however, has been held *ultra vires*, it has been held that this Legislature has not the power to take away the right to sue for private damages. The idea is a very good one to enable the magistrates in trivial assault cases to award \$10 or \$12 as compensation, if we have the power to pass it. I question it, however. It seems to me that it is altogether within the civil rights belonging to the Local Legislatures, and, if we exercise it, if we have the power to exercise it, we take away the man's right to go before the courts and sue civilly for damages. He would be estopped afterwards from going into another court and suing for damages. Now, after prosecuting for a breach of the law and punishing his assailant by a fine which goes to the Queen, he may sue for damages, and he is not limited to \$10, \$20, \$30 or \$100. I had a case the other day in which large damages were found, because the man was seriously injured, but, if you allow the magistrate to give even \$10 damages, I think the civil remedy would be taken away from the man, and so my hon. friend would defeat the, to some extent, the very meritorious object he has in view. I suggest the advisability of taking out of the Bill altogether the portion of the section which enables a magistrate to give compensation.

Mr. TUPPER. The criticism of my hon. friend opens up a very large subject. At present, under the criminal law in regard to property, the magistrates have the power of awarding compensation in addition to the fine, and I do not know of a case in which the point has been raised

which the hon. member now raises. At the first blush, I do not know with what success it could be raised. There have been many cases where damages have been awarded for malicious injury to property in addition to a fine. Therefore, I think I must press upon the House this clause, especially as the hon. member admits that it would be fair that the magistrate should have that right. I think, too, the hon. gentleman's argument could be answered in this way, that, though the Act says a certain sum shall be imposed by way of fine and so much for compensation, still it is not enabling the man to recover damages or enjoy a civil right, and so is not interfering with the jurisdiction of the local legislature. It is specified that the punishment shall include the fine and so much in addition, all as a punishment. The hon. gentleman's criticism, if it be sound, will affect a considerable part of the criminal law as it now stands. This principle obtains in the criminal laws dealing with petty injuries to lands and personal property in the case of trespasses, and I do not see why exception should be made in regard to persons in cases of common assault.

Mr. MILLS. I think it is pretty clear that this is a matter of civil right so far as compensation for any personal injury is concerned. I do not think we have a right so to deal with the criminal law as to embrace the civil rights of the parties as a mere incident of our legislation. If one man commits a trespass upon the property of another, any damages he may have done to the property and may be liable for in a suit for civil damages certainly could not be controlled by our legislative action here, and I can see no difference between that and this case. If we have been dealing with the civil rights of parties as well as with offences against the criminal law, we ought to retrace our steps. If there are any such cases on the Statute book, it is clear that we have been exceeding our powers, and we should not persevere in a course of that sort. Even if we had the power to legislate, we ought not to limit the compensation to the sum of \$10, because a magistrate might compensate in that way when the effect would be seriously to injure the party who was entitled to damages. My learned friend beside me has mentioned the case where a party obtained an offer of \$100 damages for injury done to him by a similar action. Now if this clause were law and a magistrate acted upon its provisions and granted compensation to the extent of \$10, then the party would be precluded from bringing a second action for the same injury. It seems to me that this is clearly *ultra vires*, and that however meritorious the Bill may be in other respects this portion ought to be struck out.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There may be a question as to whether this does not affect civil rights. The Bill is very convenient in the interests of peace, of course. I think the magistrate should have the power of punishing the party by fine going to the Crown and also by fine going to the prosecutor. But I do not see, even if he had the power of granting compensation, except at the special instance of the prosecutor, that he would be deprived of his right of civil action by any legislation of ours. It might be well that the law should provide that the fine should be so much, a certain portion to go to the prosecutor upon his stating that he abandoned his civil rights. That would be all very convenient, but still the point taken by the hon. member, I think, is a good one. I would suggest to him that the debate be adjourned until the matter can be more fully considered. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—DEBT.

Mr. CHARLTON asked what was the aggregate amount of floating or unsecured debt of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company on the first day of the present month?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government are unable to answer the question; they have no information on the subject.

TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND SPAIN.

Mr. VAIL moved for :

Copies of all correspondence with the Imperial Government on the subject of the flag Treaty between the United States and Spain, whereby American products are admitted in' Cuba and Porto Rico on more favourable terms than the products of the Dominion.

He said: A few days before the close of last Session, I called the attention of the Government to a treaty or arrangement which had been entered into between the Government of the United States and the Government of Spain, whereby certain products of the United States are admitted to entry in the Islands of Porto Rico and Cuba on much more favorable terms than the products of the Dominion of Canada, or in fact any other British possession. I also pointed out at that time that the people of the United States had the privilege of entering dry fish, which is a very important export of the Province of Nova Scotia, in Porto Rico at a rate of duty some twelve or fifteen cents per hundred pounds less than British fish. The House will understand the importance of this matter to the West India merchants and fishermen of Nova Scotia, when I state that the annual shipment of dry fish from Nova Scotia to Porto Rico alone is about 150,000 quintals, nearly one-fifth the whole catch of fish in the Province of Nova Scotia. Besides this, we ship a large quantity of pickled fish to that Island. In the Island of Cuba the difference is greater. They admit United States fish at from 27 to 30 cents per hundred pounds less in duty than British fish. Our exports to the Island of Cuba are not nearly so large as those to Porto Rico, but they are very considerable, and up to the time that this treaty took effect, which was on the 1st of March last, the exports to that Island were rapidly increasing. Besides fish, we export a large quantity of white pine lumber to the West India Islands. The difference of the duty at Cuba in favor of the Americans is about \$1.60, which, you will see, is a very important item. Besides this, the Americans have the privilege of entering their vessels by paying one-half the tonnage dues that British vessels are obliged to pay. For instance, British vessels pay at the Island of Porto Rico \$1.25 for discharging and \$1 for loading, while United States vessels are allowed to enter and discharge cargoes by paying 62½ cents per ton for discharging, and 50 cents for loading. Now, Mr. Speaker, in this matter I am not stating that for which I have no authority, and though I have not been able to procure a copy of the treaty, I have here a copy of one clause of the report of the executive committee of the Halifax chamber of commerce, made in March last, which I propose to read to the House. It is headed "A Blow at Our Fish Trade," and this is what they say in reference to that treaty :

"Your committee learn that a treaty has lately been made between the United States and Spain, whereby the flag of the United States is placed on the same terms regarding Customs duties as that of the latter country. The conditions of this treaty does not apply to British shipping, and we are consequently placed at a great disadvantage in Cuba and Porto Rico, to which the treaty more particularly applies, the difference in favor of the American flag, so far as we can learn, being equal to an average of about 20 per cent. on the whole tariff. On our fish, which is our chief export to these islands, it amounts to considerably more. By calculations made on data received, it would appear that in Porto Rico fish by British flag pays about 12 cents per quintal more than fish by American vessels, and that the tonnage duty for landing and loading cargoes is 100 per cent., or just double, on our vessels, to what is exacted from the Americans. In Cuba the differential duty in favor of the Americans is still larger, amounting to about 27 cents per quintal. Cuba and Porto Rico are amongst our best customers, shipment to the latter having some years reached nearly 150,000 quintals, while to Cuba the demand is steady and increasing. It will therefore be seen that if the Americans continue to enjoy those

great advantages, and we are excluded, that it will be a heavy blow to our trade, and calls for prompt and energetic remonstrance from our Government. The charges made by the Spanish Government through the consulates of 10 cents per ton on securing Spanish clearances is also very burdensome, and has been objected to by the United States, who claim that no foreign Government has a right to impose such a charge, which is equal to an import tax on the products of their country.

"We have reason to believe that this unfair tax will be abolished in the United States, and our Government should take immediate steps to place us in the same position."

This was signed by John Doull (president), Thos. E. Kenny, John S. Maclean, J. J. Bremner, C. F. DeWolf, J. C. MacIntosh, all good supporters of the Government, and other members of the executive committee. I find, moreover, that a few days ago the board of trade of St. John, N.B., the city represented by the Finance Minister, also referred to this subject. In a petition to the Governor General in Council, the board say:

"And your petitioners would respectfully impress upon the Government that the present is a most opportune time to enter into reciprocal trade relations with the British and Spanish West India islands.

"That we can supply most of the manufactured goods—productions of the soil, forests, mines, and fisheries—that are imported into those islands, and in exchange, can take their productions, which already find a large and rapidly increasing market in Canada, owing largely to the sugar refining industries now established in this Dominion, which may hope to not only fully supply our home market, but with the peculiar facilities that must be developed by reciprocity with the West Indies, to also export refined sugar extensively to other countries.

"The West India 'carrying trade has heretofore been largely done in Canadian bottoms, owing to the cheapness with which that class of vessels can be built in Canada.' The tariff at present existing in the Spanish West Indies being about 40 per cent. in favor of the United States, as against Canada, is a great obstruction to our trade; and should the reciprocity treaty now negotiating between Spain and the United States be ratified, and Canada debarred from same terms, our Spanish West India trade will virtually cease."

I have not been able, as I stated, to secure a copy of the treaty, but I have here a copy of prices current issued by Lawton Bros., commission merchants, Havana, Cuba, dated January last. In one column they give the rate of duty on British goods, and in another column the rate on United States goods, and I have selected some few of the products of Canada which we might, I think, be able to supply to Cuba, so as to show the difference in the duty payable. The following are some of the articles:—

	All Countries except Spain and United States.		Difference.
	United States.	United States.	
	\$ cts.	\$ cts.	\$ cts.
Apples.....	1 47½ per 100 lbs.	1 15 per 100 lbs.	0 32½
Beans.....	1 12½ do	0 82½ do	0 30
Bran.....	0 64-30 do	0 48-30 do	0 16
Brooms.....	3 68 per dozen.	2 76 do	0 92
Butter.....	6 67 do	5 22 do	1 44
Bacon.....	3 84 do	2 87 do	0 47
Coal oil.....	2 90 do	2 20 do	0 74
Coal.....	0 61-50 per ton.	0 49-50 do	0 12
Box shooks.....	0 22½ each	0 15 do	0 07½
Wheat flour.....	5 40 do	4 00 do	0 80
Cod fish.....	1 12½ do	0 82½ do	0 32
Hams.....	3 84 per 100 lbs.	2 07 do	1 17
Smoked herring.....	1 12½ do	0 82½ do	0 30
Lard.....	4 48½ do	3 35 do	1 13
White pine lumber.....	6 40 do	4 80 do	1 60
Mackerel.....	1 12½ do	0 82½ do	0 30
Mess pork.....	1 86 do	1 38 do	0 48

It will be found that the difference is a very marked and important one. I now call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the statement made by him last year, in connection with this subject. The hon. gentleman said:

"The attention of the Government had been called to this subject previous to the statement of the hon. gentleman. We have obtained some information with reference to the effect of this treaty or arrangement between the two countries; but, as far as we have received it, if it includes the question of tonnage, it does not bear out the statement the hon. gentleman has made, though I dare say he may be right. The arrangements made between Spain and the United States were not really as favorable as those between Canada and Cuba or Porto Rico. There were charges made that did not exist here. They have been removed and the United States have been placed in the third list of duties. The Government are quite alive to the importance of having our trade

Mr. VAIL.

on as good terms as that of the United States, and no time will be lost in endeavoring to bring about such arrangements as will place us on quite as favorable terms as they have."

Nearly a year has elapsed, and I am anxious to learn what the Government has done in this important matter. I suppose the answer will be—I do not know that I have a right to anticipate it—the stereotyped one, that some negotiations have been going on and some progress has been made; that although this is the case, the Government are not in a position to bring down papers and tell the country exactly how far they have gone and what progress they have made. What I complain of, however, is, that so much time has elapsed without the Government approaching the Spanish Government on this important subject—of course, through the British Government, because we are not a treaty-making power. The Government, I think, should have given attention to this question immediately after prorogation last Session. Surely if the United States Government could, more than a year ago, have arranged such a treaty as that to which I have referred, and which has such an important bearing on our trade, and could since that time have made the necessary preliminary arrangements for a wider and more favorable treaty, our Government should at least be in a position to tell this House and the country that they have done something and made some substantial progress. It is too important a matter to us in Nova Scotia to admit of our keeping quiet much longer. Surely, a year is long enough within which to have made some progress in this matter, and unless something is done I am afraid the people of Nova Scotia will have just reason to complain that the Government have neglected their interests, while, perhaps, their attention has been engaged with some things of far less importance.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I may say to the hon. gentleman who has moved this resolution, that early after the return of the High Commissioner to London, he was instructed by the Government to take certain steps with a view to securing the same advantages to Canada as were secured to the United States by the treaty referred to. Instructions were given to him to make certain propositions. If those failed, he was to make other propositions. Correspondence was entered into between the High Commissioner and the Imperial Government, and it was settled that he was to act in conjunction with the British Minister in Spain, in negotiating a treaty of this kind. It was stated at the time the treaty was made that a more extended treaty would likely be arranged between Spain and the United States during the summer. It was found that negotiations of a much more extended character were being prosecuted between the representative of the United States and the Spanish Government. It was found desirable—in fact our High Commissioner was communicated with—to say that understanding, as we did, that the new treaty proposed was so extensive in its operations, that the authority given the High Commissioner would be inadequate to meet the enlarged concessions proposed to be given to the United States. Under these circumstances the High Commissioner waited until the larger treaty was agreed upon, and then he was instructed to put himself in communication with the foreign office, and with the Government of Spain. The answer of the Spanish Government was, that they declined to continue further negotiations with the representative of the Government of Canada until the decision of the Senate of the United States was known, as to the new treaty; and therefore the matter stands in that position until the action of the Senate is known. I might state that it would not be in the public interest to say what instructions were given to Sir Charles Tupper in reference to the Flag Treaty. If the treaty made is ratified the Government will probably be in a position to give decided instructions to the High Commissioner in the larger and more important question. The Government think it would not be in the interests of the public to state exactly what the instructions were or to

bring down the papers which would show exactly what we propose in the first place, and then as an alternative-suggestion.

Mr. VAIL. I agree with the Finance Minister, but the trouble is, that the old treaty is in force, and I say that the proposed treaty between Spain and the United States provided that the other treaty shall cease when this becomes a fact.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Of course we will have to deal with a much larger question.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I wish to say, with reference to the statement of the Finance Minister, that while agreeing with the view that after giving instructions to the High Commissioner it would not be proper at the present time to bring down those papers, I regret much the course of procedure, which in its efforts at diplomacy the Government has thought fit to pursue. It seems to me that the true course for the Government to pursue was this: The moment we found that the Spanish Government and the Government of the United States had agreed on a treaty under which more favorable terms existed for the trade of the United States than for the trade of Canada, their attention should have been directed to the single point of placing the trade of this country on as advantageous a footing as that of the United States. It is true that their attention being directed to that matter it was diverted by the circumstance that a treaty of a more enlarged character had been negotiated between the United States and Spain, but that treaty, although so far as Spain was concerned, it may be—I am not aware as to the constitutional principles of that country under the present constitution—it may be that it was finally assented to; but still, under the constitutional provisions with reference to the United States, the assent of that country was not completed until the Senate had passed executively upon it, and even to-day it is quite uncertain whether it will ever become an effective treaty or not. In this state of things the Government of Canada ought not to be diverted from the object to which I have referred, by pursuing a proposal for an enlarged treaty, and particularly since the Spanish Government had declared—as the Finance Minister has announced that they did declare—that they did not wish to enter into negotiations with Canada for an enlargement of the commercial relations, on the basis of the United States treaty, until it had been decided, by the action of the Senate of the United States, whether the treaty was to become operative or not. I can understand that course of action by the Spanish Government; they may have determined that it would not be well that the relations between Canada and Spain should be of a different character than those between the United States and Spain; they may have determined that a different consideration would arise as to the proposed negotiations if the treaty was unfavorably viewed by the United States. But for all the intervening time, in the meantime, now, until it shall be decided whether the Spanish treaty shall become effective or not, our trade remains under the relative disadvantage which has been created by the fact to which my hon. friend has alluded. That difficulty still subsists; and supposing a new treaty should not be operative, by reason of the Senate of the United States refusing to assent to it, the hon. gentleman has to begin his negotiations again, to put the country on as favorable a condition as it would be under that treaty, and in the meantime we suffer the disadvantage from day to day and from hour to hour. Therefore, I say, a great miscarriage took place when the Government suffered itself to be delayed in the progress of the negotiations to put us and keep us abreast of the United

States, with respect to the commercial advantages referred to in this discussion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman supposes a great many things, from the brief and incomplete statement which the Finance Minister was obliged to make, because he was obliged to preserve that reticence which was his duty, and any breach of which might cause the failure of the negotiations. The hon. gentleman must not suppose that either the British Ambassador or the High Commissioner has been idle during the period he has mentioned. The hon. gentleman knows, or he should know, that if there is one thing as to which constant vigilance has been exercised by the Canadian Government and its representatives in England, it has been with regard to the negotiations with Spain. The hon. gentleman knows that Sir Alexander Galt, whose diplomatic abilities even he will acknowledge, was in Spain; that he spent a long time there, and that he was fully accredited by Her Majesty's Government to act in accord with the British Minister in Spain—with Mr. West, and afterwards with Sir Robert Morier. Pressure was brought to bear upon the Spanish Government with the view of opening up the trade of the Spanish West Indies with Canada on mutually advantageous terms. The Spanish Government seemed to agree with the idea, but suggested that perhaps it might be widened, so that there might be a reciprocal treaty not only between Canada and the Spanish Antilles, but between Canada and the mother country of Spain. Of course an intimation of that kind could not be thrown over or rejected or limited. The mere fact of doing so would injure any arrangement of a more limited nature. I do not know whether the information reached the hon. gentleman, but we know that in consequence of frequent changes of Government in Spain, the Government who received our first advances so readily were removed, in some way after the Spanish fashion, and another administration came in who were not so friendly; and all attempts, both by Her Majesty's Government, on behalf of Great Britain itself, and by our representative, fell to the ground and were not entertained. We cannot force Spain to make a treaty; but the pressure has been continuous. It has not been given up or surrendered or forgotten for a moment, and Her Majesty's Ambassador, Sir Robert Morier—I cannot say the present Ambassador, because I believe he has been removed within a few days—as well as Mr. West, the British Ambassador at Washington, have been fully alive to the subject, and have lost no opportunity of pressing upon the Spanish Government our desire to have the same privileges as the United States; and we have, I believe, offered reciprocal advantages as regards Canadian trade. Everything that could be done has been done; there has not been a moment of delay, and no opportunity has been lost or neglected. The particulars cannot, of course, be gone into, but I believe we never stood a fairer chance of making an arrangement with Spain. The matter, however, rests with Spain and not with us. The United States, unfortunately for us, can offer greater advantages than Canada. Whether the present treaty made between Spain and the United States will be ratified or not we cannot say. I fancy there will be no chance of its getting the sanction of the Senate during the present Congress, or during the term of the present moribund Government; and it is impossible to say whether the treaty will be taken up in a special Session, under the authority of the new President, or whether it will stand over for another year before it is sanctioned by the United States. As to all that we cannot say. Meanwhile, however, the negotiations are kept alive. Spain, naturally very anxious to secure the enormous advantages which the present treaty would give to Cuba, does not desire to disturb that arrangement or make any new arrangement with Canada until that whole question is first settled. The advantages

offered by that treaty to Spain are so enormous that she would sacrifice everything—she would sacrifice a dozen Canadas—for the sake of getting that trade. To get \$20,000,000 annually, which it is alleged by the *New York Nation* would be given by the United States for that trade, is a matter of such importance that Spain would not look at anything else. Should that treaty come to nothing, failing to receive the sanction of the Senate, whether a treaty of a financial nature can be finally ratified without the consent of the Lower House, the House of Representatives, is a great constitutional question which has never yet been settled. Meanwhile, all we can do is to be constantly on the watch; to be vigilant. We are vigilant: we believe we have done everything we could do; and hoping and believing that we shall get the support of this House on both sides, we will continue to watch every opportunity of pressing for a treaty which will be reciprocally advantageous to Canada and the Spanish Antilles. You see how anxious Spain is to have that treaty with the United States sanctioned. It is rumored in the press that she even offered to do what was never done before—to add the trade of the Philippine Islands to that of the Antilles for the sake of securing that treaty. The situation of Cuba is to-day so desparate that unless some relief of that kind is secured there is no hope for the Spanish Antilles, and they will be in a revolutionary mood. Spain will not look at anything until that question is settled. If that should fail, I think Canada will have more than a fair chance of making an advantageous treaty. I can only assure the hon. gentleman that there will be no neglect, but that there will be continual watchfulness and pressure on the part of the Canadian Government upon the Government of Spain, in the first place, directly through our own officers, and then constantly, every day, through the intervention of Her Majesty's Ambassador.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I had not the advantage of hearing the first remarks of the First Minister. Did he state whether the Canadian Government were taking part in the negotiations which were recently going on between the British Government and Spain, with a view to a treaty between Her Majesty's Government and Spain, which would secure the admission of Spanish wines on more favorable terms into England, for corresponding concessions in the way of reducing the duties now levied on English goods imported into Spain? That would afford, I imagine, an opportunity for something to be done. Did the First Minister mention that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Perhaps I had better not now enter into details on that matter; but the hon. gentleman will understand that in the event of an alteration in the English wine tariff in favor of Spain, a corresponding advantage must be given by Canada before we can hope to have any arrangement with Spain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wished to ascertain whether the Government had called attention to that point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes.

Mr. WELDON. I quite understand that the steps taken in connection with the British Ambassadors were most essential, more particularly in view of the new treaty now before the United States Senate; and judging by what I observe in the United States press, the people of that country are becoming daily more alive to the importance of getting that trade with Spain. Hitherto, under the late treaty, we have labored under a great disadvantage. A great portion of the vessels of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are engaged in the West Indian trade, and we have hitherto enjoyed a great portion of the trade between the Spanish Antilles and the United States. That is being gradually reduced under the operation of the present treaty, and if the new treaty comes into force it will be

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

practically destroyed. I will give a statement which was made up to show what the effect of the new treaty will be with regard to our products. An elaborate statement was made with regard to a brig of 333 tons register carrying in a cargo of shooks to Cuba valued at \$3,300. At present she will pay in Cuba \$1,964 tonnage dues and consul fees, while, if the new treaty comes into force, an American vessel will pay \$1,900 loss. Thus the result would be practically to destroy our trade as it stands. Now, under the present regulations fish can be carried to the United States and thence shipped to Cuba cheaper than it can be carried direct from United States ports. As shown by the statement of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), the following are the differences in dues chargeable to vessels, foreign or Spanish or American, under present treaty arrangements:—

Potatoes in Spanish or American vessels,	\$0-61	per 100 kilos.
do " foreign	" 0.87	" "
Rails " Spanish or American	" 2.60	" "
do " foreign	" 3.77	" "
Pork " Spanish or American	" 2.85	" "
do " foreign	" 4.06	" "
Butter " Spanish or American	" 6.49	" "
do " foreign	" 9.20	" "

The result of the treaty will therefore be disastrous to us, should it be endorsed by the United States Senate; it will practically destroy trade between the West Indies and the Maritime Provinces.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest to the hon. gentleman that perhaps arguments of that kind are not of a nature to strengthen our position.

Mr. BLAKE. Does not everybody know what the duties are? Do not the people of the United States know what the duties are?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The people of the United States are not Spain.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, Spain is not so ignorant as the hon. gentleman supposes.

Mr. WELDON. The reason I put this forward is because we know the present state of trade between the Maritime Provinces and the mother country is most depressing, and if we destroy our trade with the West Indies we shall have no outlet for it at all. That is why I maintain that valuable time has been lost, and it strikes me that if we had the right we claimed, on this side of the House, we ought to have, to negotiate a treaty ourselves, instead of going through the red tape circumlocution office, we might have been in a position to have a treaty now. While we have been watching and waiting, the Americans have got ahead of us, and are in a position to command the trade, not only with Cuba and the Spanish Islands, but eventually with the West India Islands.

Mr. DAVIES. The importance of this subject is so great, that I believe it warrants me in making a few remarks on it. The right hon. gentleman either failed to catch the point made by the leader of the Opposition, or skillfully evaded it in his answer, by deprecating any discussion at present upon the negotiations going on with regard to a new treaty. Hon. gentlemen on this side do not wish the Government to divulge matters not proper to be divulged, but the point made by the leader of the Opposition, and one which has great weight with hon. gentlemen on this side, is this: that the House is entitled to know something of what has been done by the Government with respect to the existing tariff between Canada and Cuba, before a new treaty can be negotiated. The hon. gentleman said we ought to be satisfied; that the Government have done everything; but he has failed to mention one step the Government have taken; he has failed to mention one item of instruction that they have sent to our High Commissioner. The charge we make is, that they have neglected our in-

terest to such an extent that we are at present in the disadvantageous position, explained by the hon. member for Digby, of having to pay very much higher duties than the United States, and that we will have to remain in that position for one, two or three years, until this treaty be either approved or disapproved of by the Senate of the United States. In the meantime, our trade will become more crippled year by year, and this at a time above all others when the Maritime Provinces demand some outlet for their produce. I have listened carefully to the remarks of the hon. gentleman and those of the Finance Minister, and have failed to find that the Government have taken any active steps whatever to guard our interests, or that they have made any demand that we should be placed in the same position as that of the United States. To talk about the inopportuneness of referring to facts which are public, facts which the hon. member for Digby copied from the prices current of a circular known to commercial men all over the Dominion and the United States, the Havana prices current, which is in the hands of every man who deals in the trade between Canada and Cuba, is beside the question. These facts publicly known show that our trade is hampered, and in the face of them we have the right to ask what steps, if any, have been taken to remove the disadvantages under which we labor. Never mind the new treaty. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a perfect right to refuse to divulge steps now taken to secure a new treaty, but they have no right to refuse this House information as to the steps they have taken, if any, to remove the disadvantages pending the conclusion of a new treaty, from which we now suffer, and from which we will have to suffer, unless removed, so long as the United States do not disapprove of their new treaty with Spain, or until we succeed in having a new treaty ourselves.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Impartial people outside of this House will agree with the suggestion of the First Minister, that this debate is not likely to result in improving our position or in aiding us to secure new treaty arrangements. The same rule exists between communities as with individuals. It is a new doctrine that, if you want to get advantages, the first thing you must do is to declare that without them you cannot live; that you have everything to gain and nothing to give in return. Hon. gentlemen opposite, while they have pointed out from their standpoint that without a treaty with Spain, without our getting similar advantages to those provided in the Flag Treaty now adopted between Spain and the United States, this country must be seriously injured, have not pointed out, as they might, that we have some advantages to present on our side. They simply have presented an argument least likely to commend this country to the Government of Spain as a country with which it is desirable to have treaty arrangements. Of what possible interest can it be with Spain whether a treaty they will enter into with this country is going to be advantageous to us or not? If they enter into a treaty, it will be at least because the advantages to be gained will be reciprocal. It seems to me, if we look back a little into the history of this country, we will find there never has been a time hardly when we have not had people declaring the condition of the country was verging on ruin. In 1843, when free trade was adopted in England, we had people in Canada who declared that our future would be absolutely paralysed in consequence of that policy, and it certainly was a policy which, on the face of it, seemed calculated to bring great injury to Canada; but we managed to live through it and to prosper very well, despite those predictions. When the treaty of 1854 was adopted we certainly derived considerable advantages from it, but when it was abrogated in 1866 what did we find? We had a gentleman, Mr. Potter, sent to Detroit, to the convention there, carrying with him letters from gentlemen in Canada, declaring that they ought

not to renew that treaty, because if it were not renewed the condition of things in Canada would be such that we would be compelled to seek annexation in order that we might have commercial existence at all in the future. The treaty was abrogated, yet, despite its abrogation, we succeeded in managing to live and to prosper. In 1874, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, they sent the late Hon. George Brown to Washington, to negotiate a treaty which they felt was absolutely necessary; they made every effort to get it. What would have been said by hon. gentlemen opposite if the Conservatives had denounced them because they did not succeed in getting a treaty? Surely they did all they could to get it; they offered, as every one will admit, concessions, I venture to say, no one would be disposed to offer to-day, to secure a treaty with the United States; but the United States did not even give us the courtesy of discussing them in the Senate. But nobody here complained that the Government was recreant to its trust to the people of Canada because the United States would not give them a treaty, and when we find hon. gentlemen opposite talk about our demanding certain concessions, in order to secure a market for our goods in foreign countries, and then attempting to show, on the floor of Parliament, that this country depends for its existence commercially on these concessions being obtained, we cannot but conclude that their course is unfortunate, and that they are not likely, by means of it, to secure the concessions they ask. The leader of the Opposition tells us that Spain knows all these things; that she knows what the tariffs are; that she knows the position in which we stand towards her, compared with the United States, and what the effect of a treaty with us will be, and that nothing said in this House can affect her in the least. But they do not know, and, Sir, they cannot know, because it is not true, that the future prosperity of this country depends upon their giving us a treaty; and I am bound to say, and I think everyone outside of this House, at any rate, will admit, that after the frank statement of the First Minister, that the Government are doing all they can, all that can be done, in order to secure a treaty, a fair treaty, a reciprocal treaty, a treaty that will be advantageous to both sides, and to secure it with the approbation and the support and the influence of the Imperial authorities at their back, it does not lie in mouths of those hon. gentlemen opposite to attack the Government, because they are not getting a treaty, because a foreign Government, over which we have no control, have not yet seen fit to give us the treaty which these hon. gentlemen say we ought to have. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Weldon) tells us that, if we had the right to make our own treaties, if we had the right to go straight to Spain without the red tape, as he calls it, of going through the Imperial Government, we would have had this treaty long ago. Does he not know that Spain would naturally ask, who are you? if we went there simply as a colony. We go there with the Imperial Government at our back, accredited by the Imperial Government. The power of making treaties is an attribute of sovereignty, and if hon. gentlemen are only honest enough to admit frankly what they desire, that they desire independent nationality, that we may go as an independent sovereignty to demand treaties, we can understand what they are asking for, and we can discuss it on its merits. I am not going to say whether we should have it or not; it is not pertinent to this discussion; but I do say that he who undertakes to assert that a colony can have the power of making independent treaties says what I doubt very much whether he believes himself, but what I am certain he cannot make any one else believe who knows anything of the position of independent nations. The question of a treaty with Spain or with any other nation is one of a bargain between people, and we cannot demand, but we

can ask, we can negotiate, and, if those on the other side are willing to enter into the negotiations, if they see it to their advantage to yield concessions in return for concessions, we can get treaties. I think, after the statement of the First Minister, that the Government have been and are earnestly engaged in the work of getting treaty arrangements with Spain, the House and the country may fairly leave the matter in that position, trusting to the Administration to press as far as they can for those treaty arrangements, which will be to the advantage of this country and reciprocally, I hope, to the advantage of the country with which we may make them.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is, perhaps, as important a debate as any which has occurred during the present Session, and it is one in which the future of this country is largely involved. I have listened with very considerable interest to the remarks made on both sides of the House, and while I pay great respect to the utterances of my hon. friend who has just sat down, and recognise the eloquence with which he has put forward his view of the case, I must say that I do not entirely agree with the conclusions at which he arrives. I may also say that I do not agree with the contentions of the other side of the House. I am in the happy position that I think I represent independent public sentiment, both inside of this House and outside; and while I do not assent to propositions brought forward for purely party purposes, for the object of making an attack on the Administration, neither do I agree altogether with those wholesale defences of an Administration which has a great many faults. I agree with the right hon. the Premier that this not the time to discuss the question of whether the Government have done their duty or not, that this is not the time, when questions are on the tapis, important national questions are under consideration, important questions between two foreign nations, in which we desire to participate, this is not the time for the gentlemen on the Opposition benches to get up and point out the reasons why it will ruin and injure this country if our Government do not step in and endeavor to secure a share of the benefits which a foreign country has obtained. Therefore, I think it is indiscreet at this moment to arraign the Government, to pour-tray the disadvantages and point out the ruin which this country may suffer if this treaty is not negotiated. It is not the time to point out to the Government their duty. They know their duty, and while I am not one of those who believe they always do it, yet I believe that, in an important question such as this is, the Government have too high a sense of the responsibility which devolves upon them to allow an opportunity like this to pass them without endeavoring to secure to Canada, or taking the preliminary steps to secure to Canada, the advantages which she would enjoy by participating in those which are given to either Spain or Cuba. I hold that the time to arraign the Government is not now, but when, having their attention called to the necessity of it, not only by the public prints but by the motion of the hon. gentleman, they neglect it. I think, perhaps, to some extent, the hon. gentleman's motion was judicious and proper, but I think the pursuance of that motion, as followed out by some of the hon. gentlemen opposite, may work to the detriment of Canada and may hinder and retard and handicap the hands of the Government in carrying it out. A word as to what my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) has said, and I suppose I may say "hon. friend," for everyone says he will be an "honorable" soon, and I am sure he will be a great addition to the Administration when they get him. He arraigns the members on the other side of the House and gentlemen like myself who may sympathise with them in some particulars, by telling them to ask for independence if they want it, but not to ex-

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

pect to get the treaty-making power. It is not necessary to have independence to have the power to make treaties, or at all events to get the power to arrange the preliminaries of those treaties.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Hear, hear:

Mr. MITCHELL. I believe that all we have to do to-day is to say to the Imperial Government: We, as Canadians, knowing better than you can the necessities of our trade and the peculiarities of our position, claim the right to have you place us in such a position with foreign nations that we may arrange the treaties with them, and, if it is necessary to confirm them, we expect you to do it *sub silentio*, without question or negotiation, whether it suits Birmingham or Manchester or Sheffield, or suits the ideas of free trade or not, but because Canada desires it and her statesmen ask it. I should like to speak further upon some other points, but I have been suffering so much from cold that I can hardly give utterance to my views on this. There is one thing, however, that I feel it my duty to say as the representative of the county of Northumberland. I had placed in my hands a letter received from a friend of mine in Chicago, bearing upon a question which, if not exactly directly in the sense of this motion, was so nearly allied to it that I hope the House will allow me to refer to it. We have heard of deputations of millers and of those interested in the manufacture of flour coming to the Government and asking that an additional duty be placed on flour because there is a discriminating duty against it in the duty placed on foreign wheat. That is a thing which directly affects the interest of the United States and United States manufacturers, as it does those of Canadians and Canadian manufacturers. It affects Canadians not only in connection with their manufacturers, which principally applies to the western portion of this Dominion, but also as to consumers, which applies mainly to the Province of Quebec and the eastern Provinces of this Dominion. Now, Sir, what is asked to be done? They claim that there is a difference in the duty on wheat and the duty on flour, against the miller, because the relative duty is greater on wheat than it is on flour, and these millers modestly come here and ask this Government to increase the duty on flour, to allow them to get wheat without a discriminating duty against it, thereby adding to the increased cost of an article of consumption which is the main staple of the poor people of the country. Now, Sir, I say that in place of levelling up the duty to make flour correspond with wheat, if there is a difference, let the Government level down the duty. If we cannot get the duty off flour altogether, as we ought to have, the Government ought not, at all events, to increase it, particularly at a time of a crisis such as exists in the country to-day. Sir, I have had placed in my hands a letter in relation to that question, and I will read it if the House will permit me:

"DEAR SIR,—I see by the Canadian newspapers that it is the intention of your Government to increase the duty on flour. As I believe you are well posted on that subject, will you please let me know your opinion. I hear on the board of trade here—

That is, in Chicago—

"that should your Government put up the duty—

That is the point to which I wish to call the attention of the Government now—how it is going to affect us with the United States—

"they will petition the Congress to raise the duty on barley, rye, lumber and fish from Canada, to such a figure as to stop its business. No doubt your Government will hear both sides of the question before they vote on it."

Now, Sir, what I ask is this—speaking for the consumers, the large class of consumers, the large outside party of which the right hon. Premier spoke of me as the representative, the other day—I speak for them, I speak for the consumers in the Maritime Provinces, forming a very large class of the population, and I say that the duty ought not

to be put upon a staple article of produce which forms their food; and if there does exist any discrimination against the miller in the country, let the Government level down the duty and take it off wheat, and bring it down to the level of what flour is, and not add to the cost of living, to the cost of the poor man's bread, by increasing the duty on flour and levelling it up. That is all I have to say on that subject just now. At a later stage, perhaps, when I can speak more directly on the subject, and I am in better condition to speak, I shall take the opportunity of discussing the subject at greater length.

MR. HILLIARD. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I think, is out of order, because this is not the proper time to speak on this question. The millers have asked the Government—

MR. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman must confine his remarks to the question of the treaty; he must not speak on the flour question.

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then, I think the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) ought to have been stopped.

MR. BLAKE. Otherwise his observations would remain unanswered.

MR. MILLS. The House, no doubt, took note of the fact that the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) threatened the Government with what might seriously affect the country in case it persisted in the policy which it was rumored it was likely to adopt. But the observations of the hon. member for Northumberland were not relevant to the question before the House. The discussion indulged in by the First Minister and by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was equally irrelevant to the motion of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Vail). Now, Sir, my hon. friend did not go into any such discussion as the hon. member for Cardwell spoke of. He did not say that the establishment of a reciprocity treaty with the Spanish West India colonies was necessary to the existence of the Maritime Provinces, or of Canada. That was not the subject of discussion. Every one knows the people of Spain, at all events, know that unless Canadians believe that there is some advantage to be derived from a reciprocity treaty, they would not seek to engage in such a treaty at all; and if the First Minister or the hon. member for Cardwell supposes that we can go to Spain, with a view of negotiating a reciprocity treaty and inform the Spanish authorities that we have no interest in such a treaty, that it would not be advantageous to the people of this country, they would hardly take the trouble of entering into any correspondence or of negotiating with us. I also observe that the hon. member for Cardwell said that to speak of negotiating treaties on our own behalf was scarcely less than treasonable; that, in fact, it was a demand for separation in disguise, and that those who are advocating the right to negotiate a reciprocity treaty were in favor of independence. Well, Sir, I observe that the Imperial Government has taken a different view. I understand, from the public press, that at this very moment they have authorised the Government of Newfoundland to enter into negotiations with a view to a reciprocity treaty with the United States, and certainly no one supposes that the Government of Newfoundland, at the present time, is demanding independence or separation from the mother country. What is important at this time, is to bring before the House the fact that in our commercial relations with the Spanish West Indian colonies, in consequence of the existing treaty between Spain and the United States, the products of the United States, such as we also might send to the Spanish West Indies, are admitted from the United States on more reasonable terms than they are from Canada. Now, we understood that the hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government, and his colleagues, had taken

steps to secure a treaty between Canada and Spain similar to that which now obtains between the United States and the Spanish West Indian colonies. My hon. friend who is leader on this side, asked the First Minister how it was that these negotiations came to be broken off; how it was the Government did not persist in these negotiations and secure for Canada terms at least as favorable as those which existed at the present time between the United States and the Spanish West Indian colonies. The First Minister did not answer that question; he evaded it. The Finance Minister, just before we adjourned at six o'clock, informed us that these negotiations had been broken off, and that they had been allowed to stand over until it would be seen what were the results of the proposed ratification of the treaty which has been negotiated between the Government of Spain and the Government of the United States. Well, Sir, we do not understand, on this side of the House, why it is that these negotiations should be deferred. If the treaty is completed between the United States and Spain, if it is ratified by the Senate, and the Spanish Government are favorable to a reciprocity treaty, why did our Government not take the initiatory step? Why did they not go at least as far as the present treaty relations go between Spain and the United States? That would have been a step in the right direction, and it would have facilitated negotiations for a further treaty, to secure more direct trade relations, even than would have been secured by an arrangement of that sort. What we would like to know is, why these negotiations were broken off—why the Government did not persist in them? The Spanish Government are favorable to reciprocity; they have shown that by their negotiations with the United States. We have the same products to offer them, and the Spanish West Indian residents would like to secure competition in their market, no doubt. They would like to purchase Canadian fish upon the most favorable terms. They know that the supplies which they obtain from the United States and from Canada would be obtained at a more reasonable rate if both Canada and the United States were competing in the Spanish West Indian market than if it was made a close preserve for American products alone. That being the case, and the course taken by the Spanish Government being before us, we are satisfied that the Government of Spain is ready to negotiate a treaty. They are willing to go at least as far as they went in their negotiations with the United States; they are ready to go further if the United States Senate ratifies the new treaty. Why did this Government not negotiate a treaty like that which is in force? Why did they not secure to our people trade relations at least as favorable as those which were obtained by the people of the United States with the Spanish West Indian residents? I say the hon. gentleman has not given us that information, and to talk about the imprudence of discussing the matter is quite beside the question. We admit that the treaty is advantageous; we admit that trade relations freer than those which exist, will be advantageous. The very fact that we propose to negotiate shows that we make that admission. That being the case, there is no possible imprudence in saying so. But what we want to know at this time is why a treaty similar to that which now obtains between the United States and the Spanish West Indies was not negotiated, and why those negotiations were broken off?

Motion withdrawn.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CONSTRUCTION NEAR LYTTON, B.C.

MR. BLAKE moved for:

Information in the possession of the Department as to the character of the work done near Lytton, B.C., on the Canadian Pacific Railway, on that portion of the road for which Mr. Hugh J. Keefer had a sub-contract and which was under the inspection of his brother, Mr. George Keefer, Government engineer; also, copies of any statements as to the

character of the material allowed as rock or as other than earth in this part.

He said: I make this motion in consequence of information which has reached me twice. At the close of last Session I received from one source a very authentic and circumstantial statements given to me by a gentleman, who communicated it upon the authority of a person who had personally known of it, setting forth the fact that a very considerable fraud had been committed with respect to this portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway; that a large quantity of stuff which was entered and counted as rock was really earth or sand, and that Hugh J. Keefer, the sub-contractor, I presume under an arrangement with the main contractor—I presume there was participation, but as to that I cannot say—received, the Government's estimate having been paid in that way, the price of rock for earth work to such an extent that within a very few months large sums have been accumulated by him. Since the commencement of the present Session I have received, from an entirely independent source, information to the same effect. I made no enquiries, and the information in both instances was communicated to me spontaneously. It seems to me to be my duty to bring this matter under the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite and of the House, in order that if those statements have not reached the ear of the Government, proper enquiries may be made. Hon. gentlemen will observe that the case is one in which the Government engineer is a brother, and my informants believe he was also, although not ostensibly, a partner with the sub-contractor, Mr. Hugh J. Keefer; and if those facts are correct, it would seem that a considerable fraud has been perpetrated on the country by the sub-contractor and the engineer.

Mr. POPE. I would say to the hon. gentleman that, of course, I knew nothing of this matter. I understand from the chief engineer that this is a very small contract and that it was mostly earth work. I have some information here from the chief engineer. This is what he says: There was a man by name Hugh J. Keefer, working upon contract 61, upon which Mr. George Keefer was engineer in charge; he is said to be a cousin of George Keefer. The part of the road on which Hugh J. Keefer appeared to be working, and who was said to have a sub-contract, was in charge of Mr. John Grey and Mr. Hannington, assistant engineers under Mr. George Keefer. Under Mr. John Grey and Mr. Hannington were employed a number of men as loose rock measurers, whose duty it was to measure the boulders as excavated, and record them in a book; these were to be returned daily to the assistant engineers, and upon these returns the quantity of loose rock was calculated at the end of each month by the assistant engineers, and checked by the engineer in charge. The work on this portion of the road is of good quality.

Mr. BLAKE. I made no complaint as to the quality.

Mr. POPE. Any papers we have on the subject will be brought down.

Mr. BLAKE. I am informed, and a statement is, that \$100,000 were extracted by this means. The hon. gentleman says loose rock, boulders and earth, but he knows that the difference in cost between boulders and loose rock, and earth and sand, is very considerable. I daresay the difference is 25 cents on the one hand and \$1.75 or \$1.35 on the other.

Mr. POPE. We do not pay \$1.85 for loose rock.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know what the Government are paying for loose rock in British Columbia.

Mr. POPE. Nothing of that kind.

Mr. BLAKE. How much?

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. POPE. I cannot say. Probably not more than half Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.

Mr. MITCHELL moved for:

A statement in detail of the several casualties or accidents whereby passengers were injured or killed which have occurred on the Grand Trunk Railway—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am glad to notice that my motion meets with so unanimous a feeling of approval in this House.

and any of its branches, and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and any of its branches—

I think I should have added also the Intercolonial Railway, and any of its branches, and I shall be happy to have the motion amended in that way, if any hon. gentleman wishes it—

from the 1st day of January, 1884, to the 1st day of January, 1885, stating in detail where and when such casualties occurred, the number of persons killed in each casualty; also number injured, stating whether seriously or otherwise, the several amounts paid, and to whom paid, as damages in each accident, whether any law suits for recovery of damages are pending, and stating in detail what amounts are still claimed thereon; also the causes of such accidents.

He said: I think, from the frequency of these accidents, and the very enormous character of many of them, it is very important that we should get this information laid before the House, and that these railway corporations should understand that public attention is being called to the manner in which human life is being sacrificed upon their roads. I am not pointing at any particular road now; I think there is general carelessness on all roads, and I think it is well to call attention to this fact and get these returns, as the law provides.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—COST OF CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

A statement of the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway from Winnipeg to a point 615 miles west of Winnipeg, divided under the usual sub-headings of cost of railway construction; or in case the company has not recorded the expense under the usual sub-headings, then divided in such a way and in such detail as the company has recorded it.

He said: I have more than once, on former occasions, felt it my duty to call the attention of the House to the alleged cost of this section of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was with some difficulty, and after a good deal of delay, that a statement was obtained of the expense of the construction of the different sections, and the efforts up to this time to obtain a statement in those details which are usual in all works of railway construction has been a failure. We know the general sub-headings under which estimates are made for works of railway construction. We know that they are almost invariably on one line—that there are some leading sub-divisions which are well understood to be the proper mode of estimating and of recording what is the cost of a line. But, as I have said, former applications though acceded to by this House, though thought reasonable by this House, have not been responded to by this company in a satisfactory manner. So with reference to the contracts; we have not been able to obtain any of the contracts for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, excepting one of the contracts of Langdon, Shepherd & Co., and the contract with the North American Contracting Company. All the other contracts have been omitted up to this time to be supplied to us by the Canadian Pacific Railway, though called for by this House by the medium of an address. I have said that I have felt it my duty to call the attention of the

House on more than one occasion to the cost of this section, and to impress, if by any means I can impress, on the House, the importance of insisting on further information with reference to the cost of this section. We have several tests which we may fairly apply with reference to the cost of this section. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the section of which I am speaking is the section from Winnipeg to a point 615 miles west—that is, to the point to the eastward of the South Saskatchewan, so that the heavy bridge over the South Saskatchewan is not embraced in the cost of this construction. In fact, there is only one bridge of any importance embraced in this whole stretch of 615 miles—I mean the bridge over the Assiniboine—a bridge which is certainly important, but which probably did not cost, with its approaches, much more than one-third of the cost of the bridge over the Saskatchewan. For the rest, the road is as easy a road as is to be found anywhere, and the cost has been stated to us during last Session, irrespective altogether of the terminals and station buildings, and the offices and workshops at Winnipeg, so that we are dealing simply with the ascertained statement of the cost of 615 miles of line, of the cheapest description which it is possible to find in the character of the works which are necessary. Now, as I have said, there are several tests we may apply as to what the cost of this line may be. In the first place, there is the estimate of Mr. Fleming, made, I think, in the year 1880, for 1,000 miles of prairie line from Selkirk, trending more to the northward over a more difficult country than that traversed by the southern line—more difficult in several particulars, and notably so in respect of the river crossings—and certainly a much more expensive piece of line which Mr. Fleming estimated, at a period at which, if I remember aright, steel rails were much more expensive than they are at present—at \$13,000 a mile for the whole stretch, including a light equipment. A light equipment has been estimated for the purpose of the present contract at \$1,300 a mile, which would leave the cost of that more expensive prairie section at \$11,700 per mile. Of course it is to be observed as against the observation of its being a more expensive section, that the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway is probably more substantial in the sub-grades than that referred to by Mr. Fleming. That is certainly an observation quite fit to be made, and it would probably compensate fully for the more expensive natural features of the road to the northward. Now, the next element for calculation is the actual cost of the branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Province of Manitoba, and these are at a figure, by their own reports, which amount to \$10,700 per mile. These lines, as we know, are not very extensive, though there is an important line from Winnipeg to the south and south-west; but the cost to the company is \$10,700 per mile, over a country certainly not superior for railway building to that of the 615 miles to which I have referred. Another element in the consideration of actual cost—which is always more satisfactory than an estimate—is the actual cost of the 345 miles commencing at the termination of the section which is the subject of this motion—the 345 miles which commences at the 615th mile west of Winnipeg and terminates at the Rocky Mountains is a piece of road very much more expensive than the 615 miles. First of all, it is more expensive in respect to the haulage and the distance, because all the material which comes from the east had to be hauled over the whole 615 miles before it reached the initial point of those 345 miles; and we know that during the year before last the cost of the haulage of the material on the Canadian Pacific Railway amounted to about \$1,200,000, and that last year it amounted to over \$600,000; so that is not an unimportant point. Secondly, this piece of road, the 345 miles, possesses very much more difficult characteristics, with reference to the bridging. There is a very important bridge over the

Saskatchewan river, which, with its approaches, cost between \$500,000 and \$600,000, which, if you divide it by the comparatively small mileage I am referring to, you will see makes an addition for one single bridge of something like \$1,500 a mile over the whole distance. And lastly, the third unfavorable element comparatively is the well known circumstance, that in the course of the section to which I am referring, you pass the foot hills and up the Rocky Mountains. After Calgary there are some foot hills, and although up the hither slope of the Rocky Mountains the route is fairly good, it is very much more expensive than the ordinary work of the line. With these three relatively unfavorable elements—the distance from the base of operations, a very important bridge over a small mileage, and a country comparatively difficult, with a good deal of mountain work—the actual cost of that section of 345 miles was \$14,530 a mile. So that you find the branch lines near Winnipeg costing \$10,700; you find this section I have been speaking of costing \$14,500; and you find Mr. Fleming's estimates, apart from equipment, to be \$11,700. And now I come to my fourth and last element of the calculation in reaching the price, and that is embraced in the report of Mr. Reed, the engineer I referred to yesterday, with reference to a section in the mountains in British Columbia. Mr. Reed reports with reference to a particular section of 113 miles; and I am desirous to point out to the House what the features of this section are, and what his statement of the cost is, in order that we may bring it into a comparison with the cost of the section to which this motion is directed. The section to which he refers commences at Kamloops Village, and terminates at Griffin Lake, near the summit of the Eagle Pass in the Gold range. Mr. Reed says:

"From Kamloops village to the Little Shuswap lake, 38 miles, the line runs near the shore of the South Thompson river, crossing the farms that are located in the valley, where the small streams, tributary to the river, furnish water for irrigation. The grading and bridging on this portion of the line is very light, and the material is mostly sand and gravel. The trees are few and scattered, and the clearing and grubbing will be very light."

You will observe that this 38 miles is a very favorable piece of railway construction, and may not unfairly be compared, for most of the distance, to the prairie line.

"From Little Shuswap lake to Sicamous narrows, 45 miles, the line will be somewhat more expensive. The Shuswap lakes are of irregular shape, and their arms, extending out between the mountains, distort the railway line and cause a loss in distance of about 8 miles. The line leaves the South Thompson river at the head of the Little Shuswap lake, crosses a 'divide' to the Salmon arm of the Shuswap lakes, and passes around on the south shore to Sicamous narrows."

"From the west end of the Little Shuswap lake, going eastward, the excavation on the first 6 miles will average nearly 30,000 cubic yards per mile, about one-half of which will be rock. On the next 14 miles the work will average 16,000 cubic yards per mile, all earth and gravel. The next 13 miles will average 16,000 yards per mile, 1,000 yards of which will be rock, and the rest earth, gravel and sand. The remaining 12 miles to Sicamous narrows will average only about 10,000 cubic yards to the mile, 40 per cent of which will be rock. On this section there will be two short tunnels—one of 240 feet and one of 300."

"From Savonna's ferry to Sicamous narrows, a distance of 108 miles, the entire line is contiguous to navigable water, and is therefore more favorably situated for cheap and rapid construction."

There you see a section of 45 miles of a very different character—and I will advert presently, in more detail, to what I calculate to be the cost of that 45 miles.

"From Little Shuswap Lake eastward there is a marked change in the climate."

And he proceeds to state what the climate is, and goes on:

"From Sicamous narrows to Griffin lake, near the summit of Eagle pass, in the Gold range, 30 miles, the line follows the valley of the Eagle river. But little if any rock excavation occurs, and the earth work is very light. Some pile bridging and a short pivot bridge at Sicamous narrows will be required. The country is densely wooded, and clearing and grubbing will cost about \$1,000 per mile over the remaining portion of the line, east to the Rocky Mountains."

I say, with reference to that 30 miles, being the eastern portion of this section of 113 miles, that the observation I

made as to the westerly 38 miles may be repeated, namely, that it is a cheap line, possessing the general characteristics of the prairie line, except that there is a dense timber, and therefore the clearing and grubbing will cost \$1,000 a mile, which is in excess of the cost on the prairie, where that cost is almost nominal. Now, Mr. Reed estimates the cost of this whole 113 miles at \$16,000 a mile. Of course, the locality is one of the least favorable for railway construction, because the base of supplies is very much more distant, and the haulage is very much greater than that which was essential to complete the 116 miles west from Winnipeg. Then the broken character of the country and of the section itself involves a considerable difficulty in railway construction. It is not possible in such circumstances to construct as fast or as cheaply as when you have an unbroken stretch of prairie. But apart from the middle 45 miles, this section of 113 miles is not a difficult section. There are in that portion, according to Mr. Reed's estimate, no less than 151,000 yards of cubic rock, two tunnels, and 12,000 cubic yards of earth a mile, apart from the 3,000 or 4,000 yards of rock a mile. There is a very heavy timber over this section, making \$1,000 a mile for clearing, cutting and grubbing, so that upon the whole, looking at these circumstances, my opinion is that a fair estimate for this 45 miles would be \$22,500 a mile; but in order to be safe, I reduce the cost of these 45 miles, to \$21,000 per mile, which makes \$945,000, while the whole 113 miles are estimated at \$1,808,000, leaving \$863,000 for the remaining 68 miles, on 30 miles of which there is \$1,000 a mile for clearing, post cutting and grubbing. Therefore, the comparison of these remaining 68 miles, with the prairie section, to which I have alluded, remains unfavorable, because you have \$500 a mile about to add for the simple item of clearing; and the comparison remains unfavorable also with reference to the distance from the base of operations and the broken and mountainous character of the country. But making no allowance for all those circumstances, assuming there was no more clearing than on the prairie line, assuming that the base of operations was as near, assuming that the country was such that you could press on the work with equal rapidity and facility throughout that broken and mountainous country as on the prairie section, still the cost would be \$12,700 a mile, for the 68 miles of these 113 miles, and the total cost of the 113 miles is \$16,000 a mile. There you have my fourth element of comparison or calculation, the cost of this section in British Columbia, which, with its expensive 45 miles, Mr. Reed tells us is going to cost \$16,000 per mile, and eliminating that expensive 45 miles, would cost between \$12,000 and \$13,000 a mile. With these four elements of comparison, what I desire to know is, how it comes that the section from Winnipeg to a point 615 miles west has cost, according to the statement of the company, no less than \$16,780 per mile, or three or four thousand dollars a mile more than any of these other pieces of the line, and more than what the estimate, properly applied, would lead one to conclude it ought to have cost. To my mind it is wholly inexplicable. I cannot understand how it can be alleged that this 615 miles cost this sum of nearly \$17,000 a mile; and yet that is the statement the company has returned to Parliament as the cost of that section. I have reason to believe that the first 133 miles from Winnipeg to Brandon, which was carried on under the former engineer of the company, cost about \$10,000 per mile. Under the Langdon-Shepherd contract, which commenced at Brandon, a very high increase of price, an inexplicable increase, was adopted; but I cannot see how even there it could cost more than \$12,800 or \$13,000 a mile at any reasonable rates, and how we reach the sum of \$16,700 or \$16,800 per mile is wholly inexplicable. As far as I can judge, there cannot be less than two and a half million dollars of which we have no reasonable explanation whatever in the cost of this sec-

Mr. BLAKE.

tion. Now, some clue would be given as to what has become of this money, as to how this which, by a sad experience too lightly to be repeated, we know is our money, has been spent, if this motion be passed by this House and if compliance with it be enforced from the company and we receive a statement, according to the usual sub-heading of railway construction, of what the cost of this sub-section was.

Mr. POPE. The papers will be brought down. I can say to my hon. friend that he is laboring under a considerable mistake when he says the first 615 miles was lighter work than the 345 miles. I have travelled over all parts of this railway, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that the 345 miles are quite as light as the 615 miles. It is not built as usually with a prairie road; the road is elevated very high, so as to prevent snow collecting on it. The banks on each side where there is a cutting, and there are very few cuttings, are levelled up for a very great distance, to prevent the collection of snow. It is not very strange, it is possible this piece of road referred to in Mr. Reed's report may be as easily built as the road across the prairie, because they would not take the same pains with it, and there is nothing like the amount of earth to be removed as on the prairies, nor are there high banks to be built in many places as on the prairie. But the hon. gentleman is not singular in not being able to understand that. I do not suppose many lawyers who have devoted most of their time to the practice at the bar would understand railway construction. No doubt he has exercised great ingenuity and has studied the papers very closely, but it is an exceedingly difficult thing for a man to come from a lawyer's office and to understand why a section of grading should cost a great deal more than estimated; but he will have the papers, and what more information he desires.

Mr. BLAKE. I am quite aware, and I did not say that this is built as ordinary roads are; I said it was a road over the prairie. I am quite aware that the embankment on this line is wider than it ordinarily is.

Mr. POPE. And there is the height.

Mr. BLAKE. I am speaking of one of two things—the hon. gentleman is trying, as usual, to put two ideas into one sentence, but with my limited comprehension, to which he referred, I prefer to state one thing at a time. I was speaking of the width of the embankment and was going to speak of the height. I know that the embankments were very wisely made higher, having regard to the pliable material with which they were made. It is said that they are much higher than they need be, and I suppose they are as high as a judicious engineer would provide them to be; but the only information we have on the subject is the amount of earth work over the whole line. There is no statement of the earth work on this section, although there is of the average earth work all over, and it certainly is a surprising amount, one of the things one wants to find out a little more about. Even allowing for the earth work, I am still at a loss to understand the cost of the line. The hon. gentleman says I come out of a lawyer's office and know nothing about railways. I suppose he would say I do not know more about railways than he does about law, and I admit that is very little. But, Sir, I am sorry to say that for a great many years my life has been passed very little in my office, and very much in this House, and in the discharge of my duty as a public man, and that I cannot take the hon. gentleman's kind excuse that my attention to my own business prevents me from understanding this matter. I think the statements I have made will be found to be verified. They are based not upon my own information, but upon information supplied by the hon. gentleman himself and the Minister of Railways, with reference to other sections, and

what he says with reference to the Columbia section is: I dare say it did not cost any more than the prairie section. I dare say it did not. I dare say it was not more expensive than the prairie section; but, according to this estimate of Mr. Reed, it cost a great deal less than the prairie section, and that is the point. I want to know how it is that it costs so much less than the prairie. I do not believe that they have given us an under-estimate of this, and therefore I believe there is an extraordinary amount of cost in the prairie line. Then, he says that 345 miles from a point 45 miles east of the Saskatchewan to the summit, is just as light as that from Winnipeg to that point.

Mr. POPE. Average.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course it is an average that we are talking of. He has been over the line, he says. Part by day and part by night, I suppose.

Mr. POPE. Every foot by day.

Mr. BLAKE. And perhaps he was looking out of the glass all the time?

Mr. POPE. No; I did not take my glasses.

Mr. BLAKE. What the hon. gentleman, running over the Canadian Pacific Railway at between 30 and 40 miles an hour, on a special train, with my hon. friend from Ottawa to cheer him by the way, and I know of no one who could better cheer him by the way, could not find out, I suppose is not worth mentioning; but, for all that, we would like the figures; and even if the work were just as light on the average for the 345 miles as it was on the prairie section, there is the big bridge which I mentioned; and even if the work were just as light including the big bridge, —

Mr. POPE. I did not say that. I did not say including the bridge.

Mr. BLAKE. He acknowledges then, that including the big bridge, it was not as light on the 345 miles as on the 615 miles; but the fact is, that the admittedly heavier section, what he now admits to be the heavier section, cost \$14,500 a mile and the lighter section, \$16,700.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman must understand that they did not include the bridge in that statement; it was made when the road was first built. I must say that the hon. gentleman has displayed a great knowledge of railways when he says the usual width of a dump is 12 feet. The width of that dump is 16 feet.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not speak of a dump at all.

Mr. POPE. Well, the embankment. Did he ever see one on a road that was 12 feet in width? I never saw one less than 14 feet.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLIES FOR THE HUDSON'S BAY STEAMER "NEPTUNE."

Mr. VAIL moved for:

Copies, in full, of the accounts and vouchers of all provisions, coal and other supplies furnished the Hudson's Bay steamer *Neptune* at Halifax in July last.

Mr. McLELAN. I would ask the hon. gentleman to amend that by adding "Copies of all tenders upon which all the contracts were based."

Mr. VAIL. I have no objection at all.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

INLAND FISHERIES.

Mr. O'BRIEN. In the financial statement of the Treasurer of the Province of Ontario, delivered at Toronto the

other day, I find a claim made on behalf of the Province for a sum, I think, of \$129,000 for license fees due to the Province for licenses for fishing in the inland waters of Ontario. I think that, in view not only of the importance of the sum mentioned, but also of the fact that the Government and other members of this House have taken a great interest in the promotion of our inland fisheries, it is for our interest to know, at the earliest possible moment, in whose hands the promotion of these fisheries is. It might be a strong argument for those who favor a legislative over a federal union that in almost every province of legislation which we take up we are hampered, and our hands are tied, by being met with this conflict of jurisdiction. The constituency I represent is largely interested in this question. We have some 100 miles of coast on the Georgian Bay. We have in every township inland lakes and rivers, which are largely stocked with fish, and we have been making great efforts to preserve that industry, which is of great importance and value. The Government have also done a great deal in this direction in the last year or two, and I was hoping that before the expiration of another Session we should have had these fisheries placed on such a footing that we would avoid that which has happened in almost all the older Provinces—an entire destruction of the fish in the inland waters. So far as I have had an opportunity of considering the nature of the judgment to which reference is made, I do not think it goes as far as is stated by the Provincial Treasurer. I do not gather that it at all affects the rights of the Dominion to control the fisheries, so far as legislation may go, irrespective of fees for licenses. In fact, it seems to be in somewhat the same position as the liquor question, and attended with all the same difficulties. But, from a cursory examination of it, I do not think it debars the Dominion from exercising that control over the fishing which has already been claimed and exercised. Of course we can hardly expect the Dominion will continue to administer a branch of the executive if the fees are to be taken by another party, if they are only to have the expense and another Legislature is to receive whatever profit may be obtained. I cannot myself understand by what process of calculation the Treasurer of Ontario has arrived at the very large sum he claims, because the fact is, that so far as the inland fisheries are concerned, which alone were affected by the judgment in the Queen against Robertson, which came from the Province of New Brunswick, the fees are exceedingly small and the expense of management correspondingly great. I think that so far as any money interest is concerned, the Province will find that it had better have allowed the subject to rest. But however that may be, it is important that we should know how far this judgment affects the Province and the Dominion. Having taken myself great interest in this matter, and knowing that other hon. members are interested in it, and that the Government will be compelled to take it into consideration, I beg to move:

For a copy of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of the Queen against Robinson, so far as the same relates to the rights of Provincial Governments to control the inland fisheries of the Dominion; and also for copies of all correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and that of the Province of Ontario in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL moved:

For copies of the returns as required to be made under the Consolidated Railway Act of 1879 and the Acts in amendment thereof, of 1881 and 1884, by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, for the fiscal year 1883-84, in each case separately; and

1st. The number of miles of main line of Grand Trunk, with statement of actual total cost of construction and equipment thereof. The separate cost per mile of construction thereof, without rolling stock. The total amount of capital account now standing against the said railway, including its equipment.

2nd. A statement in detail, showing the several branches or side lines now owned by the said company, including the number of miles in each, with the amounts severally paid for each. How such amounts were paid; whether paid in cash or securities, and the statement and character thereof in detail. The amount for which each of such securities was sold, and the net amounts which were realised in each.

3rd. A statement in detail of any railway line or lines leased by the Grand Trunk Company or agreed to be worked by them on a percentage of earnings or other terms, with the length of each of such lines and the conditions in detail of the agreements in relation thereto.

4th. A statement in detail of any interest the Grand Trunk Railway may have in any other railway or railways, with the securities in detail that they may hold in relation thereto.

5th. A statement in detail of the net earnings of each of the railways mentioned in the four preceding clauses, after the payment of working expenses, for the past financial year of each of the said railways, with a statement in detail of the percentage that working expenses bear in each case to the gross earnings.

6th. Whether any and what amounts were paid by the Grand Trunk Company towards the construction of the Toronto and Ottawa Railway, and the amount thereof; with the statement of the gross as well as the net earnings of the said railway, for the past financial year of the said railway, and a statement of where these funds came from; also, a statement as to where they appear in the accounts of the Grand Trunk Company's accounts or returns.

Mr. McMULLEN. I certainly think it is unwise to assist any hon. gentleman in this House to worry and annoy a railway company in the way in which the hon. gentleman is determined to annoy and worry the Grand Trunk. I do not think it is wise for this House to assist him in calling upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company to bring down extended returns of this kind. It will cost them a great amount of money, and will be of no use to the country, that I can see. I have noticed, since it has been my privilege to sit in this House, that the hon. gentleman has got some peculiar spleen of his own against the Grand Trunk, that apparently is not very well known to any other member. I cannot understand what it is. Possibly there may be a \$10,000 nigger in the fence, or something of that kind. I have noticed that he has a continuous antipathy against that corporation. The word Grand Trunk is hardly ever mentioned in the House but that he goes for that company like a mad bull at a red rag. I notice that the hon. gentleman has got three motions on the Order paper, and every one of those motions is Grand Trunk, Grand Trunk, all the time. I would certainly like to have some explanation of the secret of his antipathy. It appears to me that in justice to the House, as well as to himself, the hon. gentleman ought to enter into a detailed statement of all the grievances that exist between himself and the Grand Trunk, of all the facts at issue between them. I think certainly that we should not permit this Order to pass until the hon. gentleman gives the House such explanation as will warrant us in believing that it is necessary, in the public interest, that we should permit it. The Grand Trunk Company has performed a great deal of valuable service to this country; it was the pioneer line of this Dominion, and I do not think it is quite right that we should permit any hon. gentleman here to ask questions, from time to time, to annoy the company in this kind of style. I hope the hon. gentleman will give the House some extended explanation of the cause which leads him to take this course.

Mr. MITCHELL. I certainly did not desire to occupy the time of the House at any length with remarks on the Grand Trunk at the present moment; but since the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has chosen to make references to me, and thinks it is due to the House that I should give some explanation why I want these returns, I shall be happy to comply with his request. That hon. gentleman has chosen to imply some personal interest, or some \$10,000 nigger in the fence, or some other reason, which, I presume, he intends to be jocular about—or, at all events, to imply that I have personal motives in my action in relation to the Grand Trunk. Sir, that there may be some personal differences between the leading executive and myself, is true; and, Sir, I thought that I had given, last winter, sufficient explanation of my attitude towards

Mr. MITCHELL,

the Grand Trunk Company. Was my hon. friend, who has chosen to make these inferences about myself, in the Committee of Railways and Canals last winter when this matter was discussed, when another hon. gentleman, who is now in my eye, chose to make similar references to those which the hon. gentleman has just made? Does the hon. gentleman not recollect what my answer was to my hon. friend then? I am prepared to make the same answer now. I leave it to the House, who witnessed the struggle last winter, between myself, individually, and a great corporation—a struggle in the interests of the public of Canada, a struggle in vindication of Canadian rights, a struggle to remove the stigma and stain that have been put upon Canadian statesmen, the Canadian Government, the Canadian people and Canadian institutions, by the leading power that controls that corporation in London. Was the hon. gentleman not in the House when I read the report of the proceedings at the semi-annual meeting, in April last, when they charged this House with corruption, when they slandered the people and Parliament of Canada, and when they found fault with our enterprise and attempted to dictate to this Parliament how they should spend their money and what undertakings they should enter into? Did the hon. gentleman not hear those remarks; and if they are not sufficient explanation of the reason why I have placed these motions on the papers, I will give him and this House further explanation. Everyone knows that this corporation owes this country \$26,000,000, and ten years' interest on that amount, and that this corporation, through its chief executive officer, threatened the Government of Canada that if they dared to enter into and encourage the construction of a Canadian Pacific railway across the continent, the power and vengeance of the Grand Trunk would be visited upon them. We want, and this House has a right to demand, that that company shall place before Parliament, each year, information which they are bound to supply, according to the statute. The hon. member who last spoke should have paused before making an exhibition of himself by questioning my right, or the right of any other hon. member, to ask information on public affairs, information on a subject which we have a right to know about, and which I am sure the House will order to be granted. Does any one question the right of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) when he rises, day after day, to move strings of resolutions respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway, an enterprise which Canada has initiated and is bound to carry out. Did anyone question the motives which inspire the hon. gentleman. I might ask why should the hon. member, day after day, place motions on the paper, calling for statements and returns, and asking for information in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. Have I, as any hon. member, ever questioned the hon. gentleman's right? No. He has a right to move for information which he desires to procure, and which he, as a representative, has a right to demand; and why should I, as an hon. member, not have a right to call for returns which the statute requires the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific Railway to lay before the House from year to year. But this House has supreme power outside of the statute, and it has the right to obtain all information from its debtors as to the manner in which they are expending their money, as to why they have entered into enterprises which may be very questionable in their character, such as branch railways and speculations which may imperil the safety of the \$26,000,000 the company owe us. If that is not sufficient, I will tell the hon. gentleman that it is the time Grand Trunk, that monster corporation which dictates to the people and the Government of Canada, should understand, and their representatives and controllers in England should realise, that Canada is not going to tolerate any more of their insolence, or put up with any more of their insinuations. The other night I read from the statements of Sir Henry Tyler and those who

spoke in his interest—I have not the extracts here, but I am able to produce them again—containing the insinuation that this House was corrupt, and asking how much of the £6,000,000 sterling voted for the Canadian Pacific Railway had gone into the pockets of hon. members of this House, or members of the Cabinet. Such an insinuation is an outrage upon the independence and honesty of this Parliament of Canada, and ought to have been resented in a more striking manner by some hon. members on the Treasury Benches. It has not been done, and I have an opportunity of doing it now. If I had possessed the information then, which I have now, I would have talked to them about corruption. For what were the thousands of dollars put in circulation in Montreal—for what were they given by the Grand Trunk on a certain occasion? I may have to enlighten the hon. gentleman about these things before we get through. In conclusion, I desire to say this: I have a right, in the public interest, to enquire how the money that is due to Canada by this company is going to be paid. I have a right to see as to the condition of the enterprise which is security for the money. I recollect, when we of the Maritime Provinces were entering into Confederation, this Grand Trunk debt was put forward as an asset against the investments of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, when the matter was dealt with in London, and it was represented and counted as a good asset. I, as one of those representatives, have a right to know what the particulars are and what is the condition of that security for repayment of the money. I have a right to ask why the Grand Trunk have put a million dollars in the road between Toronto and Ottawa, which I cannot find charged in the Grand Trunk accounts, but which was paid for by them. I want to unearth some of the jobs perpetrated in connection with the Grand Trunk, and I have a right, as a representative of the people, to ask that this information which is embodied in my motion be given to us, for the purpose of finding out in what position our accounts stand, whether the condition of that enterprise is satisfactory, or whether it is not the duty of the House and of the Government to deal with that corporation and prevent it squandering money and thus removing all chance of this country ever getting recouped any portion of the money due it. These are my reasons for making this motion, and I think they are good and substantial ones.

Motion agreed to.

SQUATTERS IN TOWNSHIP 3, RANGES 23 and 24, WEST.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for:—

Return showing

1. The names of all squatters or occupants on the various sections in Township 3, Ranges 23 and 24, west; when such sections became occupied; the various applications made by such squatters or occupants to acquire said land; all petitions and correspondence with the Government respecting residence; all declarations made by such squatters or occupants and sent to the Government touching said land; the names of all persons who have been allowed to make entries on said lands, and the names of all squatters or occupants who have not been allowed entries; the decision or adjudication of the Government respecting all such claims, and the reasons therefor.

2. All claims made by the Morton Dairying and Farming Company to said lands; when such claims were made; the action of the Government or Department of the Interior thereon; a copy of any agreement, lease or license under which said company claim said land; and all correspondence with the Government and said company respecting said claim, and the action of the Government or Department thereon; and all other documents or papers affecting said land.

He said: My reason for troubling the House with this motion is contained in the following letter, which I shall read to the House. It is dated 20th February, 1885, and addressed to myself, and is in the following terms:—

“DEAR SIR,—In the fall of 1881 I, with a number of others, squatted on Township 3, Ranges 23 and 24, west. In May, 1882, a company, by the name of the Morton Dairying and Farming Company, informed us that these two townships were part of the land they bought from the Government. Since that time we have sent a number of petitions and

letters to the Minister of the Interior, asking him to give us an entry for our land, but all we can do seems to be of no use. At different times we have asked three members on the Government side of the House to take our case in hand. Two of them promised to do so—the third one advised us to go to the North-West, where the land was in market. In 1882 an order was sent from Ottawa to the land agent, asking him to send in a report of the number of squatters, their improvements, &c. In 1883 blank forms were sent us to fill up, asking us some forty-two questions. These forms had to be filled up under oath. Well, the forms were filled up and sent to Ottawa. In September of the same year an order was sent to the land agent to give us an entry for our land. In a few days the order was cancelled. The excuse they gave us was that they were not aware that the land was reserved land. During those few days seven of the squatters got an entry. There are eleven of us that have the same right to get an entry as those who got it. Will you be so kind as to take our case in hand, and try if you can get them to give us our land, and oblige,

“Yours truly,

“WILLIAM MUSTARD.”

“P.S.—As for the company, every dollar's worth they had on the land was sold by the sheriff in the summer of 1883.

“W. M.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are some facts in this letter, some statements, which I desire to submit to the attention of the House. I find, by the terms of this letter, that in the fall of 1881 eighteen heads of families left the Province of Ontario to settle in the North-West, and these eighteen heads of families, as this letter states, squatted on vacant Government lands in Township 3, Ranges 23 and 24, west. That is the first fact. I find that all, or nearly all, of these men, in the fall of 1881 and the spring of 1882, entered into possession of what they supposed to be their lands, and made some improvements thereon, such as putting up houses of the dimensions required by law, and entering on the cultivation of the soil. That is fact number two. I find, by the official *Gazette*, that on the 28th of February, 1882, long months after these men had squatted upon the land, the Morton Dairying and Farming Company gave notice of their intention to apply for an Act of incorporation, and some months after the 28th February, 1882, this company did become incorporated. That is fact number three. Now, Sir, recollect all this took place several months after the settlers or emigrants had entered on the settlement of their land. I find, further, that after these men had entered on the settlement of their land, after they had made some improvements on their lands—and they were *bona fide* settlers from the Province of Ontario—some time in the year 1882 that company gave notice to these settlers that the land belonged to them and gave them notice to leave it. That is fact number four. I find that these men, according to the statements of the letter, by petition, by representation, by letter and otherwise, stated their complaints to the agents in Manitoba, and sent their complaints to the Government, at Ottawa, and in answer to these complaints an Order in Council was passed, in 1882, and was transmitted to the local agent, allowing these squatters to make their entries. Fact number five. This action of the Government was correct. Nobody has any objection to it. After that Order in Council reached the local agent, seven of the eighteen heads of families to whom I have referred having become aware of the Order in Council, made entry and thus secured their lands. But unfortunately within one week after the Order in Council had been transmitted to the local agent in Manitoba the Order in Council was cancelled, and the remaining eleven of the eighteen were deprived of their right of entry, and up to the present cannot get any redress. I find another fact established by this letter—that this Morton Dairying and Farming Company, almost the moment it began to exist, ceased to exist. It became insolvent, and in September, 1883 the company's assets were sold out by the sheriff of Manitoba. All the assets and property of the company were sold by the sheriff, and yet from the fall of 1881 down to the present time eleven of the eighteen who settled on the lands there have been unable to obtain an entry for their land. Now

you see that these eighteen heads of families left their homes in the Province of Ontario and went to the Province of Manitoba and settled upon unoccupied lands owned apparently by nobody, and claimed by nobody except the Government, until months after they made occupation there. They left their homes in good faith, and settled there in good faith, relying on the assurance of the Government to encourage, as far as possible, all the immigrants that would settle in that country. And yet, Sir, although these representations have been made to the Government, although affidavits have been sent to the Government, yet up to this hour these men have been unable to obtain their entries. I do not know how many of these unfortunate men, who have been dangling for three years and a-half between earth and heaven, hoping against hope, remain in the country to-day. I know that my friend, Mr. Mustard, who was a former constituent of mine, is there still; but how many more remain in the country I do not know. It would not be a wonder if many of them, dissatisfied and disgusted with the treatment they have received from the Government and from their officials in the North-West, left the country and removed elsewhere. I hope, however, that better counsels have prevailed among them, and that they have remained on their land. I hope that the energy and the indomitable perseverance which have characterised most of the immigrants who went to that country, have prevailed in the case of these men, and that they have remained, there in the hope, however faint it may be, that they will ultimately receive justice at the hands of the Government. Now, I regret that my friend Mr. Mustard has not sent his complaint to some person who has greater influence with the Government than I have. I have no other way of ventilating the wrongs of these men than on the floor of Parliament, and I can only avail myself of the opportunity this letter has given me to discuss this question, in order that the Government may see the necessity of dealing with the complaints of these men in the way they ought to be dealt with. I have more than once, both during the present and the preceding Parliament, found it my duty to point out, on the floor of Parliament, what I conceive to be the harsh treatment received by the settlers of the North-West at the hands of the Government or the employees of the Government in Manitoba and the North-West. I hoped, from the statements made in the House last Session, that a more liberal and generous policy would have been pursued by the Minister of the Interior in regard to these settlers. If the statements contained in this letter are true, and I have no reason to doubt them, I am sorry to see that a more liberal and generous policy has not prevailed; because the First Minister must admit that if these statements are correct, these men have been dealt with in the harshest possible manner. They have been allowed to remain there three years and a-half without their claims being recognised, and the hon. gentleman must know that nothing can check the progress and retard the settlement of the country so much as to let men like these remain in the unsatisfactory condition in which they have been allowed to remain. I am sorry to say that the case in question is not an isolated case. I have had half a dozen such cases brought under my notice since the opening of the Session. But it would be of no use for me to go to the Department of the Interior. If the remonstrances sent to the Government by the settlers, many of whom are warm friends of the Government, do not prevail with them, I can hardly hope that my voice will influence them; and my course is simply to state the facts to the House, in the hope that the House may press the Government to deal liberally with the settler. I have several other cases which I intend to bring before the House, in the hope of securing some redress for these people. Mr. Mustard writes that he wishes me to bring this matter before Parliament so that these eleven men, with their families, may obtain some redress.

Mr. CAMEBON (Huron).

I remember that last Session, when I drew attention to some of these complaints, the First Minister denied that any man was dispossessed of his land in the North-West or in the Province of Manitoba. If men who put their names to communications in the public press do not state what is utterly untrue, the Department has deprived more than one man of land and improvements. Let me refer to a statement made by a correspondent in a Winnipeg paper. I do not vouch for its correctness; but I will give the First Minister the man's name and address, and I will put the letter on the Table of the House, so that it may appear in *Hansard*. His name is Livingston, and he writes to the *Winnipeg Sun* as follows:—

"I see in your issue of to-day that Sir John Macdonald, in the debate on the Address, denies that any *bona fide* settler has ever been dispossessed. This I am in a position to contradict, for after residing in and cultivating my homestead for nearly nine years, and having improvements to the amount of \$20,000, my land was sold by the Government, and I was dispossessed. Hundreds of others can tell the same story."

I have no doubt the correspondence on this case has been presented to the Department of the Interior. We find that the Government's own supporters, in a certain locality in the North-West, held a meeting, confined to Conservatives, with the view of pressing this matter on the attention of the Government; and being a purely Conservative meeting, it was supposed that its influence and power would prevail with the Government, and that the Government would see the necessity, in the interest of their own followers, of doing justice to them and giving them their entries. Sir, I do not know what cause has inspired the mad policy of the Department of the Interior during the past two or three years as regards the settlers in and the settlement of the North-West. There must have been some moving cause unknown to the public, otherwise the settlers in the North-West Territory would not have ground to complain. I find in a public newspaper published in the interest of the Government, a report of a meeting of Conservatives at Moose Jaw, at which resolutions were passed condemning the action of the Dominion Government regarding their land policy. It was resolved that the Government be memorialised by the Conservatives of that place, asking the Government to grant an immediate solution of the land problem. The complaint there made was just the same as the complaint I am now bringing forward. The people had been living upon their land for years before the line of the Pacific Railway in that district was located, and yet almost up to this moment, at all events up to the end of 1884, these men were deprived of the right of entry, and were kept in a state of suspense. I know of two or three cases of men from my own county, who, through my persuasion, were induced to remain on their lands in the hope that the Government would recognise their entries. I remember last year mentioning these cases to the First Minister, who commended the action of these men in remaining there. They remained another year, but still without their entries, hoping against hope, working on and improving the land in the hope of getting their entries. I believe the Government have now decided, and properly decided, that these men were entitled to their entries, and I suppose they have given them their entries by this time. It was not only by petition their claim was urged; the press that supports the hon. gentleman, from one end of Manitoba and the North-West to the other, has been pronounced on this subject. I propose to read an extract from the *Times*, to indicate the feeling that existed in the North-West and Manitoba with respect to the land policy on this question, a policy that is keeping the settlers in a state of perpetual uncertainty and suspense. The *Times* says:

"On the lands sold south of the railway belt—

And these are the lands to which I refer—

"there are scores of squatters who, at this moment, are planting their crops in blissful ignorance of this fact, that some speculator will soon

own their farms and their labor spent on them. It is true the Department professed, some time ago, that compensation for disturbances will be given to those squatters who had made improvements, the compensation to be determined by a Government valuator; that, as a matter of fact, the buyers at the sale buy not only the land but the improvements; and even within the mile belt, the Government will find it a difficult matter to inspect the farms sold and to appraise the improvements. South of the belt, this will be utterly impossible. Then all, looking at its pecuniary results, is a failure. To reserve a vast quantity of land in the market at a time when money is exceedingly tight and the richest speculators poor, was madness. It is reasonably safe to say that Commissioner Wash did not advise that step. It was, no doubt, taken in pursuance of that inconprehensible policy which the Department has adopted at the suggestion of ignorant or interested friends. But the failure of the sale, in a pecuniary sense, is a small matter, compared to the evils it is bringing to this country. A squatter who has gone in upon the land, now being sold, and ploughed and sown, will think himself justified in holding it against all comers and his neighbors will think so too. Mr. Metcalf, of Kingston, has an easy task in selling the land, pocketing the commission; but the Department will find, when it comes to evict the squatter, that human nature, in the North-West, is much the same as in Ireland. If we cannot prevail against the Government and the speculator, the squatter can, at least, leave the country with a curse."

I do not want the squatters to leave the country with a curse. I do not want them to leave at all. I want them to remain in the country, but if you want them to remain, you must treat them with ordinary fair play, you must treat them with some degree of generosity and liberality, and you must not prefer an insolvent and speculative land company to the actual settler. That is what these men complain you do. They say that they were there before this company applied for an Act of incorporation; they say that six months before the company made application for incorporation they were on the land and made improvements on it, and the Government agreed to give them the land and sent them out papers to swear to. They did swear to these papers, and the Government passed an Order in Council granting them the land, but before the entries were made the Government cancelled the Order in Council, and these men are still without their entries. If that be the case, they have a fair and just ground of complaint against the Government. The *Times* still further discussed the question. I want to make this point so impressive, pointed, and strong, as to induce the First Minister, not from anything I can say, but from what his friends say, to do justice to these men:

"The fundamental blunder which underlies the policy of the political parties at Ottawa is that the North-West settler is a pampered individual, and that he ought to submit to little inconveniences like heavy taxation, notably land regulations and disregard of his rights as a squatter. The fact that large sums have been spent on the railroad here is held up to us as a proof of the beneficent treatment we are receiving at the hands of the older Provinces. That we pay three times as much *per capita* into the Dominion Treasury as the eastern tax-payer, that the National Policy increases the price of everything we buy, without adding a mill to the price of wheat, oats or barley, that even with a free homestead the settler's life is for some years a hard and unprofitable one. These and such like considerations are quietly ignored. To make matters worse, the people of Ottawa forget that not many miles from here a foreign flag offers the settler nearly all the advantages he can obtain here, with others, good railway facilities, peculiar to every settled region. He gets nothing here which he could not get elsewhere, and it should be the policy of the Government to treat him, not as though he were beholden to it for special favors, but in terms of equality and in a spirit of fair play. A few more blunders, a little more stamping on his corns, may provoke him, until he becomes 'unreasonable' in earnest."

I have drawn the attention of the First Minister to the statement made by my correspondent, to the opinions of the press that support him, and to a resolution passed at a Conservative meeting dealing with this subject, and I trust he will see the necessity, in the interests and prosperity and growth of Manitoba and the North-West, to at once deal with this question in a generous and liberal spirit. He must admit that for some cause—I am not going to discuss for what cause—the tide of immigration into the North-West has not been what was expected. The First Minister or some of his followers may say it is because I and some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House ventilate these questions on the floor of Parliament; but my tongue is not to be tied nor my mouth closed when a wrong has

been committed, until justice be done. If our country is only to prosper by our lying about the condition of affairs in the North-West, I say the country should not prosper. No country can prosper without the truth being told, and I am satisfied if we tell the truth and deal with the immigrants in a spirit of generosity and fair play, that country is bound to prosper, and all that hon. gentlemen opposite may do will not prevent it from prospering. They may check its growth and stunt its prosperity to some extent, but its ultimate growth is beyond peradventure, no matter what the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite may be. That the state of the country is not what it ought to be is beyond peradventure. A prominent member of the hon. gentleman's party stated not long ago that we had spent large sums of money in immigration, and that everybody knew the settlement of the country was not what it ought to be; it was a truism that settlers were leaving in large numbers for the United States. I do not say whether that is true or not, as it does not affect the motion I am submitting; what I say is, that if the statements contained in the letters of my correspondent be true, these settlers have been hardly dealt with, and the quicker the Government retrace their steps the better for the country and the settlers. I do not make this motion out of any desire to do damage to the Government in any way, or with any view of making political capital. My sole desire is that something like justice should be done to these men. Hon. gentlemen opposite may cheer derisively. They cannot understand that a man can honestly submit these facts without political motives; they measure other people's corn by their own half bushel. As I have said, I do not present this case before the House with a view of damaging the Government. I have some idea of the difficulties the Government have to encounter in carrying out their regulations, when the carrying out of these regulations is entrusted to the hands of their subordinates in the North-West. I know something of the way in which these subordinates deal with the settlers there; and although the Government are responsible for a good deal of the difficulty, they cannot, in many respects, be chargeable, except through their subordinates, for things that have happened in the North-West and Manitoba. I make this statement with a view of securing redress at the hands of the Government, and I am sure if the First Minister finds the facts I have mentioned to be anything like correct, he will give a fair and dispassionate consideration to the question, and have no hesitation in at once directing the Department of Interior to rescind the Order in Council by which the Government cancelled the Order in Council allowing these settlers their entries, and thus give them the right to enjoy the fruits of their industry and the reward for their patience, long-suffering and forbearance.

Mr. ORTON. I did not hear all the remarks of the hon. gentleman, but although the hon. gentleman stated in the last part of his address that his object was not to injure the Government, or to decry its land policy, I must say that the tenor of the remarks which I did hear was calculated not only to bring the policy of the Government in the North-West into discredit, but to do what has been done in the past to so great an extent by the party to which the hon. gentleman belongs, namely, to decry the North-West and to deter settlement in that country. Why did he read the remarks of newspapers decrying the management of that country and comparing it with older countries; why did he refer to vested rights and to acts of oppression and tyranny which are not exercised by the Government of Canada? I maintain that there is no land policy to-day that can compare with that of Canada. The policy of the United States does not compare with the liberal land policy of this Government. I am not familiar with all the cases the hon. gentleman has brought forward, but I am familiar

with one of those cases, that of Mr. Livingstone. Although he introduced that case with the view, apparently, of decrying the course pursued by the Government or by their officers in the North-West, if he made himself thoroughly acquainted with that case he would know that it resulted from a transaction under the former Administration, when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was at the head of that Department, when a patent was granted which apparently was fraudulently obtained. The member for Bothwell has expressed regret, I believe, that that patent was issued, but he knows, as a lawyer, that there is no means by which a patent from the Crown can be set aside—

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Oh, yes; there is.

Mr. ORTON—except by the law courts of the land, and it was not generous or proper that the hon. gentleman should refer to that as one of the instances in which the land policy of the Government was detrimental to the interests of the settlers of the country. I sincerely hope that gentlemen on that side will come to their senses in regard to this continuous harping upon the unfavorable conditions in which the settlers in that country are placed. I maintain that they are placed in an exceptionally favorable condition. Although we have not, perhaps, all the money at our command to build all the railways required in that country, still there is nothing the Government have not shown their willingness and desire to do; and if hon. gentlemen would apply themselves to assisting the Government to carry out their measures of good, instead of decrying the country, they would do more good to the struggling settlers. Men have gone up there and invested largely in that country, but their best efforts have been marred by the continual desire to injure the Government, by decrying the North-West and the facilities by which the settlers are surrounded there, and by making out that they are suffering hardships equal to those of the serfs of Russia. I am proud to say that the settlers in that country are in a much more favorable position than the settlers on the other side of the border. Last year I heard an hon. gentleman on that side of the House from Manitoba make some remarks on this subject, and state that our settlers were not in as good a condition as those on the other side of the border, but they have told me to-day that the settlers in Manitoba and the North-West are in a much more favorable condition than those in the neighboring States of Minnesota and Dakota. It is well known to members coming from that Province that the farmers in Minnesota and Dakota are taking over their grain and paying 15 cents per bushel duty, in order to sell it at Emerson and other points on this side, so that they may have their grain carried to the markets of the world by the Canadian Pacific Railway. Not only have the Government, but the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, exerted themselves to the very utmost to accommodate the settlers of that country, and to assist the development of our North-West. I have no doubt they will continue to do so in the future. There is a great deal still to be done in that country, but I am sure that if the Government fail, it is not from a want of desire but a want of power. I hope, therefore, that hon. members on the other side, instead of weakening their efforts, will co-operate in every way they can to develop the best means for helping the people of the North-West.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all correspondence exchanged between the Department of Public Works and any person whomsoever, in relation to the construction of a wharf at Pointe aux Trembles, county of Portneuf.—(Mr. De St. Georges.)

List of the names, in detail, with the residence or business address of each of the several stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, on the 1st day of January last.—(Mr. Mitchell).

Mr. ORTON.

Return of all free passes over the Intercolonial Railway issued to persons not actually employed as officers or workmen on this road, during the year 1884, distinguishing between annual passes, passes for a more limited period, and single or return trips, with the names of persons to whom, the dates when, and the occasion for which the same was issued.—(Mr. Gillmor.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10:50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 25th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the Message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons the Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, and the evidence taken thereon.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,

OTTAWA, 24th February, 1885.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 64) further to amend the Patent Act of 1882. He said: The purpose of the Bill is to add several clauses to the 23rd section of the Patent Act of 1872. That section gives to the Minister of Agriculture or his Deputy power to hear complaints with regard to the manner in which the licensee of a patent has fulfilled some of the conditions under which the patent has been granted, and it purports to make the decision of the Minister absolute and binding. Now, Sir, I much doubt the power of this Parliament to pass such a clause as that at all. It appears to me that it is a matter which concerns civil and private rights, and that it should be more properly left to the legislation of the Provinces. But if it is the law I think it is well that there should be some power given to the Minister to examine witnesses under oath, which he has not now; to compel the attendance of witnesses, and to compel them to produce documents that may be necessary to the proper adjudication of the matter. Further, I think there should be some appeal from the Minister's decision, and I propose that the appeal shall be to the Supreme Court. I introduce this Bill knowing that from the strong views which the Minister entertains as to his powers under the Act, it may be impossible to get his assent to the abolition of that power, but I believe that the judicial and the executive power should be separate, and I will gladly accept any amendment which may be proposed to my Bill which will have the effect of doing away with the power the Minister has under the Patent Act of 1872. In the meantime I move the first reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry to hear the hon. gentleman give such an account of the autocratic habits of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. POPE. I am sure I will have the support of my hon. friend opposite since I am to lose the support of my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy).

Mr. BLAKE. That shows that the hon. gentleman thinks the Minister knows as much of law as I think he does of railways.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 65) to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. McCARTHY. The object of this Bill is to permit those persons who, by the Canada Temperance Act, are authorised to sell in the county where the Act is in force—but not to sell to persons in that county—to sell in that county. The law now stands in this way: That those who are authorised to sell, such as distillers, brewers, wholesale merchants and others, may sell, provided they sell to persons who will take it out of the county, and those who live in the county where the Scott Act is in force may buy it outside and bring it in. It appears to me that this is a manifest absurdity, and I propose to permit those who have a right under the Act to sell, to do so to those who reside in the county, as well as to those outside.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Is there any limit as to quantity?

Mr. McCARTHY. The same as in the Act—ten gallons as to one class, and eight gallons as to beer. I do not make any alterations except the one I have spoken of.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman seems to be much disposed to amend the Scott Act. Does he not think that he had not better turn his attention to amending the McCarthy Act?

Mr. McCARTHY. I may satisfy my hon. friend by saying that there is a clause or two in that direction also.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend's modesty prevents him from saying how far he will amend it.

Mr. McCARTHY. It is only a small part of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSOLVENT BANKS, INSURANCE COMPANIES, &c.

Mr. EDGAR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) to further amend an Act respecting insolvent banks, insurance companies, loan companies, building societies, and trading corporations.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. EDGAR. The object of the Bill is to make provision that clerks and other employees of insolvent companies shall have three months' privilege over other creditors for arrears of wages. This was a provision of all the Insolvent Acts which this House has passed, and I do not see why it should be left out of an Act providing for the winding up of insolvent corporations.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TRANSFER OF BATTERIES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to transfer the battery now stationed at Kingston to Quebec?

Mr. CARON. I beg to state that it is the intention of the Government to transfer "B" Battery, now at Kingston, to Quebec, and "A" Battery, from Quebec to Kingston.

CABINET REPRESENTATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to make provision for the Province of British

Columbia to be represented in the Cabinet? If so, at what date?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to say that the Government has not yet come to a conclusion on that subject.

ABSENTEES IN THE CENSUS OF 1881.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Is it in the power of the Government to ascertain how many persons out of those returned as forming the population of Canada according to the census of 1881, were absent from their residence at the time the said census was taken?

Mr. POPE. It is not.

PAYMENTS TO G. M. CLARKE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What sums (apart from his salary as county judge) have been paid to G. M. Clark in each of the years 1879, 1880, 1881, 1882, and 1883 respectively? And for what services in each year? Also, what sums, if any, have been paid to him from the 1st July, 1884, to the date of this enquiry?

Mr. POPE. I am not in a position to answer that off hand. If the hon. gentleman will move an address, the papers will be brought down.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—PROGRESS ESTIMATES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, How is the figure of \$5,160 per mile given in the progress estimates of the Eastern Section of the Canadian Pacific Railway as "rails as per standard" made up? What tonnage per mile is allowed for rails and what for fastenings? What price for each and how much for haulage in addition to the prices?

Mr. POPE. The \$5,100 "rails, etc., as per standard," is made up of rails and fastenings, \$3,207; sleepers, \$683; track laying, \$210; ballasting, \$300; station building and water service, \$400; engineering and superintending, \$300. There were 97 60 tons of rails, and 7 40 tons of fastenings, making a total of 105, giving one-half allowance for siding. The price of the rails and fastenings was \$30.

QUEBEC PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY.

Mr. LANGEЛИER asked, Whether advances have been made to the Government of the Province of Quebec since the 1st July last, on account of the provincial subsidy or otherwise; and, if so, when, to what amount on each occasion, and on what conditions?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There have been no advances made to the Government of Quebec since the 1st of July.

REPORT OF CHINESE COMMISSION.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that the report which he has just laid on the Table of this House was laid on the Table of the other Chamber of Parliament yesterday. As we have the advantage of having present in this House the Secretary of State and one of the commissioners, I think we might at least have expected that the report would be presented to us as early as to the other Chamber, and I do not very well understand how this could have arisen unless the hon. gentleman entrusted the report to the postmaster.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No one regrets more than myself that this has happened. I received a Message from His Excellency conveying the report last evening, but I did not want to interrupt the proceedings of the House, and intended to present it at the end of the sitting; but, unfortunately,

the adjournment was proposed and carried before I could do it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was evidently my fault. I moved the adjournment too quickly.

Mr. BLAKE. I noticed that the hon. gentleman was very anxious to move the adjournment, but I think this report was presented to the Senate in the afternoon. They did not sit after six o'clock.

COMPENSATION TO BREWERS AND DISTILLERS.

Mr. KRANZ moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient whenever Parliament decides that a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes should be enacted that equitable provision should be made for the compensation of brewers, distillers and malsters, so far as respects the diminution in value of the real property, premises and plant owned and used by them in their business.

He said: In rising to move the resolution in my hand, I desire to say that the principle expressed in it, the principle of compensation to those who are prevented by law from carrying on their business, is one so fair and just that I think it requires only a very few words on my part to recommend it to the unprejudiced consideration of this honorable House. It may be said that it is rather premature to move a resolution of this kind at present, when there is no legislation in favor of total prohibition before the House; but a large industry has been so much disturbed by the adoption of the Scott Act and by the great number of petitions presented to Parliament every day asking for total prohibition—that those engaged in this industry wish to have at the earliest moment an expression from this House as to what are their vested rights in their property. The industry of the manufacture of liquor, and especially beer, is a very large one. There are about 200 breweries, distilleries and malt houses in Canada; the capital invested in them is over \$2,000,000, and the number of hands employed about 2,500. Already, wherever the Scott Act is put in force, this business is practically prohibited, and I think it is not more than fair and right, whenever a man's property is taken away from him in the interest of the general good, that he should be compensated. Not being a lawyer, I am not able to give a legal definition of vested rights; but it appears to me, as a layman, taking a common sense view of the matter, that a business which has been lawfully carried on for centuries, a business which has been carried on in this country with the consent of the Government, and which has yielded a large revenue to the Government who gives a vested right to those who invest their money in it. It may be said that their right is only a permissive right; but I believe their right is as perfect as that of any other manufacturer. It is true, they manufacture under a license, but the license given to a brewer or a distiller, or a tobacco manufacturer, or an auctioneer, is not a restrictive license. It is not imposed in order to restrict him in the prosecution of his business, but it is a license to produce a revenue to the Government; and let me tell you, the revenue derived from the industry of liquor manufacturing is a very large one. It amounts to about one-sixth of the total revenue of this country. If I am correct in this, every member of this House draws a certain percentage, while he draws his indemnity here, of the money which has been collected in the manufacture of beer and whiskey. It is beyond doubt that the majority rule in this country, and if in the opinion of the majority it is necessary that, for the general good and prosperity and morals of the people, the carrying on of a certain industry should be prohibited, well and good. Let the majority prohibit it, they have the right to do so, but they have no right to take away a man's property without compensation. Certainly public morality, commercial

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

morality will not be furthered by an act by which you take away a man's property without giving him proper compensation. I hope I have clearly shown that this is a question which ought necessarily to be debated in this House, it is a burning question, and I hope hon. members will consider it calmly and without prejudice.

Mr. WELLS. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to have the opportunity of seconding the resolution of my hon. friend. The only thing I find fault with in it is that, in my humble judgment, it hardly goes far enough; I should have been better pleased had it made allusion to another class which I consider have been harshly dealt with by this Parliament—I mean the licensed victuallers. But taking the resolution as it is, I think that inasmuch as it is simply an affirmation of the old constitutional axiom that private property shall not be taken by the authority of Parliament for public use, unless it is paid for, it ought not to require any great effort to induce this House to formally adopt it. I am sure if my hon. friend had simply moved a resolution affirming the abstract principle, without referring to any particular class or interest, it would have received the support of every member of this House; I do not imagine that any member, if such a motion had been proposed, would have risen to say that he could not conscientiously support it, so long as under any contingency it covered the case of a brewer, a malster or a distiller—and that with respect to that class he was willing to give the right to expropriate, but no right to compensation. Of course, Sir, in a purely technical sense, the property of a brewer or a distiller would not be taken under the operation of a prohibitory liquor law. The owner would still have the legal ownership of his property. He would still have the satisfaction of calling it his own, although he would be prohibited from using it as a brewery or distillery; and although the result so far as he is concerned would be precisely the same as if the property itself were expropriated. Now ought that circumstance to make any difference? I think not. We know that under the laws applicable to the expropriation of property the owner is entitled to compensation even if his property be only injuriously affected. It is not necessary that it should be taken or even touched. For instance, if the Government under the Public Works Act, or a municipality under the municipal laws, or a railway company under its charter, injuriously affects the approach to a property, no matter whether that property be a church or a tavern, the owner is entitled to compensation for its diminished value. Now, is there any difference between that case and the present? Is there any difference between the case of a brewer's right to compensation, because the free ingress and egress to and from his property is interfered with by a railway, and his right to compensation because he is forbidden by an Act of Parliament from using it altogether? If there is a difference, it must be purely technical and not reasonable or substantial. I know that a great many good and earnest men look upon this as a matter of conscience, and they say that under no circumstance will they consent to a compromise with the devil on the whiskey question, that the war that they are engaged in is a war of extermination, and that they will neither take nor give quarter. Now, while we may have great respect for the opinions of these men, because we know them to be sincere, I do not think that that is an argument which can be fairly addressed to Parliament. It is our duty, I submit, simply to enquire what is the legal status of these men who are engaged in the manufacture of beer and spirits, and to apply the same rule to them that we would apply to those engaged in the manufacture of any other article of commerce. If you make any distinction at all, you must put it upon an intelligent and intelligible principle. It seems to me that you will be driven to say that in no case where the trade is pernicious or dangerous

to the public health, compensation can be allowed. In that case, Sir, the manufacturers of tobacco, according to some, the manufacturers of confectioneries, according to others, would be under the ban, and scores of other industries. I firmly believe that measured by the harm which tobacco has done to the human race it has as much to answer for as alcohol. Of course that is a mere matter of opinion, but when one considers not only the constant but the universal use of tobacco as compared with spirits the aggregate amount of harm it does must be enormous. At all events as between the two, it is only a question of degree. The argument, therefore, that we are now dealing with—the conscience argument—seems to me to be an argument for particular occasions; it does not seem to be an argument for every day. For instance, to use the illustration I have already referred to, if a railway company comes to this House and asks for powers to run their track through a brewery, or if we require for departmental purposes certain tavern premises in this city, would any hon. member say that he would grant the powers, but that, inasmuch as the trade is a pernicious one, he would deny the compensation? Yet all the surroundings of the two cases are just the same. In both, you require Parliamentary authority; in both the object of the expropriation is for the public advantage; in both the kind of property injured is exactly the same; in both, the injury is the same. Surely, if it offends the conscience of any man to grant compensation in a case where the owner of property is injured under a prohibitory law, it must offend his conscience also to grant it where the property is injured under the Public Works Act. Surely, it is a matter of small consequence to enquire in what way Parliament has authorised the injury to be done; whether by burning it up or pulling it down; whether by running a railway through it, or cutting off all access to it, or hermetically sealing up its doors. What difference is there between putting up a barrier or an embankment so that the public cannot get at a particular property, or passing a law which makes it a crime to do so? The only substantial question, in my humble judgment, is: Ought Parliament in any case to authorise the destruction of property even for the public good without requiring full and complete compensation? A great judge, Chancellor Kent, laid down that principle in these words:

“The settled and fundamental doctrine is that Government has no right to take private property for public purposes without giving just compensation and it seems to be necessarily implied that this indemnity should in cases which will admit of it, be previously and equitably ascertained and be ready concurrently in point of time with the actual exercise of the right of eminent domain.”

I admit that, in some of the States of the neighboring Republic, they have in their prohibitory liquor laws violated this great charter principle, but I am one of those who believe that there are higher models for this Parliament to imitate than some of those State Legislatures, and I think that, when we do resolve to imitate them, we would do well not to imitate them in a case which overturns one of the oldest and best constitutional principles, especially when we find what the opinion of some of their own great constitutional writers is upon this subject. Mr. Cooley, in his work on “Constitutional Limitations,” says:

“Perhaps there is no instance in which the power of the Legislature to make such regulations as may destroy the value of property without compensation to the owner appears in a more striking light than in the case of these statutes. The trade in alcoholic drinks being lawful and the capital employed in it being fully protected by law, the Legislature then steps in and by an enactment based on general reason of public utility annihilates the traffic, destroys altogether the employment and reduces to a nominal value the property. Even the keeping of that for the purpose of sale, becomes a criminal offence; and without any change whatever, in his own conduct, or employment, the merchant of yesterday becomes the criminal of to-day and the very building in which he lives and conducts his business—which to that moment was lawful—becomes the subject of legal proceedings if the State so declare, and liable to be proceeded against for a forfeiture.”

But what must we think of a measure, which in addition to making the “merchants of yesterday the criminals of to-day,” proceeds to confiscate his property. Sir, I hope, and I confidently believe that no British Parliament will ever do that. Mr. Speaker, I intimated a few moments ago that many excellent and earnest men have conscientious scruples about rewarding such “bad men” as brewers and distillers. That very argument arose in the celebrated debate on the abolition of slavery in the West Indies fifty years ago. There was a conscience party then as there is now, and as I hope there always will be, who said: How can we, who believe that slavery is the vilest and wickedest of all vile and wicked things, consent to compensate the slave owners; they said, moreover, that there could be no such thing as property or the right of property in human flesh and blood, and that they would never consent to compensate a man for giving up what he could not own. The House will see what a great difference there is between that case and the present one. There is in the first place the great contrast between the two trades, that of the slave owner and that of the brewer; and in the second place, there is the argument to which I have alluded, viz, the right of property in human flesh and blood. Yet that argument made absolutely no impression whatever upon the Parliament or the people of England. It was felt to be altogether too theoretical—too sentimental for practical purposes. If the House will allow me for a moment, I will quote what Lord Sandon said during the debate on the subject:

“The right of property, I know, is often denied. The possibility of property in man may be a fit subject of discussion for the schools. I do not deny that it is vicious and mischievous property, but that it is property in the light in which we as practical men consider it, I fearlessly assert, as an abstract principle it cannot be disputed; but such as it is, it has been recognised—nay, created—by Parliament itself, and having been so recognised and so created Parliament we cannot, without the grossest injustice, affect to consider it no longer as property for the purpose of extinguishing it without compensation. If the right of property is to be extinguished on these abstract principles, what species of property will not soon be in danger?”

Now, Sir, I have never heard from that day to this any serious disapprobation of what England did on that occasion. I know that Wilberforce, only three or four days before his death, thanked God that he had lived to witness the day when England was willing to give £20,000,000 sterling for the abolition of slavery. Now, if it was right to compensate a slave owner for his right of property in the flesh and blood of a fellow creature, it must be *a fortiori* right in the case of an owner of a brewery or a distillery. Their business has, to use Lord Sandon's words, “not only been recognised, but created by Parliament itself, and Parliament cannot without the grossest injustice affect to consider it no longer as property for the purpose of extinguishing it without compensation.” The British nation gave \$100,000,000 for the abolition of slavery, and the civilised world has a thousand times since not only commended their humanity to the slave, but their noble recognition of the great principle that nothing, not even the unspeakable horrors of slavery, will justify the State in destroying private rights and property without compensation. Now, I do not think it is useful or even possible to put the case upon higher grounds than that of justice to the manufacturer himself. I observe, however, that a petition was presented to the First Minister the other day at the Opera House from the bankers and loaning companies of Toronto, which set forth how seriously the passage of the Temperance Act has damaged their investments, and the ability of their debtors to pay, and praying for relief. Now, however reluctant any one may be to compensate a man who has himself been engaged in what he may consider a pernicious business, I do not believe that any member of this House will go so far as to put under the ban every man and every institution that in the ordinary course has a lien or mortgage upon this particular kind of property. They certainly are entitled to our protection.

They certainly have done nothing wrong. It has been said that this resolution is premature, and that it is time enough to consider the question of compensation when we are called upon to consider the question of prohibition. I do not agree with that suggestion. The petition to which I have referred itself shows how necessary it is that something should be done at once either to forewarn these people on the one hand or to reassure them on the other, as to what they have a right to expect. We know that petitions for prohibition are pouring in upon us by the hundred from every quarter, and that they indicate very clearly an organised determination to force a prohibitory law upon the country at the earliest possible day; and unless something is done at once by this House to settle the public anxiety upon this question we will have, during the coming year, a very great amount of unnecessary distress and a very serious derangement of business. I have often heard it said that the men who are engaged in this particular trade are very bad men, and that if they suffer loss they deserve punishment, and therefore have no right to be compensated. We have often heard temperance orators declare in their wrath that brewers, distillers, saloon keepers and tavern keepers are all the servants and agents of the devil—that they are moral outcasts—and deserve no consideration at the hands of the avenger. Of course we know, happily, that these gentlemen do not mean quite all they say, for I have heard it also openly declared on more than one occasion that even moderate drinkers are just as bad, if not worse, than the others, because if there were no moderate drinkers there would be no brewers or distillers. In that case, Sir, I fear that a good many members of this House are in a bad way. Perhaps, Sir, we may even be presided over by a moral leper. But are all who are engaged in this trade equally guilty? Are they all deserving of the same punishment? Are there no degrees in their guilt? Are there no extenuating circumstances in the case of any? I know a man,—a quiet, unassuming country storekeeper—who has spent his life in doing good. What his private charities may amount to, I do not know, for he has often given anonymously and always unostentatiously; but I am safe in saying that they amount to a sum which without exaggeration I may call munificent. In fact, Sir, I do not know of any man who lives a better life, a purer life, a nobler life, or a more religious life, and yet, Sir, this hideous creature owns a brewery. Perhaps I may explain, in extenuation of his fault, that he was obliged, about two years ago, to take it in payment of a debt, and that having got it, he was obliged to spend a large sum in improvements. Well, Sir, the passage of the Temperance Act in Bruce has made this property actually valueless; for, Sir, the House will easily understand that a property of this character in a small country village could not be well adapted for any other purpose. The result has been that this man has suffered a direct loss of, I understand, about \$8,000. He has, in other words, been compelled by an Act of Parliament to contribute out of his own pocket \$8,000 for the public good, as the majority in his county understand it. Now, Sir, that may be all right, but I do not think so. There may be some code of precepts somewhere which will justify this terrible confiscation of private property, but it seems to me it is a code which is a little too severe, a little too Draconian for modern times. I give this individual case—and I will be happy to give the name of my friend if any one desires to verify the facts—only to show how impossible it is with any regard to justice to apply one rule and measure of punishment to all who are engaged in this particular business. Now, Sir, no one can fail to recognise the earnestness of those good men and women who are engaged in this great temperance movement, and no one for a moment doubts their sincerity; but whether they are wise—whether they are the true friends of their own cause in carrying on this war

Mr. WELLS.

of extermination is another matter. "Firmness with moderation" seems to me a far better motto for a temperance party than "war to the knife." They must not forget that the enforcement of the Scott Act will prove a much more difficult task than carrying it. The leaders of this movement must remember that the majorities they have obtained here and there do not indicate the real, permanent strength of the movement. There are thousands and thousands of men who, like some of those I am now addressing are moderate drinkers—who do not therefore belong to what is called the temperance army, but who were willing to give the Act a fair trial. And these men will certainly judge of the Act according to the result in their particular localities, and if they find these result to be unsatisfactory, they will certainly vote against the Act at the very first opportunity afforded them. This large vote is really the vote which has carried the Act, and is really the vote which will determine whether the law is to be a permanent one or not. The same thing occurs in this House. There are, no doubt, many cases in which votes have been carried in this House for the temperance cause which really do not indicate the real, inherent, permanent strength of the temperance movement, nor the personal views of hon. members. The truth is that many of us, most of us indeed, find ourselves in a rather ticklish position in respect to what is called the temperance vote. We have adherents and friends on both sides of the question, and we are naturally very anxious to please them both; we could indeed be "very happy with either were t'other dear charmer away." The Government also are in the same position. They too, would like to "run with the hare and hunt with the hounds," and they are doing their very best to do so. But in the motion now before the House I see no cause for embarrassment to anybody. It declares nothing antagonistic to the temperance movement. Indeed, I think it will materially assist it, if those who are engaged in it will only be moderate and just, and do as they would be done by. For my own part I think I am doing right in supporting this resolution. I am not afraid of my friends in the County of Bruce, no matter how pronounced or how much in earnest they may be on this question. I am certain that they do not expect me to be, and do not want me to be, a better man or a more severe moralist than Wilberforce and the other philanthropists who carried the abolition of slavery in England 50 years ago, and I am willing, at all events, to let them judge of me in this matter and to accept their verdict. I repeat that I think I am doing what is right and fair as between man and man in supporting this resolution. I believe that it is contrary to law, to justice and to constitutional usage to forcibly deprive any man of his property without making fair compensation, and I believe that the triumphs of the temperance party cannot be permanent if this great fundamental principle of justice is disregarded. At all events, Sir, we have a noble example in the case to which I have alluded, and I think it is an example which ought to be followed by the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. ORTON. The motion before the House is one which has emanated from the fact that the Scott Act has been advocated throughout the length and breadth of this country. One result of that agitation has been wholesale distress and ruin to a large class of our people. There is no right feeling member who is not in entire sympathy with the object of the Scott Act. The indignation felt by the right minded people of this country with respect to the cruel wrongs that have resulted and are resulting day after day from the improper use of the abuse of, alcohol and other stimulants, is felt by every hon. member. I believe there is no right thinking individual here or outside of this House but is in entire sympathy with the temperance body, in entire sympathy with the object of the Scott Act. So far

we are all united; but as to the proper means of attaining that great and good object, the removal of the evils of intemperance, great and wide differences of opinion exist. We have been accustomed in the past to believe, a large portion of those who have had the privilege of living under the British flag have been accustomed to believe, that the force of precept and example and the influence of religious teaching were the right and correct means of correcting all forms of immorality. A large portion of our people have believed with respect to this question, and still believe, that the evils of intemperance can be stayed more effectively and more certainly by a continuance of those means, supplemented by such restrictions as license laws and the inspection of the articles used by the people. We are encouraged in that belief by the fact that a very great deal of good has resulted not only to this country but to Great Britain and other countries, by the earnest faith and belief in the adoption of such a mode of staying this evil. But there are others who have departed from the old means, and believe that the people can only be made good and moral by an Act of Parliament. They have lost faith in the efforts they have exerted in the past. Temperance societies in former days have done, and I believe are still doing, a great deal of good by earnest teaching and example. But I say they have lost faith in those means, and they have formed an alliance to force on the people of this country coercive measures to make them moral and to stay the evils of intemperance. Sir, I do not know whether hon. members of this House have carefully investigated the principles which are, as it were, set at nought in the Scott Act—principles upon which we believe that the freedom of the people of Great Britain depends so largely—principles upon which the good which the British Government has done to the world depends so largely. What are those principles? One principle is that under the British Government justice shall be done to all classes of our people, from the highest to the lowest, to the humblest individual in the community as well as to those who occupy the highest positions and are surrounded by wealth. Another principle is that vested rights, the rights of property, shall be respected. Another principle is that if the public welfare desires the property of an individual of the community, that individual shall be paid for it, and the whole community shall bear the burthen of making that payment. Another principle is that individual liberty of action shall not be interfered with, unless injury is done by that individual to his fellow man; and it is always considered that this principle should not be transgressed without grave reason. I invite the attention of hon. members for a few moments, and I ask why are these principles the chief corner stone of the grand edifice of human freedom which has been raised under the British flag? The first of those principles is justice. Mr. Speaker, justice properly forms the main corner stone of all Governments. Why? Because we believe the British constitution is based on religion. We believe we are living in a Christian community, and we know that justice is the highest attainment the Christian can arrive at. We are told that the throne of the Almighty is surrounded by justice and judgment, and we believe the objects to be attained by all religious services are that men may learn to act justly one toward another. Now, Sir, I would ask hon. members to consider for a moment whether the great principle of justice has been observed in the Scott Act. Sir, under that Act the property of individuals is being despoiled. From time immemorial, as long as Great Britain has existed, and long before the British Empire was formulated, stimulants of one kind or other have been used by the human race, and it has never been asserted that it was wrong that such should be the case. Property has arisen under the custom of using those stimulants; men have engaged in undertakings by which they have accumulated property; they have worked hard, and have saved, and have become the possessors, and the

honest possessors, of a means of livelihood, and perhaps some of them of more than a means of livelihood. I need only point you to the enormous structures in Great Britain, the large breweries, and to the honors which are given by the British Parliament to the men who have accumulated wealth and honor in the manufacture of ale. Sir, in Great Britain they have been knighted in honor of the distinction they have attained from their industry and carefulness in that kind of industry, as well as in others.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. ORTON. The leader of the Opposition sneeringly says, "hear, hear." However, I will ask the hon. gentleman to have patience and listen to my remarks, or if he does not desire to listen, he will perhaps try to treat me, at any rate, with some courtesy. Under the Scott Act, Sir, property of this kind is being confiscated. Men who have invested their money in erecting breweries, in building malt houses, in manufacturing the various implements which are required in these establishments, are, under the operation of this Act, having that property rendered valueless. That Act goes further, and it debars them from selling their article in the county in which it passes, so that it virtually destroys their property. Now, Sir, I maintain that that is not justice. I maintain that it is not just that these men, who have pursued an honorable course in life, who have industriously followed their calling, who have not been drunkards, who have not assisted in making men drunk, should have their property taken away from them and destroyed, even for the good of the state, without compensation. Sir, I believe that under the Government under which we live vested rights should be respected, and the rights of property should not be thus invaded. The Scott Act does invade vested rights in property, and renders it valueless. It has been said that the state does the same thing in many other particulars, as when a charter is granted to a railway, the rights of property of a stage owner or a steamboat owner are destroyed. But not in the same way. He is not debarred from following his occupation. But under this Act those who have built a house for the entertainment of the public under the belief that they can pursue their calling as they have in the past, are debarred from pursuing that portion of their business, and their property is being destroyed. We all know that stage owners can continue, if they like, to drive their stages, and if they do not pay it cannot be helped; but under this Act no proprietor of a hotel or other hostelry can pursue his calling; he is debarred entirely from doing so, and, therefore, I say, it is an entirely different state of affairs. And, Sir, I say that the principle of compensation to individuals if they are called upon to sacrifice their property by the State for the good of the public, is nothing more than right and correct. Does the Scott Act afford any means by which the individuals who are willing, perhaps, to sacrifice their property, and are desirous of sacrificing it for the public good, if it is in order to try the experiment, rather than to be supposed to stand in the way of any good, and are ready to destroy their property—I ask, does the Scott Act provide any means by which the public at large shall bear the burdens of the loss of that property—of that right which the individual may be even desirous to renounce for the benefit of the State, if he is only fairly remunerated therefor? Now, Sir, with all this sacrifice of principle involved in this Act, let us consider for a moment is there any possibility of any great good resulting from the continuation of that Act in the various counties in which it is passed, or in passing it in other counties in which it is not in force. We know that in the County of Halton, near which I have lived for many years, the effects of the adoption of this Act have been anything but of a moral character. The moral tone of the people of that county has not been elevated.

Instances have occurred there in which deliberate and wholesale perjury has been committed by people to uphold the illegal traffickers in stimulants. Why? Because, Sir, the popular element feels that a great wrong has been done to the people who were engaged in the liquor business by the destruction of their property. They sympathise with them, and they believe that where a great wrong is done, even by a Government or a people, people are not to be blamed for ignoring the law under which that wrong is done. Sir, I think that any candid individual from any part of the country where that law has been put into operation, will agree with me that it has not had the effect which was expected from it. It is a well known fact that instead of the people having the opportunity of indulging in comparatively harmless beverages, such as beer and wine, the only stimulants that they can secure are ardent spirits, and these usually of the most inferior character. In the North-West I have had some experience of the workings of a prohibitory law, and what do we find there? That strong liquors are kept out of the country? No; all along the line of railway in British Columbia, spirits of every description are brought in in wholesale quantities and sold at retail at enormous profits in the face of the law; and notwithstanding that a large body of mounted police are kept there at great expense to the people of this country, and are vigilantly doing their utmost to preserve order and to prevent infringements of the law, they have been powerless to prevent this traffic. Then, Sir, how can we expect that it could be otherwise in a community in which perhaps a large majority of the people are in sympathy with those who carry that traffic on? But a great many will argue that this is only an experimental law, intended to educate the people up to such a position that they will call for a total prohibitory law. Well, Sir, in reference to that matter, though my own individual judgment is not in favor of a prohibitory liquor law, I believe that if legislation of any kind can do any good, a prohibitory law is the only law that can restrain the evils of intemperance. The only pledge ever asked of me in going into Parliament, was as to whether I would vote for a prohibitory liquor law; and I did pledge myself the first time, that though I did not believe it in myself, I would vote for a prohibitory law if it provided for compensation; and I am prepared to do that to-day—to sacrifice my own individual opinion and to assist loyally our temperance friends in seeing that that law is respected and honored. But, Sir, the question of total prohibition, and of the Scott Act, I think, should to-day command the close attention of every hon. member of this House. I think this tentative Act, the Scott Act, has proved in every form and shape, a lamentable failure. I think, Sir, it has proved more; it is not only creating immorality through the illegal use of ardent spirits, but it is sapping the very foundations of our Christianity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ORTON. Hon. gentlemen sneer; but I will show you why I have endeavored to show that the Act is unjust—that it is contrary to the spirit that should actuate a Christian community. I have endeavored to show that from the very earliest history of the world it has never been considered a wrong to use in moderation the fermented juice of the grape; and I maintain that when the leaders of religious thought use their positions in order to intimidate the people of this country and to influence their judgment by trying to make them believe that in order to be good and religious they must have a law compelling them, they are sapping the very foundations on which our religious system rests, and they are doing an immeasurable wrong to their own calling. The question of prohibition is one which if seriously considered will bring the House and the Government face to face with various difficulties. The first difficulty is in reference to its

Mr. ORTON.

effect on the revenue of the country, and I think there is not an honest man here but knows that the Scott Act, if it means anything, means total prohibition. Therefore, I think it is the duty of every member of the Government and of the House to consider what effect it will have on the public revenue, and whether the loss of revenue can be borne by the people of this country. We have also to consider its effect on immigration into Canada. Sir, it is my opinion that if prohibition is brought into operation in Canada we shall have very few German immigrants, very few Swedes or Norwegians—those people from northern latitudes of Europe who make the best settlers in this country, but who have been accustomed from their infancy to the use of light wines and beer. I believe, too, that we shall have comparatively few from the British Isles. I know that to-day in the North-West Territories old English settlers are very much dissatisfied because they cannot have their accustomed glass of ale, and are threatening to leave the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. ORTON. Hon. gentlemen again say, "hear, hear," as if that statement was not worthy of credence; but if those hon. gentlemen who sneer would take the trouble to go up and interview the settlers in the Regina and Moose Jaw districts, and all through that region, they would find that my words are true to the letter. Sir, I think this House ought also to consider the question whether the use of alcohol should be entirely abolished or not—whether it would be to the best interests of the people of this country that that should be done. So far as our knowledge and experience go, it is certain that those people on the face of the globe who have used light wines and beer have been a courageous, a long lived, a generous, and a noble people. We know that there is not a nation under the sun but that uses in some form or other stimulants. The Turk uses his opium, the Chinaman his tea, and in some form or other the wild Indians of North America use their stimulants. They use their herb stimulants and vegetable stimulants which enables them to perform feats they could not do without those aids. We know for a fact that alcoholic stimulants are of use to humanity and that many a human life has been saved by their judicious and proper use. A great deal has been said with regard to the *modus operandi* of alcoholic stimulants, medical authorities have been quoted on that subject. I regret to say that so far as regards that portion of the profession to which I belong—and I say it without fear or contradiction—not only the *modus operandi* of spirits and drugs, but the following of those drugs through the system is any thing but clear, and that our profession are no more able to follow alcohol in its course through the system and state its exact action than they are able to describe the exact action of quinine which is known so well to destroy the poison remittent fever and other diseases. So with regard to other drugs, but we do know that in cases of extreme prostration there is nothing that can take the place of stimulants. Alcoholic stimulants are the easiest assimilated and the most readily applied of all stimulants in cases of extreme depression or extreme shock to the nervous system. I know of cases where men have lived for weeks upon little else but the wine or whiskey which was supplied them as food. I knew a very singular case, that of an insane woman who would not take food into her stomach, who refused food of every kind, and had to be supported by having food injected into her stomach; and that woman lived upon what? Why it was found that milk and whiskey was the easiest kind of food for her to assimilate, and for a whole twelve months that food, milk and whiskey, was injected into her stomach three times a day; it was, at any rate, sufficient nourishment to keep her alive, and at the end of twelve months her reason was

restored. There are cases occurring day by day in the experience of every medical man where those who have lost blood—when nearly the very last drop of blood has been extracted from their body—have been kept alive for hours, their nervous force supported by the use of stimulants, until sufficient food could be taken and assimilated in order to support life. Therefore, I say that when men get up and say that alcohol is a useless article, that it is of no benefit to the human race, they know not of what they speak. In reference to this question there is one thing that I have remarked on the various occasions upon which the temperance question has been brought before the House. I have noticed that the men who should lead public opinion, who should deliberate upon this great question, who should give this House the advantage of their ripe judgment, are not the men who speak, and a discussion of this question is left to the tale end of the rack and file. I think that that is, at any rate, not creditable to those leaders. I do not refer to the leaders of one party more than to the leaders of the other, but I do say that on this serious question we should have, and the country should have the advantage of their ripe judgment. Is it to be thought that this silence on their part is to be accounted for by the fact that one side or the other are trying to take advantage of this question in order to keep in power or to get into office? If such is the case, it is sad indeed. But I believe that to-day, at any rate, no political capital can or should fairly be made out of the question by either side, and I am glad to see hon. members on both sides ready to discuss it in a fair and open manner; and I do hope we shall have the benefit of the opinion of the leaders of both parties on this question. We ought to have their opinion as to whether any legislation of this kind is calculated to lessen or increase crime, whether it will create a greater or a less respect for the laws of the country, whether it will increase or decrease the feeling of security in property which exists among our people. I shall not detain the House any longer as there are many other hon. gentlemen who desire to speak on this question, but I will say this, that if hon. members are of opinion that the people desire prohibitory legislation, if that is the conclusion they come to, the sooner we have prohibition the better; but I would say, on the other hand, that prohibition should be coupled with compensation. I say it not only on the ground of justice but on the ground of temperance; and I direct the consideration of the temperance leaders in this House to that point. I think it would be better for them and their cause if they would enlist on their side men who are bound by honor, bound by every principle which should guide a man to assist loyally in carrying out the laws, rather than have a large portion of our people estranged from their efforts by injustice and by sympathy with the wrongs done to a portion of our people.

Mr. SPROULE. In rising to express my views on this question, I do so with some reluctance, knowing that many of my warmest political friends differ from me in reference to the opinions I hold on this subject. It is only from my strongest sense of what I believe to be right and my duty that I feel bound to give the reasons why I am prepared to support the resolution before this House. The resolution expresses a principle which, in my opinion, is this: Have we the right to take away property without giving some compensation for it? It is a principle which has been acknowledged through all the years of the history of this country and in every part of the British Empire. In asking foreigners to come to this country, they might reasonably ask what advantages we were about to give them provided they became residents of Canada. We tell them that we are prepared to give them protection to life and property, and to hold out as a premium on their industry protection to whatever property they may accumulate in

the country. This principle is acknowledged in reference to other questions where the public good is on one side and private interest on the other. It was acknowledged by England when she abolished slavery, and, in that case, a great evil was effectually done away with without any injustice being done to those engaged in the trade. If this was acknowledged by England and has been acknowledged by all the dependencies of England, if it is the admitted principle embodied in the laws of our country, why should we not support that principle in this House to-day, in reference to a question which is said to be of so great importance to the country. If a man's property is depreciated in value by a railway passing through or in close proximity to it, he is allowed compensation for the depreciation of his property, because it is admitted that, when the interest of the community requires that his property should be destroyed, it is fair that he should be compensated for it. It is said that a great good will be done to the country by the abolition of the liquor traffic, because it will abolish what is every year imposing a very heavy outlay upon us for the administration of justice. If this be correct, then as a matter of financial policy we should be ready to concede it; if the abolition of the liquor traffic would result in the large saving to the country that is claimed by the temperance advocates, we ought to be prepared to sacrifice a share of our money in buying out the trade. When we find men engaged in business who have been respectable members of society, who have always been foremost in enterprise, who have always been ready to give a helping hand in whatever assisted the community, or individuals in the community, who have been living within the bounds of law, and have been recognised as respectable citizens, why should we take away from them what is virtually the accumulation of their industry and economy; without giving them a recompense for it? It may be said that those who are engaged in the business hold their tenure of office only for a limited time, as their licenses are granted but for a year, and that at the expiration of the year it is no injustice to take away these licenses. Apply that to every other line. Take the people who are building up ranches in the North-West Territories. When the demands of settlement require that these leases shall be cancelled, the law is that they must be cancelled in the interest of the settlement of the country; but does any one pretend to say, that if the Government have made regulations compelling a man who has a rancho of 20,000 acres to put on one or two head of cattle for every 20 acres of land, and he has invested so much money and has built up whatever is necessary for the purpose of carrying on that respectable business, they may at a moment's notice at the expiration of his lease, perhaps at the time when he has just completed the requirements of the law and put on the number of cattle demanded, annul that lease and make the man suffer the consequences whatever they may be? That, I think, would be regarded as most unreasonable. A gentleman at my right has suggested timber limits. There are many lumbermen in this country who have bought extensive timber limits in Ontario upon the principle of the established order of things, and as long as these men pay the royalty and are prosecuting what is a legitimate business, the acknowledged principle of the established order of things recognises that they should be allowed to prosecute that work, from time to time, without being molested. The same principle is involved in all these matters, whether you apply it to the slave trade, which was bought out by England, or to the licenses given from year to year to the brewers, or to the timber licenses given from year to year. The same principle exists equally in one as in the other. What has been the result when there has been a violation of this principle? We need only look back to the civil war that occurred in the United States a few years ago. They had also to

grapple with the question of slavery in a free country. They said that, in the interests of the morality of the country, it was important to do away with it. Did they adopt the same principle as England adopted in the accomplishment of that great work? No; they said: We will do away with it by one stroke of the pen, whatever injustice may be done, and we will balance the injustice done to the slave trader by the great good done to the country. But what was the result? A civil war, the most important, the most gigantic, the most destructive ever known in the history of the country, was the result; and not only that, but to-day and for the next hundred years, for the next two or three generations, a large number of the citizens of the States will recognise that, in that method of doing away with the slave trade, a great injustice was done to them, and they will never feel that they have the security for property in their country which the laws guaranteed to them when they came into it. This resolution is not dealing with the general trade. I should be disposed to go further, and to say that those who are engaged in the retail trade should be compensated as well, but this does not go so far, and I am glad to see that it does not, because it would be used as an argument in the campaigns which are being carried on in the country in favor of what is called the Scott Act. But the resolution acknowledges that, after the people have expressed their opinion by their voice in such numbers as to show that they are in favor of prohibition, those parties who are said to be at the root of the trouble, the brewers, the malsters, the manufacturers, who have their trade taken from them, shall be compensated for it. I say, that when these men have been paying large sums into the treasury of the country to support the country, to defray the expenses of legislation and government, and to build up the country when they have their vested rights to the extent of tens of thousands of dollars, it is only right, if we take away from them that property and that business out of which they have heretofore accumulated money, if we believe it to be in the interests of the country to do so, we should be liberal enough, we should be Christian enough in our charity to pay them for the rights we take away; because if we destroy that business so that there is a depreciation in the value of their property—it may be to the extent of \$1,000, \$2,000 or \$10,000; the principle is the same—it is taking away something from them that represents, in their eyes, money that they accumulated by their hard labor, that they have put into these various enterprises. Holding those views I am prepared to support the resolution. I believe that carried out it will more effectually stamp out the liquor trade in the country than any measure that has been passed through this House for a long time. Why? Because, when we compensate men for their trade, if there is any violation of the law on their part, there is no sympathy with them. As soon as we pay a man what we believe to be a fair compensation for stopping that trade, if he endeavors to continue it afterwards the whole country would be against him, almost to a man; and public opinion being then strong against the business it would be much more easy to stamp it out than it is at the present time by the Scott Act. I say I am prepared to support this principle and shall be well pleased to see it carried. I am glad to find that it is not recognised as a party question. I think that these things too often fall into the arena of party, and very great injustice is done thereby; that because one party takes it up and endorses it, therefore the other must oppose it. I endorse the expressions of the hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton). I think it is a great pity that the leaders of opinion in this country are not now ready to express their views and their judgment on this very important question, for as long as they hold back as a matter of policy, the country will not be in possession of what might be called the

Mr. SPROULE.

ripe opinions of the foremost men on this question, and it is left to others, who might be termed subordinates, to endeavor to force the question upon them, and oblige them to support either one side or the other.

Mr. FISHER. I rise to move an amendment, and perhaps I had better read it as an introduction to the remarks I am about to make:

That all after the word "that" be struck out, and the following be inserted in its stead: "The time when Parliament proceeds to discuss the details of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, will be the proper occasion on which to discuss the question of compensation to the manufacturers of such liquors as may come under the operation of such a law."

I am sorry I was not able to catch all the arguments that fell from the lips of the hon. mover of the original motion, and I was somewhat disappointed in what I did hear, to find no sufficient justification was given for the introduction of such a resolution at the present moment. If there was any immediate prospect before us that a prohibitory law would be passed by this House during the present Session there would have been, perhaps, some justification and some reason for discussing this matter as one of the details of the general question. But the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution, and the hon. gentleman who seconded it, did not show that there was any immediate prospect of a general prohibitory law being passed in this country. More than that, they did not even give us any argument to show that there was a prospect that even during the life of the present Parliament we were likely to be called upon to pass such a law. Now, of course, a resolution like this would express the opinion of this Parliament, but I do not consider that it would thereby be binding upon the country or the people; it is merely an expression of opinion by the members who vote upon it. That being the case, I do not think that much good can come from submitting such a resolution; and I fear, on the contrary, that a great deal of harm might arise from it, for in case a large number of leading men here should express their opinion in favor of such a course, the hopes of a large body of people who are interested in this trade would be raised, in the expectation of getting compensation. The hon. gentleman who sits before me (Mr. Wells) said he regretted that the resolution did not go far enough. I suppose the reason why this resolution did not include compensation to others who are engaged in the liquor traffic was because the proposer and seconder were fully aware that such a proposition would meet with far greater opposition than the one they have submitted to us. It is evident that the question of compensation, which seems to be now chiefly agitating those interested in the liquor traffic, is divided into two parts—the part which comes under this resolution, and that part which refers only to the dealers in liquor who hold licenses. I am not now going to enter into the discussion of the question of compensation to those who are licensed. I do not believe that these gentlemen have any grounds whatever upon which to base a claim for compensation; if there is any claim for compensation which can be entertained for an instant, it may be that of the manufacturers who are referred to in this resolution. But speaking for myself, and I think also for some others who are interested in this question, I must say that I should feel bound, under the present circumstances, and at the present time, to vote against this resolution—at all events, until such arguments are brought forward as will convince us of the justice of such a demand. So far, I have not heard any such argument, and I believe if such arguments were brought forward to-day they might assume a very different aspect if a prohibitory law was now before the House for discussion. We can well understand that if we promised to-day to the men engaged in the manufacture of liquor that their loss in consequence of a prohibitory law

would be compensated, they would naturally extend, instead of contracting, their business, and instead of preparing for a prohibitory law they would be tempted rather to plunge more deeply into that business in order to obtain larger compensation. Especially would that be the case in a time like the present, when money finds but few investments, and when other kinds of business are more or less depressed. The passage of a resolution like this would naturally give an impetus to their business, and this is a sufficient reason for us withholding, at the present time, an expression of our opinion. These gentlemen, I understand by this resolution, do not pretend to claim any compensation whatever for loss which they may suffer in consequence of the adoption of local prohibitory laws throughout the country. We are aware that on the 1st of May next about one-third of the whole country will come under the operation of local prohibitory laws, and we know that in consequence of that fact those gentlemen who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of liquors have already suffered a great deal of contraction in their business. This was stated to us the other day, when a deputation of licensed victuallers interviewed the Government on this question. Now, Sir, I believe that the same causes which have been in operation for the last year in this country will continue to act and will produce in the future even greater results than they have in the past; I believe that at no distant day more than one-half the country will be under a local prohibitory law. When that takes place we can understand that this business will be still more largely contracted, and when the time comes to discuss a national prohibitory law in this House, the chances are very great that by the simple operation of the law of supply and demand the business of the licensed victuallers will then be very much less than it is to day. But, as I pointed out a few moments ago, if Parliament pledges itself to give compensation at a future day, and at a time when we do not know what the circumstances will be under which compensation will be demanded, we can understand perfectly well that instead of diminishing the compensation we are more likely to increase it. This, as a matter of prudence, should cause hon. members to hesitate before voting for any such resolution as that before the House. I do not know what may be the extent of the prohibition which may be introduced. We have already on the paper a notice of a resolution to prohibit the manufacture of alcoholic beverages. But there is nothing in regard to brewers and maltsters. When that question comes up we shall have to discuss compensation in regard to those particular items; but the compensation for those items would vary from the compensation to brewers and maltsters, so if we were to pledge ourselves to provide any such compensation as is proposed, we would weaken our position when we come to discuss the question. The hon. member in front of me (Mr. Wells) alluded to the evident feeling on the part of the temperance people that they could not make any compromise with this trade, that they were not prepared in any sense or any way to acknowledge that the trade had rights. I confess that there may be a wing of the temperance party who are animated with that spirit. There is, however, a very large part of the temperance party who are not animated with that spirit in any sense; they demand legislation in their favor and ask that the people of the country be protected from the great evil which is in our midst. I believe those temperance people, when they have the power, will not use it in the same way as the liquor dealers have used their power against us in the past. I believe we will be actuated by a desire to give justice to our enemies, even though we have not received justice at their hands in the past. The hon. gentleman in front of me said that temperance people would neither give nor receive quarter. I believe, that although we have never received quarter at the hands of our opponents, we will be quite willing to give it

when our opponents are on their knees before us, and we have triumphed over them. If to-day this question is urged and forced upon us, we shall feel, as I do personally, that we cannot admit this principle, that there has not been placed before us sufficient grounds on which this principle should be acknowledged; and we will vote against this principle, if brought squarely before us to-day, whatever course we might take on a future occasion, when, under different circumstances, such a proposition for compensation might be brought before the House at a time when we were discussing the details of a prohibitory law. I shall not enter in any sense or way into the question of prohibition. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. Orton) has stated that the majority of the members of this House are in favor of restricting the traffic in liquor, and of freeing the country from the evils which that traffic has brought upon us. I believe that is the fact, but I am not going to discuss the principle of prohibition. I am glad, however, to be able to stand in this House this Session in a position different from that occupied last Session. The people of the country at large have spoken on this question, and have decided in favor of temperance. I was glad to hear from the lips of an hon. member who has not always been on the side of temperance, that this position is taken, and that we are to-day acknowledged to be on the right side in this question. I think this matter simply resolves itself into a question of justice. If at the time a prohibitory law is passed here, manufacturers of liquors can show us they have just grounds for compensation, let them come forward and prove to us that such is the case, and ask that a compensation clause be introduced into the law. But I do not think they are wise in their day and generation, or that it is expedient and right that Parliament should be asked beforehand to pledge itself and the country, in so far as Parliament can do so, to any such proposition. I think I have touched shortly upon the reasons which have prompted me to move this amendment, and in view of the fact that the country is not likely to be asked to pass a prohibitory law this Session, or be asked to pass such a law during the life of the present Parliament, it is inopportune and premature to make any such arrangement as is proposed with the manufacturers of liquor.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the vote is taken, I should like to say a few words with respect to the original motion particularly, and in a slight degree with respect to the amendment. I am not sorry that this question has come before the House, I do not think it is premature to discuss it at this or at any subsequent time. I have, however, my own opinion as to the time when this question should be decided. As prohibitionists and temperance men, those of us who have been in favor of a prohibitory law and have argued for it, certainly do not regret that this resolution has come before the House at this time or in the way in which it has come. It has been quite common, in the years that have passed, for those who did not believe in the principle of prohibition to think little of the movement which was inaugurated and carried out by that section of the people who did believe in prohibition, and who were generally said to be but few in number and to have but little influence. That argument can no longer be used. During the eight or ten years that have passed, both the number and influence of the prohibitionists in the country and in the House have been augmented, and to-day we have a resolution which distinctly recognises the fact that the prohibition movement can no longer be ignored, that the people are behind it, and this resolution is, if I understand it rightly, the calm and deliberate expression of opinion of the brewers and distillers of this country, that whether they be prepared for death or not, death is imminent; that they are looking now for some way in

which the business may go out with pecuniary consideration attached to it, and may, so to speak, in some way get the promise of the country to erect a mausoleum to its memory. I thank the mover and seconder of this resolution, and those who are behind it, for this strong admission, and I assure them it will be heard from one end of this country to the other, that, after to-day, no person in this Dominion will be able to say that the strength of the prohibition movement is to be despised, but that this resolution is an indication that it is the general sentiment of those to whom prohibition is opposed, that it is a growing power in the country, and that it is coming close to its consummation. Sir, this resolution which has been introduced to the House, I do not consider, so far as my judgment goes, to be one which we ought now to decide. I am willing to discuss the principle; I want a fair and square discussion of that principle; I want the leaders of public sentiment in this House to give their opinions on this weighty matter—the men who have studied political economy and social economy; the men who are conversant with the affairs of state; the men who have studied social problems in all their parts—I want them, as leaders of public opinion, and as standing as representatives of the people in this House, to discuss this question as deeply, as widely, as fully as it can be discussed, so that the people may have the data whereupon to gather to the discussion of it outside of this House. But this House is not prepared to decide this question, or to say that the decision of this question to-day, on the original resolution in the affirmative, would be the decision of the country, or could, in any way, be tortured to be taken as the decision of the country. This resolution, as it comes down, is a contingent resolution. It does not ask for the taking away of any existing grievances; it does not ask for the addition of something to any existing law, or to any law which is to-day in process of being enacted. It simply says that if something or other, in the years of the future, in five years or twenty-five years from this day, shall come to be the case, then, this other thing which is asked for by the resolution, shall also come to be the case. I do not think that this is the usual method of procedure in a deliberative body. It is as though when the new improvements in cotton machinery and woollen machinery were coming to the front, and when employees were looking out in the not very distant future, and saying there will come a time when, if these things are allowed to come into use, our labor will be thrown out, our wages taken from us; and now, before the advantages of these things can be fully seen, now, on the wave of the prejudices which exist against them, we will pass a resolution through Parliament, saying that in the event of these machines coming into use those employees who are thrown out of employment shall be compensated for their loss. It is as though, when a Bill was before Parliament to charter a railway to run along the side of a great navigable stream, those who owned boats plying on that stream, seeing the approaching diminutions of their gains, seeing the fact that in the near future their gains would be interfered with and a different route of travel would be taken, should say, we will make interest; we will pass a resolution through Parliament saying that if such and such a thing takes place we are to be compensated for the loss which may come upon us. And what is this resolution? It is nothing more nor less than an attempt, in a time when there is a want of knowledge on the subject, in a time of first feeling, to bind the hands of the future by a resolution contingent on something else happening. And if I mistake not, although this resolution may have within its scope the compensation of brewers and distillers, it will have this effect—whether this is its motive or not—it will have consequence: It will raise up a sum of money anywhere from \$12,000,000, which has been spoken of by my hon. friend as the

Mr. FOSTER.

capital invested in the brewing business to day, up to \$30,000,000 or \$40,000,000—it will raise that sum up as the probable sum which the people of this country will invite to fall upon their shoulders, and be laid as a burden on their backs if they pass a prohibitory law. Sir, I do not think it is the usual course for a parliamentary or deliberative assembly to proceed in that way. Then again, I think this resolution, as my friend on the other side has stated, is premature. Has it been discussed in the country? It may be said that your prohibition resolution last year was premature. But, I reply, there is a great difference. That question has been before the country for fifty years; it has been steadily marching forward towards its solution. Every year it has been increasing in strength. Every year the influences behind it have been augmented. This question has permeated every nook and corner of the land; it has gone into the centre of every constituency, it has been talked of at every fireside; and this Parliament last year, or any year within the last fifteen years, has had the data at hand to give a vote on that principle, feeling certain that those who voted upon it would represent the aggregate feeling of their constituents. But where has this question of compensation been argued? In what constituency, in what nook or corner has it been raised? Is there a single representative here who can get up and say: I can vote for this question, for or against, feeling that I know what the sentiments of my constituents are, and that by my vote I am representing them here.

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman says he can. He then is one of the favored few, but I think the large majority of this House will feel that they cannot. Well, Sir, following that out, I do not think this House is in the position, in its representative capacity, to decide this question for or against compensation; because, whether this House does possess the knowledge of its constituencies far enough and wide enough to make a fair decision in this matter—even if they do not, yet the opinion will go out from this House, if it be taken in the affirmative or negative, the opinion will go out that this Parliament of Canada, representing the people of Canada, would make this decision, when I hold that that would not be the case, but that it will be the gentlemen who are sitting in the Parliament of Canada, who have expressed their own collective or aggregate opinion on this question. Do not imagine that I wish to say that we should not discuss manfully and fairly and squarely the whole issue, and nothing else. I think we should; but I think we should reserve our opinion as a solemn declaration until we find out the feeling of our constituents on this question. At least, that is my private opinion, guiding my own conduct and speaking for myself. Nor has this question come up on the ground of petition. Has there been a single petition put before Parliament asking that compensation should be given to the brewers and distillers and maltsters? Is there one from all this country—from the island of Cape Breton to the Pacific ocean? Can there be produced on the Table of this House a single petition coming from the people asking that compensation be granted? I think not. And we are a representative body; we represent the people in this House. This is a large matter, involving at least \$12,000,000, according to what my hon. friend, the mover of this resolution, has stated to be the capital employed in breweries and distilleries. I say that, under the circumstance, that no voice of the people has asked for this action, it is too great a burden for us to resolve should be placed on them without consulting our constituents. It may be stated that a deputation which came to this city not many days ago, presented to the Government a memorial in which they claimed compensation. That may be; but it was not the compensation which is claimed in this

resolution. That deputation, if I understood their memorial aright, asked for compensation for the license victuallers, for the coopers, for the employees, and for the cigar manufacturers. This, then, is not their resolution; it is not founded on their presentment of the case. This is somebody else's resolution, and is founded on somebody else's presentment of the case, because the brewers and distillers are the only people included in it. Then I say that from the sovereign people of this country, in the exercise of their right of petition, there has not come a single voice to this Parliament, asking that compensation shall be granted. So much, Sir, with reference to that point. But this resolution is also, to my mind, one which we ought not to take into consideration, so far as to decide in favor of it, for another reason, and that is this: It is a resolution which, besides embodying something which has not been asked for by the people, besides tying the hands of the people in the way I have stated, is one which is not backed up by that amount of argument necessary to show that the necessity for it exists. I may just refer, in passing, to the kind of argument with which this demand is sometimes backed up. For instance, I think the only financial argument which was used by the deputation which came to Ottawa a few days ago, the only argument which condescended to figures, was that used by the cigar manufacturers. Hon. gentlemen who have read their memorial will remember that the cigar manufacturers started out by arguing that they should have compensation on the ground that the Scott Act was injuring them; and they showed, from official records, a diminution of \$449,000 in the amount paid by the cigar manufacturers into the Dominion revenue in 1884, as compared with 1883; and then, by that strange sort of argument which so often prevails, they stated that this diminution was due to the operation of the Scott Act in the different counties. Now, Sir, examine that argument. When we come to look at the returns of the Minister of Inland Revenue, we find that last year the duty on tobacco was reduced from 20 cents to 12 cents on the pound. The Minister calculated that some \$800,000 would be lost to the revenue in consequence of that decrease; but he states, in his report, that instead of \$800,000 being the decrease, the decrease was \$419,000. Now, you see what kind of an argument that was. The Minister of Inland Revenue says that the diminution is due to the decrease in the duty; but the memorialists, in order to use it as an argument to show why compensation should be granted to them, say it is due to the effect of the Scott Act on the cigar trade. That is an instance of the curious kind of *non sequitur* argument which is used in favor of compensation. Well, Sir, I am glad this resolution has been brought forward for other reasons. I am glad, because it shows that the finality is somewhat near, that the end is approaching, and that there is a feeling not only widespread among the people that prohibition ought to be established, but that there is a feeling amongst those likely to be affected by it financially that it is coming, and that it is an event that ought to be provided for. What does this resolution affirm? It affirms that these petitioners have no legal ground on which to base the continuance of their traffic, that they have no legal ground on which to ask for compensation. If they had in the constitution of the country or in the laws of the country any such ground, they would not be approaching Parliament to-day by a resolution asking that measures should be taken to give them that compensation. They have also abandoned the ground that they are able to go before the country and argue, on the ground of right, that their traffic shall be maintained and their trade carried on. They distrust the people in regard to that, and they come to Parliament and ask that a compensatory resolution should be passed by this House. As a temperance man and a prohibitionist, I thank the promoters of this resolution for the admission which they have thus made. Then I

say, that the resolution is not an out-and-out manly resolution, and in saying that I am not making any reflection personally on the hon. gentleman who moved it. The resolution is that the brewers and distillers shall be compensated. Hitherto the strong reason that they have urged why their business should not be interfered with has been that there are correlative industries connected with the breweries that would be interfered with by the Scott Act.

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

After Recess.

CANADA SOUTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY AND ERIE AND NIAGARA RAILWAY COMPANY.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company (Mr. Bergin).

Mr. BLAKE. I should like to know why all the branch lines which are affected by this Bill are not recited in the Bill? There is a wholesale enlargement of the time for the construction of all those lines, without any statement of what those lines are.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As far as I can recollect, the mover of the Bill (Mr. Bergin) called attention to these words: "And whereas by an Act of the Parliament of Canada, passed in the 38th year of Her Majesty's reign, chap. 66, the time for the completion of the original branch lines, authorised by the Acts therein recited, or any of them, was extended until the 8th April, 1878."

Mr. BLAKE. I am not objecting to the ground being covered, but want to know what ground is covered. It seems to me, when we are extending the period within which lines may be commenced and completed, the Act itself ought, in point of convenience, to say what the general direction is of these lines with which we are so dealing. It is an interesting thing, of course, to know that the Canada Southern Railway Company has built this and other lines; that is interesting, but not very important. It is done. What is important to know is, what they want to have the power to do, which they have not yet done, and it is that they have omitted to tell us.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The committee can pass the Bill and report to the House, and we will leave the third reading to the next day, when the mover of the Bill (Mr. Bergin) will give the explanation desired.

Committee rose and reported.

RIVER ST. CLAIR RAILWAY BRIDGE AND TUNNEL COMPANY.

Bill (No. 8) respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company (Mr. Bergin), considered in committee, reported and read the third time and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 51) for granting certain powers to the International Coal Company (Limited).—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 53) respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. Girouard.)

Bill (No. 55) to authorise the Dominion Grand Mutual Fire Insurance Association to insure against fire the property of the Patrons of Husbandry, wheresoever situate in Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 61) further to amend the Act incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)

RETURN ORDERED.

Copies of all Orders in Council making any change in the contracts in printing since 1867.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 26th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 67) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria). As I understand the Canada Temperance Act is made applicable to the whole Dominion, and more recently an amendment to the Act provided that electoral districts in the Province of Manitoba could submit the Act instead of counties. The only object of the Bill is that the same principle may be made applicable to British Columbia, so that if at any time an electoral district in that Province chooses to avail itself of the Act it may have liberty to do so.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved for leave to introduce a Bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as respects matters of a purely local nature, in Province of Quebec.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I would ask whether this is not a Bill of the same nature or to the same effect as the one which has already been presented to this House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The other Bill, which is before the House still, is a Bill to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court for the whole Dominion. This Bill seems to be limited to one Province, and differs from the other in that respect. Of course, I have not seen the Bill, but that seems to be its effect.

Mr. BLAKE. Mr. Speaker, is it to be competent, then, for hon. members to introduce measures to limit the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, first for the whole Dominion, then for the Province of Quebec, then for Ontario, then for Manitoba, then for British Columbia, and so forth, by separate Bills? It seems to me, Sir, that this is a Bill concerning the same matter, and what the hon. gentleman desires to accomplish is, by an amendment to the Bill now

before the House, to limit the scope and operation of that Bill. Thus we have the same member proposing six or eight Bills on the same subject matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. It would seem to be the more convenient course for the hon. member to amend his Bill now before the House. The position we are in with regard to that Bill is that the House has not yet thrown it out. The other Bill is still before the House. I cannot say at the moment, however, that this Bill is out of order.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the hon. gentleman would not object to renewing his motion to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman will renew his motion to-morrow, I will look into the matter.

CRIMINAL LAWS OF CANADA, 1869 to 1881.

Mr. GIGAULT. (Translation) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to cause to be published in French the collection of Acts, intitled: "Criminal Law of Canada, 1869 to 1881?"

Mr. CHAPLEAU (Translation). The criminal laws are now being consolidated with the other statutes. To print these laws at the present moment would be useless. When the consolidation shall have been approved of by the House, the Government will see that, instead of sending the statutes themselves to the justices of the peace, the legislation which deals with their duties should be sent to them, and then these laws will be printed in both languages.

STATION AT CAP ST. IGNACE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to erect a station in the parish of Cap St. Ignace, in the county of Montmagny, on the Intercolonial Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the hon. member, I must say that it is not the intention of the Government to erect a station there for the present.

RAILWAY LINE KNOWN AS THE SHORT LINE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation) asked, Whether steps have been taken with a view to the production of the plans, reports and papers ordered by this House, in relation to the railway line known as the Short Line? Also, when the said plans, etc., will be laid on the Table of the House?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). In answer to the hon. member, I must say that these plans and reports are being prepared as rapidly as possible, and that as soon as they will be completed they will be laid before the House.

POST OFFICE AT MONTMAGNY.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to set apart a sum of \$12,000, or any other sum sufficient for the purpose, for the building of a post office in the village of Montmagny?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry) has already brought this question before the Department, and he has presented a petition asking \$10,000 for that work. The Government have not yet decided as to what shall be done with regard to this matter.

THE GOVERNMENT POWDER MAGAZINES AT FORT HOWE.

Mr. MILLS (for Mr. WELDON) asked, Whether the Government powder magazines at Fort Howe, St. John, N.B.,

are occupied? If so, by whom, for what purpose? If leased to any person, to whom, for what period and at what rent?

Mr. CARON. The old stone magazine is occupied by the Department of Militia and Defence for the storage of gunpowder. The magazine known as the New Brick magazine has been leased to Mr. William Henry Thorne, merchant, of St. John, N.B., for the storage of gunpowder. The rental is \$100 per annum, year by year, the rent being payable half yearly in advance.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to draw attention to a paragraph in the *Toronto Globe* of the 24th inst., under the heading of "Notes from the Capital," which reads thus:

"A large deputation of laborers who have been employed for some time on the Canadian Pacific Railway, north of Lake Superior, and who have been unable to get their wages from the Company, waited upon Mr. Pope, Acting Minister of Railways, to-day, to see if they could get any assistance or encouragement. Mr. Dawson, M.P. for Algoma, was asked to accompany the deputation, but begged to be excused, lest, to use his own words, it might compromise him with the Government or the Canadian Pacific Railway Company."

In reference to this, I have to say that I know nothing of a large deputation of workmen. All I saw was a single contractor who asked me to go with him to demand money from the Government. I simply declined to interfere, as I knew nothing of the matter. Subsequently, on seeing the article I have just read, I called his attention to it, when he at once denied having said that I used such an expression. All I have to say now is that the *Globe* correspondent was entirely misinformed in attributing to me the expressions set down in his article.

COMPENSATION TO BREWERS AND DISTILLERS.

House resumed consideration of motion of Mr. Kranz for Committee of the Whole to consider a resolution (p. 236) declaring it expedient, in the event of the enacting of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors, that equitable provision should be made for the compensation of brewers, distillers and malsters; and of the motion of Mr. Fisher (p. 242) in amendment thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. In the remarks which I was addressing to the House yesterday I was endeavoring to give some reasons why I did not regret the introduction of this resolution, and also some reasons why I should very much regret its passage. I stated, if you will remember, that I did not regret the introduction of the resolution, because it was an admission of the strength of the prohibition sentiment outside of this House—an admission from those to whom the movement is opposed; that, in the second place, it was an admission that on grounds constitutional and legal the traffic had no hope of continued existence or of compensation in the event of its existence being destroyed. I also said that I was glad the matter had been brought up for discussion in the House as it was a question of very great importance to the country and one upon which the mind of the country had not yet been very much exercised. When I had stated these reasons, I had stated all the reasons I had for not regretting that the resolution was introduced, but against the passage of the resolution there were several reasons which I urged. One was the unusual and contingent character of the resolution itself. The other was that I thought an expression of opinion by this House, binding, as it would, to some extent, the country, standing, as it would, to some extent, for an expression of opinion of the country, would be premature, because the question had not been sufficiently discussed to allow us to get at what would probably be the sentiment of the country upon it. I also stated that I would be sorry to see it pass because it was not based upon any popular demand, because there was not a single public depu-

tation nor a single petition sent in from the country upon which to base this demand for compensation to the brewers and distillers. I may state in addition that the resolution is not a logical one, that it is of a kind that we may call a class resolution. Heretofore the contention has been of the brewers and distillers that their business did not stand alone, but that other great interests were dependent upon it, that by its destruction other great correlative industries would suffer to a large extent; and if any plea has gone forth through the country as to why the brewing and distilling business should not be interfered with, it has heretofore been the plea that the destruction of other interests would be involved in the destruction of the brewing and distilling interest. But in the face of all that, we find this resolution introduced into the House and an attempt made to get the authoritative decision of this Parliament—upon what? Upon a proposition which includes but 130 men in the Dominion, a proposition which includes but the brewers and distillers nominally, which leaves entirely out of sight all those correlative industries and employments which we have heretofore been led to consider as depending upon and liable to be greatly injured if the business of brewing and distilling were interfered with. There is another reason why I should not like to see the resolution adopted, and that is this, that it is a very unguarded resolution. A prohibitory law may not be brought before the people for ultimate decision, for one year, or three years, or five years, or even for ten years; but the very moment this resolution is passed, what happens? If there were no vested interests before, there will be vested interests after the passing of this resolution. It is now a moot question as to whether there may be vested interests or not; some claim that there are or ought to be, others that there are not. But from the moment this resolution is passed, it is a declaration that hereafter all those interests are vested interests, and must be considered in any attempt to legislate with reference to this traffic. I do not think so unguarded a resolution as this, one so liable to be followed by such consequences financially to this country, ought to be passed by this House. More than that, in all the years which may intervene, be they few or many, between the passage of this resolution and the passage of a complete prohibitory law, all brewers and distillers will be in a position to add to their business. They will be in a position to say: Let us make all the gain we can out of it, let us enlarge our places of business; and those who have not invested in it will say: Let us also invest our property in it, there is a chance of making money out of it until prohibition comes; and when that period arrives here is a resolution which binds Parliament and, which will be pressed to its furthest consideration, that our interests will not be sacrificed without money compensation. I do not think it would be wise for us to put Parliament and the country in that position. Again I say that this resolution either goes too far or does not go far enough. What is the principle affirmed in it? It is this simple principle that if the brewing and distilling traffic be interfered with by law to its injury, either by restricting it or by our preventing it entirely, a money compensation should be given to those who are engaged in it. That is the principle. Now, I say, if that principle be true, it does not go far enough. I heard a good deal said yesterday about justice, about its being the corner stone of good government, and I think quite a number of hon. gentlemen who spoke, thought the ends of justice would not be met, nor the sentiment of justice fully and completely respected, unless this compensatory principle were added to the prohibitory principle whenever the latter should be affirmed. Sir, if it be true, as a principle, that if you interfere with the brewers' and distillers' traffic you should compensate them, where is the sense of justice, where is the broad principle, supposed to be embodied in this resolution, that we should

not prejudice this interest without full compensation if it only includes brewers and distillers and does not go further; if it does not include those who need compensation more, who have labored harder in this general traffic, and without whose labor there could be no brewing or distilling interests in this country to-day, no accumulated capital and no profits to accrue from capital. I say it does not go far enough to meet the idea of justice which has been urged by those in favor of compensation. The farmer who ploughs and sows his land and brings the grain to market which is to be used in the distillery or brewery, the employé who works there, the railways which carry the grain, the people who distribute it, and the ten thousand or more who are the agents to distribute the production of the brewery and distillery to the consumers—these are the men who work the hardest, who have in the aggregate the most at stake; these are the men who must get up early in the morning and have their shutters off at six o'clock while the rich brewer or distiller is quietly enjoying his morning's snooze; these are the men who must do the sweeping and scouring, who must stand behind the bars twelve, thirteen or more hours a day; these are the men who must compromise with their conscience and stifle its voice as they see the misery which is connected, and inevitably connected, with their traffic—yet these are all lost sight of by those hon. gentlemen whose sense of justice is so great that they could not allow the rich brewer or distiller to go without compensation. If we admit the principle of compensation at all, it is impossible for Parliament to face that other and larger and poorer number who will be disturbed by the taking away of the traffic of the brewers and distillers. It will be impossible to look them in the face and say that we have acted justly and fairly. Either the principle should not be adopted, or, if adopted at all, it should be extended further than this resolution extends it. I will proceed now for a moment, with the kind forbearance of this House, to discuss the question of compensation itself. That is the question which is before the House—if prohibition, then compensation. We are all under a debt of gratitude, I know, to the learned doctor who gave us such a disquisition upon the medical and other advantages of alcoholic stimulants yesterday. We were all interested in that touching case in which a woman was kept alive a whole year by a peculiar process of administering milk and whiskey, and we have all been left in a delightful state of uncertainty to know which it was that kept her alive, the milk or the whiskey. But the medical use of alcoholic liquors is not meant to be prohibited by any prohibitory law that I know of. The question is, compensation or not? We have first to learn from the voice of precedent, from the voice of related precedent. In all the legislation which has taken place with reference to the liquor traffic, have we any precedent for the compensatory principle or for the application of money in that way for injury arising from any restrictions or prohibitions? I think I can stand before this House, and, looking back through history, can challenge any one to present a case in the legislation which has taken place for the last hundred years in Anglo-Saxon countries in which a single penny has been paid for damage or loss which has come to the traffic either from certain mild restrictions placed upon it or from the more drastic measure of complete and total prohibition. If we go back to English history, and to the history of the traffic from the first, restrictions were placed upon it, which became greater in magnitude and scope, and which must have interfered with the gains and must have curtailed the profits of the traffic, but not a single case can be found in which any one of these restrictions had attached to it the principle of compensation. You may take 1736 in the British House of Parliament, when, driven almost to desperation by the multiplied and constant evils which arose from the gin traffic, the House of Parliament in Great Britain passed the

Mr. FOSTER,

Gin Act, which was virtually prohibition, and yet that House of Parliament, noted for its conservatism, noted for its eminent sense of fairness, attached no compensation to it at all. Following that up, you find another instance where, about the year 1742, the distillation from grain or flour or malt was distinctly prohibited. Well, as a result of that prohibition what followed? Whereas, in the year 1742, the consumption of alcoholic spirits was 19,000,000 gallons a year, from 1760 to 1782 the average yearly consumption had fallen to 4,000,000 gallons. There was a reduction from 19,000,000 to 4,000,000 of a yearly sale. Does not any one see that that interfered seriously with the profits and with the gains of the traffic? And yet, that drastic measure was brought in and kept upon the statute book, and not a penny of compensation was given. The Beer Bill was brought in in 1830. It was antagonised by the whole of the licensed victuallers' interest. You will see in the debates the petitions which were presented against it, and you will see that the most determined onset was made against the Beer Bill by the licensed victuallers and by the great brewers, because, they said, it threatened their entire trade, that their vested interests were to be injured and that the families which depended upon that trade, that numbers of dealers variously estimated at from 50,000 to 70,000, would be ruined by the measure; and the plea for compensation was put in. But the Beer Bill of 1830 was passed and those vested interests were interfered with, and yet there was no mention of compensation, though in the debates those who were in favor of the Bill pressed the ground that although these interests might be interfered with, the public had no right to be called upon to pay for any damage that might arise. In 1854, the Forbes-Mackenzie Act was passed in the Parliament of Great Britain, which did away with the trade in intoxicating liquors in Scotland for every Sabbath day in the year. That had a direct effect upon the interest. Within five years time it had taken 2,000,000 gallons off from the annual consumption of alcoholic spirits, and one-third or a little less of the whole of the aggregate of the traffic in that kind of liquors. It was a serious detriment to the traffic, and yet there was no compensation given. We might cite the Irish Sunday Closing Act, the Welsh Sunday Closing Act, we might cite the fact that, upon the great estates in Great Britain, by prohibitory power vested in the land owner, these interests are interfered with and driven out and the traffic to that extent curtailed. Looking over the history of liquor legislation in Great Britain, we find a constant series of prohibitory and restrictive measures injuring the trade in every instance without the principle of compensation being at all admitted. Suppose we come to Canada, and ask what has been the course of legislation here. The old license legislation, such as it existed in the Province of Nova Scotia, for instance, which brought about virtual prohibition in three-fourths or more of the counties in that Province, which absolutely forbade the trade being carried on, yet gave no compensation, even though it was asked. In 1855, the Province of New Brunswick passed a prohibitory law, which had no principle of compensation attached to it. In 1864, the Dunkin Act was passed in the old Parliament of Canada, and, although that was sufficiently elastic to be applied to every county and town in Quebec and Ontario, and so to interfere materially with the traffic, no principle of compensation was allowed. In 1878, the Canada Temperance Act was passed, both sides of the House agreeing to it, by which every county and city in Canada might entirely do away with the retail traffic and might do away with the wholesale traffic as well; and yet the legislators of that day, who may be considered to have been as honest and intelligent, or nearly so, as the legislators of to-day, did not attach the principle of compensation to their law. So, if we take the precedents in Canada in reference to the liquor legislation, we find nothing which goes to

support the idea of compensation. If we pass over to the United States of America, the ground is still stronger. The State of Maine in 1851 passed a prohibitory law. Breweries and distilleries—distilleries which had a capacity of more than one million gallons a year—were entirely swept away; there is not one there to-day; and yet the principle of compensation was not introduced or embodied in the law. Prohibitory laws have been passed in ten or twelve of the United States of America and in no one of them has the principle of compensation been affirmed. In Kansas in 1830, a prohibitory law was passed which immediately set itself to destroy 39 breweries and two distilleries, and 1,862 wholesale and retail liquor shops, and yet the principle of compensation was not attached to that law. In Iowa a prohibitory law passed in 1882 by which 132 breweries, with a capital of \$2,000,000, and 13 distilleries with a corresponding large capital, were shut so far as the provisions of the law are concerned, and are being closed out in accordance with that law. Yet, Sir, there has been no principle of compensation embodied in that law. And so with all these precedents before us of laws varying from the restriction of the liquor traffic through local option to complete prohibition, we find Anglo-Saxon legislators, presumably with as much intelligence as we have ourselves, presumably with just as great a sense of what is honest and just—we find them legislating upon this matter without introducing in any single instance the principle of compensation. I think it will require a very strong argument to induce this House or any other Legislature in the Dominion of Canada, to be the first to break this long array and to adopt the principle of compensation in any prohibitory measure which they may enact and complete. When we come to enquire why it is that legislators have proceeded upon this plan without providing compensation for the traffic which has been disturbed, there must be some good reason, some strong underlying reason, to account for it. It cannot be mere whim, or caprice, or sentiment. This matter must have been argued and probed to its bottom, and there must have been found away down there some underlying principles so strong and so secure as to induce this universal action with reference to liquor legislation. And, Sir, what may we find to be some of these underlying sentiments? It is a common argument that you must compensate the traffic because, it is said, it has been created by Government. Government has called it into being, Government has protected it and fostered it, and therefore Government has a duty to do, and that duty can only be fulfilled by compensation whenever the Government takes away its protecting arm from the traffic. Sir, I think the whole history of this liquor traffic will contradict that statement of the case. I stand here to-day to affirm that the liquor traffic is not a creature of the Government, that it is not a pet of the Government, and never has been; that it came out of the ages when ignorance prevailed, that it came out alongside of other abuses which date from ancient times; that it fastened itself upon the country; that it grew strong before the people knew its character, and as soon as the people began to understand its true character, and in proportion as they understood it, the struggle commenced, and went on, and grew greater, to overthrow the abuse which had grown to so much power and strength during these preceding years. So, Sir, it forced itself upon the country, and when the country began to deal with it at all, the country dealt with it as far as it could get the power by restricting it in greater and greater proportion, until at last, in the long struggle, the liquor traffic is being overmastered by the people. And now when the victory is about to perch upon the banners of the temperance people, after these long years of struggle, the traffic comes up and says: Why, you have sanctioned our existence; you have allowed us—under protest it is true—but that allowance is equivalent to a sanction. Now, if you want to get rid of us

the only manly and just way to do is to pay us what is involved in getting rid of the traffic. Sir, this involves a much larger question; it involves the question as to how far it is necessary that the people of this or any other age, in dealing with the abuses that have grown out of preceding ages, should meet them and overthrow them by force, and contest, and the power of legislation, or should compensate them and buy them off from the hold that they have upon the community. If we were to admit that principle, where would we be landed? There was a time when absolute tyranny had its hold upon country after country. The people were beneath its grasp, and the yoke was laid upon them. Then commenced the struggle, and after a time the people became triumphant. Around this absolute tyranny there had clustered monopolies, vested interests of a thousand different kinds, but when the people overthrew the tyranny there was no proposition to compensate that tyranny for those vested interests which had grown up about the abuse. So it is with every abuse, every system of tyranny, every system of monopoly, which has been grappled with by the people, and overthrown as an enemy. It has not been customary to buy them off but rather to grapple with them, and to throw them off from the body politic. It would be a fair test of this matter with reference to the creation of the traffic to take a new country to-day, and attempt to establish in it this same traffic that we have amongst us by sufferance. That you could not do. Why, Sir, when the North-West Territory was set apart, a new country under somewhat different conditions, of course, it was found that this liquor traffic could not be set up anew in it, and there was an iron-clad prohibition placed upon the introduction of the traffic into that new country. Only the other day the representatives of the great powers of the world met together to lay the foundation of a provisional empire in Africa; the Congo settlement was to be put within its limits and set out in the race for progress and improvement under a certain provisional Government. When the proposition was made to introduce this traffic of intoxicating liquors into that new country, it drew forth an almost unanimous expression of disapproval from the Anglo-Saxon world, and the representatives of Great Britain and of the United States of America made their protest so strong that it had its effect and the proposition was, if not entirely, yet to a large extent, thrown aside. You could not establish that system in a new country which is a fair proof that it has grown up against the will of the people, and it will be thrown off just as soon as the peoples' will is strong enough. More than that, Sir, the traffic has grown up despite persistent warning. There is no abuse which the people have tried to throw off, there is no system of evil which the world has struggled against, that has had longer and more persistent warnings given to it of approaching dissolution, than this liquor traffic. Fifty years ago, and more in this country, the first note of warning was raised, and every temperance meeting that has been held since has been an added protest. Every resolution of a church synod has been a warning to it, and every resolution of a Legislature. I think a good many Legislatures have passed resolutions against it; I think the Legislature of Nova Scotia and the Legislatures of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Ontario and Manitoba, have all passed resolutions praying this Parliament to pass a complete prohibitory law. Sir, all these things have been notices to quit, and the traffic should have taken them to heart, and should not have gone on in the face of all these repeated warnings. If it has gone on, it has been upon this principle: Here is a man who comes up and says to himself, What business shall I take? There is the grocer's business, there is the boot and shoe business, and there is the liquor traffic—which shall I take? He says that the two former are stated, and stable, and certain; that there has been no agitation with reference to them, no strong wave of public

opinion condemning them; while the liquor traffic exists by an uncertain tenure, and goes on in spite of the prayers of the people to Parliament to sweep that traffic away. And what does he say? He says: The gains in this seem to me to promise well. True the risks are great, but I will take the risks for the sake of the gains. Now, then, if he has taken the risks for the sake of the gains, when the time comes for the risks to accumulate, let him pocket the losses as well as the profits. He has taken the risks against the strong and repeated and continuous warnings that his tenure was not a certain tenure and might at any day be disturbed. In 1864 the warning was given to him by an Act put in the hands of the people, which might have shut up the liquor traffic in any county at any time the people chose. How many are engaged in the trade who have not undertaken it since 1864? In 1878 that position was made doubly strong by the passing of the Canada Temperance Act. How many are in the licensed victuallers trade to-day that were in it previous to 1878? All that have gone in since those warnings of 1864 and 1878 were given have gone in with the full knowledge of the risk and the uncertain tenure upon which the traffic rested, and if they have chosen to take the risk they have no right to come here to-day and say: Because we have chosen to take the risk, we want you to compensate us when loss falls upon us. My friend from Grey, I think, who spoke yesterday, made the proposition something in this light—or if it was not he the proposition was made. Suppose a railway company have a charter for a railway to run through a certain district, and suppose that that railway crosses a man's land, and that it is necessary for the use of that road that the land should be taken, the company have the power, or the Government have the power, to take that land; but do they think of taking it without compensating the owner for the value of it? Not at all; they never could. But I hold that that and the compensation which is talked of with respect to the liquor traffic are two entirely different things, resting upon bases entirely different, and to which entirely different reasoning must in the very nature of the case apply. My hon. friend who was formerly Speaker of the Ontario Legislature (Mr. Wells), and who spoke to us so eloquently and ably yesterday from the other side of the House, said it was laid down by Chancellor Kent that when property was taken for public use that property should be paid for. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer; I do not know all that Chancellor Kent says or does not say, but I am willing to submit four propositions to the good sense of this House, and to ask this House if those propositions will not stand. The first is this: Whenever private property is taken for public use the public ought to pay for that property. it is an injustice if payment is not made. Second, whenever private property which is not to be put to an injurious use so far as the public is concerned, continues in that state of not injuring or harming the public interest, the Government has a right to protect it, and it has a right to claim the protection of the Government. Third, wherever or whenever private property devotes itself to the injury of the public, the Government and the public have a right to inhibit that use of the property, and, if that fails, to confiscate the property. My fourth proposition is this: That wherever general legislation is needed for the public good, even though that general legislation affects private investments injuriously, that private property must stand it, and it must pay its own loss, as it does, even though that private property is used, not against the public good, but in accordance with the public advantage. I see that an hon. member shakes his head to that proposition, and as he did not shake his head to the three preceding propositions I conclude that I have three-fourths of him at least. Let me see if I cannot get the other quarter. The principle I laid down last was this, that the Government has a

Mr. FOSTER.

right to legislate for the general good irrespective of individual loss and without compensation, even though private property used to the public advantage may be injuriously affected thereby. Has it or has it not? Let me go back, Sir, to the time of the corn laws in Great Britain. Let us ask what was the real question before the people then? It was this: Whether the public advantage should be enhanced by having the tax taken off corn, or whether, on the other hand, the landed interest should be kept with larger profits and more exclusive markets for corn even though the public advantage should be harmed thereby. The corn laws were abolished and the landed interests had to suffer, but there was no talk of compensation. That is an illustration of the principle that if legislation is for the general good, private property, even though it be injuriously affected, has to sustain the loss and gets no compensation. Let us take fiscal regulations. There is scarcely a single regulation with respect to fiscal matters which will not injuriously affect some department of trade or of business. You cannot make tariff legislation without injuring and harming some certain interest, and yet it is never contended that in the making of those fiscal laws there should be the idea of compensating the interests which suffer thereby. If they suffer they must stand it. The general good of the country is supposed to require the legislation. Again, I take railways and steamboats. Here is a railway which runs from Montreal to Toronto. There are a number of small towns along the route of the railway, towns which before the road was projected or built had in prospect and also in essence a trade, and prospectively a larger trade, in connection with the navigation of the lakes. The railway was built; it took the traffic, and instead of the lake traffic continuing to grow it has gone down, and some of those towns to-day are feeling the effects of the railway construction, and are not enjoying those special advantages which they were enjoying in essence and in prospect at that time. Yet not one of those towns comes here for compensation, although each suffered in its private town interest; yet the general good was enhanced, and private interest had to suffer for the public good. Take factory legislation, and I call the attention of the hon. member for Grey to this matter. Suppose this year, or last year, a factory went into operation under the existing law, and suppose that this year there was introduced factory legislation which made it necessary for the factory owner to do certain things. The inspector goes down to the factory, and he says: Have you fire escapes properly organized in your factory? No. Legislation which has been passed since you entered into your business says you must have those, and you must put them in and pay the expense yourself. Have you the machinery properly protected? No. The late legislation plainly says you must have it so protected, and you must pay the expense yourself. Now, Sir, the factory man has no right or reason to come to this Parliament and put his argument thus: I engaged in my business under certain conditions, made so by existing legislation; I took it with those conditions in prospect; I calculated what the profit would be after paying the expenses required to meet the existing conditions. Now you have gone to work and disturbed those and brought a great deal of expense upon me, and I demand that you should compensate me for that additional trouble and expense involved on me on account of the change you have made in your legislation. No such thing happens. My hon. friend says that Parliament does not take his factory from him. Now I wish to put this point to my hon. friend. I say that in justice and in truth it does not make the least difference in the principle whether you so legislate as to completely take away all the profits from that factory, or whether you simply legislate to take away \$10 profits from that factory. The principle is exactly the same, if you are talking of

principle. The principle is, on its broad foundation, simply this: That where you legislate to the detriment of a trade or interest you are bound to pay a reasonable compensation for that detriment, and on the grounds of justice it makes no difference whether the legislation causes a loss of \$100,000 or a loss of \$10. If you go to the ground of expediency or to other grounds, you may find a difference, and you may apply some different rule. But we are arguing, as we heard yesterday, on the ground of even, honorable justice, and on this ground the amount of loss that is entailed makes no difference with reference to the principle. Now the whole point between those prohibitionists who are in favor of compensation, and those others, be they prohibitionists or not, who are not in favor of compensation, hinges entirely, it seems to me, on this: Is the private property which is invested in the liquor traffic from first to last invested in that which works to the public injury or to the public good? If it be invested in that which works to the public injury, on the principle which we have laid down, and which my hon. friend did not contradict, and I think will not contradict, the state has a right to inhibit that particular use of that property and investment; it has the right to do it in the interests of the public, and on the ground that injury is being done as the outcome and result of this traffic. If you contend that the investment in the traffic is not being used to the injury of the public, then you have a basis or ground for demanding compensation; but if, as we hold, this investment is for the injury of the public we have good ground from which to contend that the state has a right to inhibit that use of it, and pay no compensation therefor. And I think I can challenge the production of a single instance in which property has been taken away by legislation, or the use of it inhibited, where that use was for the public injury—a single instance where such legislation has taken place in which any compensation whatever has been given by the Government or Parliament which passed the legislation. The fundamental principle then to be looked at is the difference in kind between this traffic and every other traffic. If this traffic were the same as the flour business, then, Sir, there would be a claim for compensation which no Parliament, no body of people, could overlook. Let us take the product of the miller: There is the farmer who raises the grain; there is the carrier who takes it to the mill; there is the miller who grinds it; and from the time the farmer puts his first ounce of labor on it till it comes out as bread on the table of the consumer, every bit of labor put upon it has added real actual value to the thing, and the product is increased in value by the labor which has been put on it. And when the consumers get it they get that which is food, from which they make brain and muscle, out of which they produce again larger quantities and greater results than is merely represented by the value of it. And, Sir, in the train of this there is no extraordinary disease, no extraordinary death, no extraordinary burdens of pauperism or crime that are entailed on the community in this business. But when we come to the liquor traffic there is a difference from first to last. From the time the farmer sows his grain until it is set before the consumer I contend that every ounce of labor which is expended on it is labor which is wasted. It is labor which is worse than wasted, Sir. It is labor which is put on something which in the end is not only wasteful but is worse—is destructive; and so there is no parallel between the miller's business and the distiller's business, so far as the *rationale* of the two businesses is concerned. Then what happens besides in this second business. Last year 2,384,424 bushels of grain were consumed in making the beer and alcoholic liquors consumed in this country. Can it be contended that the result, as it went into the hands of the consumers and was consumed, could at all be comparable for sustaining life and giving brain and muscle to the food which had been destroyed in order to make the substance itself? More than that, the labor was drawn from

other and productive fields in the making and distribution of this product. More than that 10,000 waste banks were set up in this country in which the people of this country deposited of their earnings, \$30,000,000 or thereabout, and from which the depositors took no principal home, and they got no interest for their deposits. It is so much money taken out from the people, and they got nothing that helps and much that does incalculable injury in return for it. Not only that, Sir, but labor is destroyed and idleness is produced as the direct result of this whole traffic. It is contended that in Great Britain, and it was contended on the authority and as the result of a Royal Commission to enquire into this matter, that one-sixth of the labor power of Great Britain, was lost to the country because of the traffic in intoxicating liquors. That serves to show that a vast deal of labor is lost to the country because of the traffic. Now, I do not pretend to say how much it is in this country, but suppose we make a calculation which cannot be impugned on the ground of extravagance. Suppose that 10,000 drink-selling places in the course of a year take away 5,000 laborers or the equivalent of 5,000 laborers. Suppose that the 10,000 places for the sale of intoxicating liquors take out of the productive labor of the country labor which would equal that of 5,000 persons, and I think that is not an excessive estimate. Those persons' labor is certainly worth in each case \$400 per year, and the 5,000 multiplied by 400 makes \$2,000,000, which will serve to show on this low basis of calculation that the productive labor power destroyed by this traffic in each year is certainly not less than \$2,000,000 per year. More than that, we know from vital statistics, from the results of researches which have been made by eminent scientific men and scientific bodies, that a great deal of life is sacrificed every year because of the traffic. Suppose we make the estimate that in the Dominion of Canada 3,000 lives are sacrificed annually to this traffic, and that from these 3,000 men ten years of prospective life is taken away from the country, which life they would have lived and in which they would have labored, had it not been for their being prematurely cut off as the result of the traffic. Those ten years of 3,000 persons every year is equivalent to 30,000 years' labor, and that at the same value of \$400 per year as before would make a loss in labor power of \$12,000,000 to this country each year. I am persuaded that any man may take these estimates, and though he may criticise them in many ways, he certainly will not have as the burthen of his criticism that the estimate is too high. I present them merely to emphasise this fact that the labor power of the country has a serious drain put upon it as the result of this traffic. More than that, Sir, the burden of poverty and of crime which is laid upon the country as a direct result of this traffic is great. I wish to present just the barest outline of last year's statistics in Ontario alone with reference to that matter. I find that in the Province of Ontario last year there were committed to the common gaols 9,830, with a cost of maintenance of \$44,783; that in the prisons there were 995, with a cost of maintenance of \$32,190; that in the Boys' Reformatory and the Mercer House there were 321 and 303 respectively, with a cost of maintenance of \$26,120 and \$21,568 respectively; making altogether a large amount of money which was paid out for the maintenance of criminals of this class in the Province of Ontario alone. The report of the Bureau of Statistics in Massachusetts, after exhaustive researches, makes the calculation that 84 per cent. of criminality is due directly or indirectly to the liquor traffic. Then, 84 per cent. of that cost of maintenance in Ontario amounts to \$105,515 every year, which at a low estimate the Province of Ontario pays out for the maintenance of that portion of its criminals in gaols, prisons and reformatories, which is found, as we may conclude after proper investigation, to be caused by the liquor traffic. More than that, Sir, the asylums

in Ontario had in them last year 2,890 inmates, and the cost of their maintenance was \$273,040. The Earl of Shaftesbury, who for a long time served on the Commission of Lunacy in Great Britain, and who was, I think, for about 20 years its chairman, gave as his opinion that three-fifths of the insanity of Great Britain was due directly or indirectly to the liquor traffic. I am assuming here but 50 per cent., showing in the case of Ontario the sum of \$136,520. Adding that to the cost of the maintenance of criminals due to the liquor traffic gives \$242,035 as the cost of the maintenance of crime and insanity in Ontario paid for by the Ontario Government as the proportion of cost which is due to the liquor traffic. Sir, it cannot be said of any other traffic or business in the world that it is responsible for anything approaching that amount of crime, and for the burden of crime which is placed upon the different countries in the world for its maintenance, its watching and its punishment. More than that; in 1881, Sir, we find that the arrests in all the cities of Ontario footed up to 13,196; and of those the arrests for drunkenness and drunkenness and disorderly conduct alone numbered 6,926, giving 45 per cent. of the total criminality in the cities of Ontario in that year as being for drunkenness and drunkenness and disorderly conduct alone. You may go outside of that, and find all the crimes which come from this as a proximate or indirect cause; but that is sufficient, and it will show you that the vast burden entailed upon our Provinces and our cities for the watching and guarding and maintenance of criminals comes directly from this traffic, and it comes from no other traffic which we have in this country. It is upon that ground, Sir, that prohibitionists are able to contend that they have a right to stop the use of property which is devoted to a purpose the ultimate outcome of which brings so many burdens and entails so great an expense on the community. The traffic is not a traffic of our creation. It has unsurpassed control against the protests of the people; it has remained in spite of the warnings of the people; it has fed and grown rich by the spoliation of the people. The property in it is not required or to be taken for public uses, and on that ground should have no compensation. The property, as the ultimate outcome shows, is devoted to the injury of the body politic, and consequently the people and the Government have a right to curtail it, destroy it, and give it no compensation in return. Mr. Speaker, I thank you and the House for the attention you have given to these remarks. I wished to have this discussion go on, and wished to lay before the House my views with reference to this resolution from one standpoint, so that if they be wrong, they may be refuted. All we want in this country is to get at the right idea, and we can only get at right ideas and conclusions by persistent discussion; and I believe the people of this country, and the Parliament of this country as representing the people, will, as the ultimate outcome of this discussion, do what is just and honest and fair; but we shall never get at the truth by refusing to discuss the question or by shelving it in any way. We have to discuss it and decide upon it, and it is best, in the ultimate interests of justice and even-handed fair play, that it should be discussed thoroughly and generously; and then time should be given to the people to make up their minds with reference to it. In conclusion, I would like just to leave one thought which may be elaborated, if any person thinks worth while to elaborate it, and which may perhaps form an element in the discussion and in the ultimate decision. It is this: What are we asked to compensate the traffic for? Are we asked to compensate it for any prospective profits it might make? I think no person puts forth so absurd a claim as that. I do not think the resolution of my hon. friend contemplates that at all. Then we may put that out of the way. The prospective profits, what might be made in the long years to come, we do not propose to compensate

Mr. FOSTER.

them for, and it is not asked that we should. What are we asked to compensate them for, then? The capital they have accumulated? Whence does the capital come? Most of this they have laid up from profits, and put from their profits into capital and stock; and this property and stock it is not proposed to take from them or to touch. No person proposes to confiscate their past profits. The stock they have to-day in liquors no one proposes to confiscate. Every honorable man and every reasonable man proposes to give them long enough time to get rid of their stock, if any measure of prohibition is passed, so that when the measure of prohibition comes into actual force, they need not have one single dollar's worth of their stock on hand to be a loss to them. Are we to compensate them for their buildings and real estate? All the buildings and real estate have come out of the profits of the traffic of preceding years, and for such I think they have not very much claim upon us for compensation. These are the accumulations of years of the profits of their traffic, and the country says and can say truly: Whilst you have had these profits and have amassed this accumulated capital, we have had all the disadvantages of the trade, we have had all the burdens to bear, and we have had to bear the losses and to take care of the burdens which have come as an indirect or direct result of the traffic. Who is to pay this compensation? I will put a practical question to my hon. friend the mover of this resolution. Will he take with him the 130 brewers and distillers and go down to any county in this Dominion, call the hard working people together in assembly, and stand up before them on the platform, and looking into their faces over which have passed years of experience, say to them: Here am I and these poor brewers and distillers who want compensation; we propose, now, not to allow them to brew or distill any more, and we propose now that they have a capital of five, six, or twelve million dollars, to call upon you, poor hard working people, to put your hands into your pockets and compensate them. How many votes does my hon. friend suppose he would get from the hard working men of this country in favor of such a proposition? They would reply that all these men had acquired, all they had accumulated in years past, had first passed through the hands of the workingmen, had been wrested from the fruits of their hard toil; they would say that there had been no tribute laid upon this country so heavy as this which they paid out of their homes and their own earnings; they would reply, that they did not propose to add to the burdens they had already borne this unnecessary burden to compensate men who are now rich, and whose riches had been accumulated by means of this traffic. They would say—leave us the future, and let us live happily and prosperously and become independent, without having this abuse from past ages, this worst of all tyrannies, this slavery than which no slavery is so grinding or so far reaching in its effects, further perpetuated.

Mr. JAMIESON. When I say that I do not propose to discuss the principle involved in this resolution, it will be discussed to all that I have no intention of making a speech. I have but a remark or two to make in the line taken by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. Fisher), whose amendment I had the honor to second. I think his view of the question is a very proper one. I am prepared to admit at the outset that the question is a very important one and ought at the proper time to receive proper consideration; but for my part, and I think I speak not only my own views but the views of several hon. members of this House, and also the views of a very large portion of the electorate of this country, when I say that I think this question is one that properly ought to be considered when the question of prohibitory legislation is brought before the House. I do not feel disposed to commit myself to any bald resolution, but I will say that when the Government of the

day or this House, in its wisdom, thinks proper to enact a prohibitory liquor law, and that law has embodied in it the principle of compensation to the class of persons referred to in the resolution of my hon. friend, I for one will be prepared calmly, honestly, and candidly to consider the question of compensation, and perhaps will go so far as to say that at the present moment I would concede it. I am not disposed to go as far as the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. Possibly he may be right. He opposes *in toto* the principle of compensation. Well, I think there may be circumstances in which compensation might be conceded, and at the proper time, when this question of prohibition comes before Parliament, there is a large class of temperance men, both in this House and out of it, who will fairly discuss the question of compensation. I do not think it would be right to discuss that question when it does not come up in a practical way. Now I hold that we cannot discuss it in a practical way in advance because we do not know what the circumstances of the country or the circumstances of the traffic may be at the time that a prohibitory liquor law may be submitted to this House. If the votes which have been given on the Canada Temperance Act during the past year can be taken as any indication of public sentiment, and I have no doubt that such votes are an indication of public sentiment, it will be a very short time before this House will be called upon to deal with this question. It has forced itself upon this House and the electorate of this country, and I have no doubt it will force itself upon the members of this House more strongly when they go back to their constituents for the election at the next general elections. This is all I have to say upon the question. I simply rose to say that I was not prepared, and there are a great many members in this House who are not prepared at the present time to discuss this question, and I do not feel disposed to be committed to the view, although perhaps the hon. member who has just sat down is correct, which he holds on this question to day. I believe that the people in favor of prohibition in this country are prepared at any moment when this question is brought in a practical shape before the House, to meet the case of the men whose interests would be affected by prohibition in a fair and reasonable way, and I have no doubt that many of them would concede a fair degree of compensation, although I, for my part, would not concede it for any great extent.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Following in the line of the last speaker, I wish to say that I do not think members of this House are called upon at this time to discuss the question of compensation. I do not understand that the question of compensation is before us. Between the resolution and the amendment to it, the question is: What is the proper time to consider the question of compensation? To my mind it is clear and conclusive that the proper time will be whenever the question of prohibition is before us. Has the Ministry brought before us any measure dealing with prohibition? I believe it has not. When we are called upon to consider that question, or when, as is more likely, some future Parliament will be called upon to deal with it, it will have been fully considered by the people, our masters, and Parliament will have received instructions in that direction. It seems to me that to enter upon this question at the present time is like giving judgment before hearing the evidence. It seems to me as if we were called upon to constitute ourselves a grand jury and to instruct the petty jury, who will hear all the evidence and decide upon it. I do not think we ought to assume that we have all the wisdom of present and future Parliaments. When these questions are to be considered, it will probably be by a Parliament elected for that purpose. Is there any new distillery proposed to be constructed? Is this an attempt to throw an anchor to windward? Is there anything at this time to show that this question is not prematurely

brought before us? I do not think we should assume that we have all the wisdom of the past and of our successors. When the question of prohibition comes before us or our successors, the question of compensation will naturally arise with it, and then I think is the time to decide. The question before us is not the question of prohibition and this is not the proper time to consider the question of compensation.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Fisher :

That all the words after the word "That" be left out, and the following inserted instead thereof: "the time when Parliament proceeds to discuss the details of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for beverage purposes, will be the proper occasion on which to discuss the question of compensation to the manufacturers of such liquors, as may come under the operation of such law."

YEAH :

Messieurs

Allen,	Dundas,	Mackenzie,
Allison,	Dupont,	Mackintosh,
Amyot,	Edgar,	Macmaster,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Anger,	Farrow,	McIsaac,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fisher,	McLellan,
Baker (Missisquoi),	Fleming,	McMullen,
Baker (Victoria),	Forbes,	Mills,
Barnard,	Foster,	Montplaisir,
Béchar,	Gagné,	Mulock,
Bell,	Geoffrion,	Pain,
Belleau,	Gigault,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Gillmor,	Platt,
Blake,	Gordon,	Ray,
Blondeau,	Gunn,	Reid,
Bourassa,	Hackett,	Rinfret,
Bourbeau,	Harley,	Riopel,
Bryson,	Hay,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Hickey,	Scrifer,
Cameron (Huron),	Hilliard,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Inverness),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Homer,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Taylor,
Casey,	Jamieson,	Temple,
Catudal,	Jenkins,	Townshend,
Cimon,	Kaulbach,	Trow,
Cochrane,	King,	Vail,
Cockburn,	Kinney,	Vanasse,
Colby,	Kirk,	Wallace (Albert),
Cook,	Landry (Kent),	Watson,
Daoust,	Langelier,	White (Renfrew),
Davies,	Laurier,	Wigle,
De St. Georges,	Lister,	Wilson, and
Dickinson,	Macdonald (King's),	Yeo.—105.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Abbott,	Girouard,	Orton,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Ouimet,
Benson,	Guilbault,	Paterson (Essex),
Bergeron,	Haggart,	Pinsonneault,
Bergin,	Hall,	Pope,
Billy,	Hesson,	Pruyn,
Bossé,	Hurteau,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bowell,	Irvine,	Rykert,
Burns,	Kranz,	Scott,
Caron,	Landerkin,	Small,
Chapleau,	Landry (Montmagny),	Springer,
Costigan,	Langevin,	Sproule,
Coughlin,	Lesage,	Stairs,
Coursol,	Livingstone,	Tassé,
Curran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Tupper,
Cuthbert,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Tyrwhitt,
Dawson,	McCallum,	Valin,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	McCarthy,	Wallace (York),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	McDongald (Pictou),	Weldon,
Desjardins,	McDongall (U. Breton),	Wells,
Dodd,	McGreevy,	White (Cardwell),
Dugas,	McNeill,	White (Hastings),
Ferguson (Welland),	Massue,	Williams,
Fortin,	Moffat,	Wood (Brockville).—74.
Gaudet,	O'Brien,	

Amendment agreed to.

Main motion, as amended, agreed to.

CARRIERS BY LAND.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 13) respecting Carriers by Land.

Mr. BLAKE. I think some time ago it was understood that this Bill, with a Bill on the same subject introduced by one of the members from Middlesex (Mr. Coughlin), should be discussed together, and the First Minister undertook that twenty-four hours' notice should be given for the consideration of the constitutional point which might arise on those Bills.

Mr. McCARTHY. When was that arrangement made?

Mr. BLAKE. When the hon. gentleman was absent.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is so. It was agreed that the House should have full notice, as a constitutional question was to be raised.

Mr. McCARTHY. I give notice that I will go on with it at the next opportunity.

Order postponed.

INTERNATIONAL FERRIES.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 17) respecting International Ferries.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). In accordance with the notice I have given, I am asking that this Bill should be referred to a select committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection to the Bill being read the second time and referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. CASEY. I think the hon. gentleman would do better to give a brief explanation of the object of this Bill, even before it passes a second reading for the purpose of going to the committee. There may be something objectionable in it.

Mr. CAMERON (West Huron). It is important to have some explanation. Not long ago a Bill passed without discussion and the next day it was seen to be a very improper Bill and a Bill which, if it had been discussed, would not have been read a second time. I think we ought to have, from the hon. gentleman, some explanation of the scope of the Bill, and what he proposes to accomplish by it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Our practice with respect to public Bills has, I think, been altogether erroneous. I think it would be well if it were understood that we should resume the practice that prevails in England with respect to all public Bills. With respect to them the statement is made on the first reading; any hon. member who asks leave to introduce a Bill has to give reasons to Parliament why that Bill is introduced. It is elaborated and fully reported, and then when the second reading comes, the House is prepared to discuss the Bill after having heard the introductory remarks of the hon. member. That rule is so stringent in England that it is not considered right, as a general rule, for a member who has introduced a public Bill to move the second reading with a speech; it is considered that he has made his speech on the first reading, and that it is not fair to the House that he should make another speech on the Bill. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, may remember that Mr. Gladstone—who broke that rule on one occasion, on a very important occasion, when he wished to impress a new and additional view—was taken very strongly to task for having broken the ordinary rule. I dare say in that case he was quite right, on account of the exceptional nature of the Bill. But the consequence of allowing hon. members to move a public Bill without saying a word is this: that the Bill is introduced, it is printed, and I am afraid that the

Mr. FAIRBANK.

majority of the House do not look at the Bill; they wait for the discussion to learn its nature. This is *par parenthèse*. With regard to this Bill I must say that I do not admit every provision of it. There is one clause in it, for instance, that by which ferry leases may be granted for fifty years, which looks very like a monopoly. As far as that clause is concerned, I would object to it strongly. Still, I have no objection that the Bill should be read, on condition that it goes to the Committee on Banking and Commerce to consider it fully.

Mr. BLAKE. I am disposed to attach more importance to the hon. gentleman's *parenthèse* even than to his comments on the principle which he has enunciated, and in which I concur. I was delighted to hear his statement. What he says is quite true, but it is quite true that we depart from it very seriously in this House. I think, however, that it is not our Canadian Gladstone, but our Canadian Disraeli, who is himself the greatest sinner of anybody in this House in this particular. He has, time and again, introduced Bills without discussion, or with such a very slight sketch of their provisions that the House was quite surprised when they came to read in print what the hon. gentleman had stated as apologetic and parenthetical matter. What he left out was the most of it. But I really hope that the House will take to heart, and that the hon. gentleman himself will take to heart, the observations he has made. I think it is of great consequence that the House should have a full statement, an expository statement, of the entire matter of the Bill upon the motion for leave. This is an occasion on which, as a rule, unless one very well understands the details, there cannot be much discussion, though observations may be thrown out; but the statement of the mover as to the provisions of the Bill and his reasons therefor, I think ought to be made at the earliest stage.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad my hon. friend agrees with me in the main, but I do not think that I am obnoxious to the charge that he made. When I have introduced a public Bill I have always made a statement in the first place before asking leave to introduce the Bill. As the hon. gentleman truly says, it would not be of very great advantage to enter into the details, because with the Bill yet *in petto*, yet in the hands of members, criticisms of its provisions would be of no value. I have always tried to make a statement of the general principle of the Bill which I was introducing. As the hon. gentleman says, my speeches were short, but then I made them fully aware of the intelligence and the quick perception of those hon. gentlemen who heard me.

Mr. PATTERSON (South Essex). If it is the desire of the House I shall be happy briefly to state the principle of the Bill. It applies to all international ferries between Canada and the United States. The ferry licenses are to be issued by the Governor in Council, and it is left to the discretion of the Governor in Council to fix the time for which a license shall be granted. It is found that when a ferry is only licensed for five years the people will not invest their money in the construction of safe iron boats, such as are required to ply across the St. Lawrence river between Prescott and Ogdensburg, between Windsor and Detroit, Sarnia and Port Huron, and a number of other places. The Bill does not fix every license for fifty years, but it leaves that to the discretion of the Governor in Council, who will be guided by the various interests involved and the amount of money invested in these boats when they grant the leases. Then it restores to the various municipalities the powers that were taken from them by the Act of 1870; it gives back to them the control of the ferry system, the tolls, and the manner of regulating the conduct of the licenses, penalties for contravention of the Act, etc. All moneys arising out of such licenses, as well as the fines and

penalties, shall belong to the municipality within the limits of which the Canadian terminus of such ferry is situated. There is a provision that it shall not affect the vessels plying between ports in Canada. It also has a provision that any company established in Canada for ferry purposes may amalgamate with companies in the United States; and it makes provision for the company taking possession of needed property for ferry purposes. It restores the Act which was in force prior to Confederation. If the First Minister will consent, I prefer that the Bill be referred to a special committee, consisting of members who are locally interested in ferries of this kind, and I have given notice of the following as the committee: Messrs. Gillmor, Hickey, Benson, Wood (Brockville), Gunn, Wigle, Smyth, Lister, Rykert and Ferguson (Welland), and the mover. These are gentlemen interested in international ferries, and they understand the working of the law and the necessity of making some changes in it, with a view to dealing effectively with this subject. If the First Minister declines to accept my suggestion, the Bill can be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CASEY. It strikes me, from the cursory glance which I have been able to take of this Bill, and from what I have been able to hear of the hon. gentleman's remarks, that it is a Bill that should be introduced by the Government after carefully considering all the interests that can possibly be affected by it. It is a Bill respecting international ferries, and it therefore requires at least as much and as careful consideration, and should be dealt with by responsible Ministers as much as any Bill regarding a general Act or respecting the building of bridges or the connections of Canadian railways with American railways, or subjects of that class. The Bill proposes to entrust very large powers to municipalities in Canada in which one of the termini of the ferry may be located. As these ferries are, to a great extent, not for the convenience of the locality at all, but for the convenience of the general public—I refer to the large car ferries making connections with railways—the measure is one which should be introduced by the Government.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). The Bill does not include the railway ferry boats.

Mr. CASEY. I did not notice that limitation, and if it is contained in the Bill, it disposes of the objection to a certain extent. But all these ferries are for the convenience of the general travelling public, and I doubt whether we have such complete control as to determine the description of vessels to be used; or, indeed, whether it is quite constitutional for us to deal with municipalities in this way—whether, in fact, we have power to entrust them with authority of this kind or not. I am not quite clear on that point, but it is one which should have been considered by the Government before the Bill was introduced. I have not been able to find any exemption of car ferries in the Bill, and one or two of my friends have likewise been unable to find it. What clause covers it?

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). It is at the end of clause 7.

Mr. CASEY. There is a clause at the end of the Bill which gives to ferry proprietors the same powers as are conferred on railway companies in regard to the expropriation of land. Considering that ferry proprietors may be very large corporations or very insignificant individuals, I do not think it is wise to give them general powers to expropriate land. I suppose a person running a flat boat, only able to carry two or three persons at a time across a river, will be a ferry proprietor under the meaning of the Bill.

Mr. PATTERSON (Essex). Not unless he is licensed.

Mr. CASEY. Of course; if licensed, he will be a ferry proprietor under the meaning of the Bill. He will have the right to establish a ferry at such point as he chooses along the river front; he can take possession of so much land as is necessary for ferry purposes where he likes, to the great injury and inconvenience of the proprietors, who would not be compensated by money or by the convenience given to the public by the ferry. That clause, I think, needs reconsideration; and it should be considered whether such a clause should be inserted in the Bill or not. For these reasons I regret that the Government did not see fit, if they deemed it necessary that a measure should be introduced, to introduce such a Bill themselves, and give it their fullest consideration. As it seems impossible to enter into these different points at the second reading, they will have to be dealt with when the Bill is in committee.

Mr. FERGUSON (Welland). I cannot see the object of proposing legislation of this kind at this particular time. Unless there is some international arrangement arrived at, the Government have no right to license a ferry, for neither the Government nor the municipalities can act without the consent of the Government on the other side or of the municipality adjoining. This matter has been determined in regard to the ferry between Fort Erie and Buffalo. The Government licensed a company, and the company had to buy out the rights of the company which had the ferry on the other side, and had to obtain the consent of the municipality of Buffalo before they could run a ferry. I brought up this question about six or eight months ago, and I understand that some international arrangements are now being entered into by which the whole question will be settled as between the two countries. I cannot see any good in legislating at this particular time. If this Bill were to proceed, however, I would object to any company owning wharves, because such ownership would virtually give a monopoly for all time to come to that particular ferry. The wharves should be owned by the Government, and when the Government grant a license to a new company they should give them the use of the wharves; but if an individual who formerly owned the ferry owned the wharves, he could practically exclude anybody running a ferry there under a license. I think legislation of this kind, unless some international arrangement is made, can be of no avail and can possess no value, either to this House or the country. As I have stated, the municipality on the opposite side of the river now controls the matter. The city of Buffalo controls it, as regards the crossing from Fort Erie, and an ordinance of that municipality has to be obtained before the ferry can get leave to land on the American side of the river. Five years is entirely too short a time. In any legislation the Government should own the wharves, and the time should be sufficiently extended, so that compensation may be obtained by parties who put on large boats, involving a large expenditure; but the proprietors should not get any right to expropriate land for wharves because they would then be owned by individuals, and a Government license to run a ferry would, under such circumstances, possess no value.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. Ferguson), and I have had some experience of the difficulties connected with the licensing of international ferries. It is true that this Parliament has no power to make a law bearing on the other side of the St. Lawrence in foreign territory. Under the Act of 1870 we can grant a license to a company for a ferry, so far as our side of the river is concerned. It is true it gives no rights to a company on the other side of the river, and difficulty thereby occurs. It is, perhaps, not correct, however, to state that the municipality of Buffalo controls the Fort Erie ferry; the people of Buffalo are just in the same position as we are, and neither of us control the ferry.

The authorities on the American side could make any laws within their powers; they could throw obstacles in the way of any company licensed by the Dominion Government, just as the people on this side could throw obstacles in the way of any company licensed by the American authorities. The hon. gentleman is also quite right in stating that having experienced these difficulties, which were of a very serious character, we had communication with the authorities of the United States, with a view of coming to some arrangement by which a more satisfactory system of letting these ferries could be arrived at. Unfortunately, however, the correspondence we had did not make sufficient progress to enable the Government to introduce, during this Session, such an amendment to the present Act as would remove those difficulties, but I trust that the communications we are having on this subject will result in such a settlement as will relieve the licensing of the international ferries of the difficulties now complained of.

Mr. BLAKE. I think there is another subject of a cognate character which should attract the attention of the Government. My own opinion has been, with reference to these international communications—whether ferries or bridges—that it was the business of this Government to communicate with the United States, or with the state authorities in the immediate neighborhood—for I fancy both of these sovereignties have to be consulted—with reference to the general plan of operations, the working of railway bridges, the corporations which should control them, the rates of fares, and so on. All these matters—the authority, the jurisdiction by which litigation should be settled by the various corporations who may have the right to share in the use of the bridge—are in a great state of confusion, owing to the sort of exclusive jurisdiction which now prevails. I hope the hon. gentleman, while promoting communication with the authorities on the other side, on this subject of ferries, will not leave this other subject out of consideration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to the railway bridge communication between the United States and Canada I think the practice has been pretty regular and well understood. For instance, in the case of any bridge crossing the St. Lawrence, the consent of the United States is always to be obtained. I do not know whether that is sufficient, but we assume it to be, though perhaps an Act of Congress would be required if that point were raised in the United States. But we get the assent of the Federal Government, and that assent once being had, then all the arrangements must be made between Canada and the particular state south of the water to be crossed, as, for instance, the state of New York. I do not know that we can do much more with respect to bridges in that regard. With respect to ferries, that question has, of course, to be settled.

Mr. BLAKE. I have failed, I find, to make myself understood by the hon. gentleman. It is not so much with reference to the initiating authority as to making, by convention between the two countries, some arrangement by which, in suing or being sued, and in establishing rights by those entitled to go over the bridge—for these purposes I say some tribunal should be established. The law now is, I think, that you may sue in this country with reference to that right on this side, but the decision would be operative only as to about one-half the bridge, and it would not affect the rights, which may be different, on the other side. There are questions of different conclusions being arrived at on both sides, and that condition of things is, I think, very unfortunate with respect to those large bridges.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman propose to send this Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee?

Mr. COSTIGAN.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Has the hon. gentleman considered whether or not that is desirable? There is no use in sending it to that committee unless the House is disposed to affirm the principle. The Railways and Canals Committee would be better, for it seems a little out of the purview of the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is a question of commerce.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Perhaps it is, but it is more closely a question of railways. But there is another point of importance, and that is, are the Government prepared to sustain the view that this business should be relegated to the municipalities. Are they satisfied that it is better for us to affirm that principle? I have not been able, more than the hon. gentleman, to look at the Bill very carefully, but it appears to me that it is somewhat a questionable principle to hand over international ferries, even for a short time, to the municipalities and the Governor in Council. I think, as there are only a few, and as they are of great importance, we might deal with each separately.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would like to get the opinion of the Banking and Commerce Committee on some of these points. There will be, I suppose, negotiations with the American Government on them, and I would like to know what the committee think should be the stipulations, so that, having their opinion, it would strengthen our hands in the negotiations.

Mr. MILLS. If it is proper to send the Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee, it should be introduced by resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

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

After Recess.

BETTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY.

Mr. CHARLTON moved the second reading of Bill (No. 19) to provide for the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, by prohibiting Sunday excursions in certain cases. He said: In rising to-night to advocate the passage of this Bill, I will acknowledge that the propriety of my course would be open to doubt, were there no other law to warrant it than mere human law. But, Sir, there is such a thing as a higher law, a law recognised by this nation, which is avowedly a Christian nation, and recognised by all Christian nations; and it is under the warrant and the provisions of that law that it is proper to urge the passage of a Bill of the character of that now before the House. If we had nothing but mere human law to actuate us, it would not be proper to urge the Bill; but as human law is overshadowed by this higher law, the human law-giver has no right to pass an enactment that supersedes the decalogue. The human legislature has no right to pass an enactment that defies or sets at naught the spirit of justice and truth. The human law-giver may not pass a law that casts discredit upon morality. The higher law is, in fact, the law of the world. We have it expressly declared by the Almighty that "By Me kings reign and princes decree justice." All human laws should be tried by this higher law; all the world is under it to-day, whether that law is recognised by the world or not; and by the provisions of this higher law, governors, princes, kings, and the people of this earth shall ultimately be judged. Now, Sir, the requirement of the observance of the Sabbath forms a part of that higher law. It is one of the provisions of the Decalogue which is binding upon man. And if we turn to ecclesiastical utterances, we

shall find that, so far as the authorities of the Protestant Church are concerned, their utterances upon this point are a unit. There exists no diversity of opinion among them as to whether the fourth commandment is binding upon the human race and upon governments. If we turn to the utterances of the prelates of the Catholic Church, we shall also find their recognition of that law, clear and unmistakable. I find, Sir, that at the address of His Grace Archbishop Gibbons, of Baltimore, His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII delivered an earnest request to the Roman Catholic Church which opposes Sunday and festival profanation. From the address, which was published in the *Catholic Mirror*, of April 23, 1881, I take the following extract:—

"The observance of the Sacred Day which was willed expressly by God from the first origin of man, is imperatively demanded by the absolute and essential dependence of the creature upon the Creator. And this law, mark it well, my beloved, which at one and the same time so admirably provides for the honor of God, the spiritual needs and dignity of man, and the temporal well-being of human life. This law, we say, touches not only individuals, but also people and nations, which owe to Divine Providence the enjoyment of every benefit and advantage which is derived from civil society. And it is precisely to this fatal tendency, which to-day prevails, to desire to lead mankind far away from God, and to order the affairs of kingdoms and nations as if God did not exist, that to-day is to be attributed this contempt and neglect of the Day of the Lord. They say, it is true, that they intend in this way to promote industry more actively, and to procure for the people an increase of prosperity and riches. Foolish and lying words! They mean, on the contrary, to take away from the people the comforts, the consolations and the benefits of religion; they wish to weaken in them the sentiment of faith and love for heavenly blessings; and they invoke upon the nations the most tremendous scourges of God, the just avenger of His outraged honor."

This, Sir, is the language held by the head of the Roman Catholic Church. With regard to the utterances of the church dignitaries, I find that a pastoral was issued by His Grace Archbishop Taschereau, dated April 26, 1880, which is clear and emphatic in regard to this matter. The Archbishop, in referring to "a disorder which seeks the public gaze, and which causes deplorable scandal," says:

"We mean, O dearly beloved brethren, those pleasure excursions made on Sundays and feasts of obligation, on steamers, on the railway, and sometimes in a long train of vehicles. Experience proves that they give rise to such disorders of intemperance and immorality that we feel obliged to prohibit absolutely, and under pain of mortal sin, pleasure excursions on Sundays and feasts of obligation. * * * Wherefore, having invoked the holy name of God, we rule and ordain as follows:— 1st. We forbid, under pain of grievous sin, the faithful of this diocese, to take part on Sunday or feasts, in pleasure excursions, on railways, on steamers, or in vehicles, even when the profit of those excursions is intended for a good work. It is not our intention, however, to condemn the pilgrimages made on those days, provided recollection, piety, and good order be observed."

I will also refer, Sir, to a few other Roman Catholic authorities on this matter. Several bishops have issued able and timely addresses on the subject. The Bishop of Buffalo, in calling renewed attention to this subject, after forbidding pic-nics, excursions, fairs, etc., on Sundays and holy days, said:

"Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath Day, is God's own command. * * * We must not only rest from all unnecessary, servile work, but we must hear mass and spend the day—or, at least, a good part of it—in the service of God and religious duties. * * * Ours is not, as we have said, a Jewish or a Puritanical Sabbath, nor do we measure its obligatory observance by a sectarian standard or any American or national idea; yet we would be sorry to see the respect in which our separated brethren hold the Lord's Day weakened or discredited. God grant that we may never see the Sunday profaned here in our own country as we have seen it in other lands."

Bishop Keane, of Richmond, Va., at a meeting called by his authority, after a powerful address against the selling of liquor on Sunday, submitted a series of resolutions for adoption and a pledge for signature, setting forth the sacred obligation of keeping holy the Lord's Day, recognising the selling and drinking of liquor on that day as violations of the commandment of God and the precept of the Church, etc. Cardinal McCloskey, in 1882, said:

"We wholly denounce and absolutely forbid excursions or pic-nics on Sundays, or after dark, all moonlight excursions and all Sunday pic-nics, and we exhort our good people who love their church to abstain from

any participation in such scandalous, unhallowed and disgraceful practices, and to use all their influence to suppress them."

The following are extracts from New York papers, when Strakosch attempted Sunday operas there:—

"Cardinal McCloskey was reported in the *Herald* to have said: 'You may say that I am opposed to what is generally regarded as Sunday evening concerts, and that, while not very Puritanical or domineering, I oppose the sensational amusement, which advertises itself under the name of sacred concerts, but which is nothing else than the ordinary week day show,' etc.

Dr. McGlynn, a prominent Roman Catholic clergyman, is reported to have said:

"In France, Sunday is more of a tiresome holiday than a rest. This disregard for the Sabbath acts unfavorably on religion. The Sabbath I have always regarded as a great social conservator in this country. The regard in which Sunday has been held by the English-speaking nations, has had much to do with their keen sense of decorum and efficient organisation. * * * The Sunday rest should be a set-off to the weekly work, and Sunday night quiet, to the boisterousness and enjoyment of the week nights."

I add to these expressions of opinion, some utterances from eminent Protestant divines, selecting four or five extracts. The first is from the celebrated divine, Taylor-Lewis, LL.D., of New York, who says:

"What a hell-upon-earth would our great cities become, and in time our land become, with one day in seven given up to idleness, to the theatre, to dissipative shows, to unchecked intemperance, or to the driving on of that flood of worldliness, which, in spite of all religious restraint, is even now threatening destruction to all that is noblest and purest in our social life."

Rev. Dr. Kogel, a Court preacher in Germany, has delivered an address, in which is presented a sad view of the immorality of the Berlin people:

"The necessity of work, and the tyranny of work rob men of their Sunday rest. And the afternoon of Sunday, which a part of the working men have for themselves, is spent in dissipating pleasure, in drinking saloons and theatres, where all that is sacred is mocked and adultery glorified."

Dr. Arthur Pierson, of Philadelphia, in an address upon Sabbath observance, says:

"A community that consents to the wanton destruction of the Christian Sabbath is committing virtual suicide; it is like a man who cuts off his left arm with his right. And if you want to see the natural and providential retribution that follows such a course, go and study the history of the French Revolution, when a nation went down into the gulf of anarchy."

And again:

"Voltaire was no fool; he saw that an habitual observance of the Sabbath, with its stated seasons of religious meditation and public worship, must both preserve and extend Christianity in any community; and he acknowledged that he despaired of being able to expel from the world superstition, by which he meant religion, so long as persons assemble regularly and in large numbers for the worship of God. And you will find that wherever the Lord's Day is regarded as set apart by Divine authority, and is observed as a day of rest from ordinary work, and of occupation in spiritual things, the hold of both Christian precepts and moral principles is correspondingly firm and strong. The Sabbath is the very bulwark of social order."

But why multiply quotations from pastors and divines. I proceed to enquire whether Sabbath laws are inconsistent, firstly, with the higher law; secondly, whether they are inconsistent with the laws and institutions of this Empire; thirdly, whether they are inconsistent with the laws and institutions of the English-speaking nations and commonwealths; and, lastly, whether they are inconsistent with the principles of human liberty. This higher law with regard to the Sabbath of which I speak first, was not a law which governed the Jews in their observances under the Mosaic dispensation only, but it was a law coeval with creation itself. Two great institutions mark the first laws given to man. These two institutions are the rest of Sabbath and marriage. The Sabbath is instituted, the command is given in the same chapter, the second chapter of Genesis, as that in which the ordinance or sacrament of marriage is instituted. It is known that the Sabbath was observed long before the giving of the law upon Mount Sinai; Moses, himself, refers to breaches of this command. This command, that out of the seven days, one should be observed as a day of rest, was observed from the earliest days of creation; the

language of the commandment proves this. The language of the fourth commandment is to remember to keep holy the Sabbath day. "Remember" a law already in existence; remember a law now and hitherto binding upon you. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; and the reason is given: For in six days God made the heaven and the earth, and the sea and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh;" wherefore He blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it. The Decalogue which contains this command is a moral enactment not limited in its application to any race, area, or time. It is a law which prohibits not only Sabbath desecration but idolatry, blasphemy, disobedience to parents, falsehood, theft, and murder. All these crimes, as well as the crime of desecrating the Sabbath, are mentioned in this law. This seventh day, it is evident from the language of the Bible, was ordained by the Creator of the world. We are told in the New Testament that all things were made by Christ. We are told that for Him and by Him all things were created, and we are told that He is the Lord of the Sabbath, and that man was not made for the Sabbath but the Sabbath was made for man. Proceeding on this authority, we find that the laws of the nation of which we form part have recognised the binding character of Sabbath observance from the earliest ages. We find a statute passed in the year 876 by King Alfred, which distinctly recognised the binding character of the fourth commandment, which incorporated the entire Decalogue as part of the English law. We find that law reaffirmed and its provisions extended by various monarchs. The list of statutes in England referring to the command of Sabbath observance is a very long list. The law was amended in 925; it was again amended in 958; again in 1009; again in 1017; amended again in 1304 under Edward III; again in 1388 under Richard II; again 1428 under Henry VI; in 1464 under Edward IV; in 1552 under Edward VI; in 1558 under Elizabeth; in 1617 the colony of Virginia adopted the Sabbath law; in 1625 the law was again amended under Charles I; in 1643 the first Sabbath law in the colony of New Haven was adopted; in 1644 it was adopted in Scotland; in 1648 in Massachusetts; in 1648 in New York; in 1661 it was again amended and perfected in its operation in the reign of Charles II. In 1837 liquor selling was prohibited for the first time in Massachusetts, and in 1833 in Great Britain; in 1854 liquor shops were closed upon the Sabbath day in Scotland; and in the same year a proposition to open museums in London was defeated by a vote in the House of Commons by 237 to 48; in 1856 a similar proposition was defeated in the Commons by 376 to 48; and in 1878 it was defeated in the House of Lords by 76 to 39. The present English law with regard to the observance of the Sabbath is in many respects a stringent law. It is unnecessary to enter into details in regard to its provisions, but the fact that such a law exists upon the Statute Book of England is a proof that the power rests with the Government of England and with the Government of the colonies to make provisions with regard to the observance of the Sabbath. If we go to the country across the border we find that Sunday laws exist in every one of the thirty-seven States of the Union, except California. One general feature of these laws is the prohibition of any work on the Sabbath, except works of necessity and mercy. In the details of these provisions, various features exist, various differences exist in the different States. In some States only one local train and milk trains are permitted to run. In Massachusetts no train can run except by consent of the railroad commissioners. In all these States provisions are made for the purpose of securing the observance of the Lord's Day. My next enquiry will be: Are Sabbath laws, which we find exist upon the Statute Book of Great Britain, and which have been a part of the English code for a thousand years, which exist in every one of the American States but one, which exist in this country and exist in all the English colonies, are these laws inconsistent with the

Mr. CHARLTON.

principles of human liberty, are they an infringement on human right, or is there a sufficient reason for the enactment of these laws, consistently with the principles of human liberty? Law in the abstract expresses what just men will not do, and what other men must not do. Law restrains human liberty, it restrains the liberty of human action, it says that human action shall be free in certain directions and certain channels only, and, when human action transcends these bounds, then human law steps in and prohibits and punishes the transgression of the bounds laid down. The object of human law is to provide for the public good. That should be the object of it. The underlying principle should be the greatest good to the greatest number. It is upon this principle that the dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church have acted in the pastorals I have read. It is upon this principle that human law should be enacted. Now, Sabbath laws are not inconsistent with human liberty, in this respect, that they are calculated to promote public health. I find that, at the time the World's Exposition was held in London, 641 medical men of London, in a petition to Parliament against the opening of the Crystal Palace on the Sabbath for profit, said:

"Your petitioners, from their acquaintance with the laboring classes and the laws which regulate the human economy, are convinced that the seventh day of rest, instituted by God and coeval with the existence of man, is essential to the bodily health and mental vigor of men of every station of life."

This law also prohibits cruelty to animals. It may restrict human liberty in that respect, but it is consistent with it, because it is a humane and just law. This law promotes public morals. You have only to look at Sabbath lands and contrast the condition of those lands with that of lands where the Sabbath is not observed, and you will find proof enough of the assertion that it does promote public morals. It is again consistent with liberty, inasmuch as it is an educational law. The church and the Sabbath school are the mightiest educational agencies existing in the world to-day, and they have always been the mightiest educational agencies. The Christian church is the great educational agency, and we owe to it all that marks the difference between our condition and the condition of pagan lands. If we stop to consider, we will find that the Sabbath gives two-thirds as much time for study as the time devoted to study in the schools, if we deduct from the latter the time given for vacations. It is consistent again, with the principles of human liberty, because it conserves and protects the home. We find, as I stated a while ago, that marriage, the institution upon which the home and the family rest, was instituted at the same time as the Sabbath was instituted—both are Edenic institutions. And we will find, with reference to the influence of violations of the Sabbath upon homes, that the condition of homes where the Sabbath is not kept always presents an unfavorable contrast to the condition of Christian homes. Dr. Lowe, of Berlin, a physician in very extensive practice, states that in the course of his practice he had visited 9,000 Sabbathless homes, homes where the Sabbath was not kept, and he found in every case slovenliness, discord, slipshod family relations, no family life in fact, but wine shop, and vice, and dissipation usurping the life which should exist in the family. Sabbath rest is essential to the head of the family, because it is of the utmost importance that he should be enabled to spend one day in seven with his family; and, if good homes are the bulwark of the nation, as they unquestionably are, then any institution which is calculated to promote, to create, to multiply good homes, is an institution which is not inconsistent with human liberty, but one that should meet with the approval of every just and good man. Again, laws of this kind are not inconsistent with human liberty because they prevent crime. The great Daniel Webster said, in relation to this matter: "It is the bulwark of liberty because it is the bulwark of morality." Where no such laws

exist, the Sabbath is the most prolific of crimes of any day in the week. In December, 1882, the police of New York City commenced a stringent execution of the Sabbath laws in that city. All drinking places were closed, all infractions of the law were vigorously suppressed, and the consequence was that the streets of New York were as quiet as the streets of a country village, and the Monday calendar of crime was very much lighter than upon days when the Sabbath law had not been enforced in that city. Professor Rosher, the famous political economist of Leipzig, Germany, says: "It is a characteristic of society where the Sabbath is not observed that the Sabbath is the prolific day for suicides among women and Monday for suicides among men." The woman, sad and neglected at home, commits suicide on the Sabbath; and the husband, coming home from a Sunday's saturnalia, and spending a blue Monday, is likely, if he commits suicide at all, to commit it on that day. The special Sabbath Committee of the English Parliament in 1882, said: "It appears in evidence that in each trade, in proportion to the desecration of the Lord's Day, is the immorality of those engaged in it." S. Cutter, of the New York Prison Association, says: "Sabbath desecration is almost always connected with crime and is the forerunner of it." He also says that, out of every hundred men incarcerated in the Massachusetts state prison, at least ninety of them are Sabbath-breakers. Chaplain Barnes, of that prison, says: "When a church-goer comes to prison, it invariably makes a sensation among the prisoners." The celebrated judge, Matthew Hale, says that those convicted of capital crimes, when he was on the bench in the great majority of cases, confessed that the commencement of their career of crime lay in the neglect of the Sabbath; and Justice Strong, of the United States Supreme Court, gives utterance to the same sentiments. We will find that, wherever the cry is raised that the Sabbath must go, it is a hoodlum cry, that it is loudest among the vile, that it comes from the class opposed to all law, human and Divine, that it is the cry of the nihilist, of the socialist, and of that enemy of civilisation the dynamiter. The basest of all classes are the classes who are opposed to the restraints of the Sabbath. I urge, in the next place, that Sabbath enforcement is not inconsistent with the principles of human liberty, because it promotes the prosperity of the individual and the prosperity of the State. We have, in fact, the Divine promise that "in the keeping of my commandments there is great reward." That promise is always fulfilled. In keeping these commandments there is great reward—great reward to the individual, great reward to the nation. It ensures prosperity in the one case and in the other; and it will be found, Sir, that the best moral condition and the greatest industrial prosperity are always inseparable. It will be found, moreover, that every non-Sabbath-keeping country in the world is comparatively poor. If we compare the condition of England, the condition of the British Colonies, the condition of the United States, where the British and American Sabbath is kept, with the condition of such countries as China, India, Japan, Turkey, Russia, Germany, Italy and Spain, and the Spanish American States, we will find sufficient proof of this assertion. I notice, next, that the enforcement of Sabbath observance is not inconsistent with the principles of human liberty, because it promotes the best interests of the laborer and of the masses; it promotes, in short, the greatest good to the greatest number. The Sabbath is the day of rest; it is the law which gives the laboring man one day in seven as a day of rest; it is the law which shields him from the merciless exaction of capital, from the merciless exactions of those for whom he labors. We will find, Sir, that this one day in seven is a natural arrangement. Seven was the sacred number; the week of

the ancients was a week of seven days. Other periods of rest have been tried. Under the French Government, in the days of the Revolution, the Sabbath was abolished, and a rest of one day in ten was established, and experience proved that that was unnatural. One day in six has been tried, one day in eight, and one day in nine. One day in six has been found to result in the rest coming too often. Wherever the day of rest has been more seldom than one day in seven, experience proves that it does not come often enough, and that one day in seven is the natural period of rest. And, Sir, it is a law of nature that rest is required for animals—rest even is required for machinery. In fact, physicians will tell you that a cessation of medical treatment for one day in seven in almost all cases produces beneficial results. Now, Mr. Speaker, the laboring man is deeply interested in this matter. If Sabbath restrictions are observed the laboring man will receive six days' pay for six days' labor; but if the barrier of the Sabbath is broken down, the result proves that the laboring man receives six days' pay for seven days' labor; that the day of rest is gone, but the aggregate of the man's earnings is not increased. This, Sir, is always the case. It is well known that the tendency now-a-days is to over-production. The increased facility for production, by means of the discovery and improvement of machinery, renders it difficult to keep production within the bounds of the demand; and to increase the laboring days from six in a week to seven, is still farther to aggravate the evil of over-production that already exists. A fisherman of New Romney, in England, when on examination with regard to this matter of labor on the Sabbath, said he had discovered that Sunday fishing kept down the price of fish. There was a great deal of philosophy in that remark. Sunday fishing would keep down the price of fish. Sunday labor of this kind is detrimental to the interests of the laborer, of whatever calling the laborer may be. The celebrated Louis Blanc says:

"The English working man produces as much in 56 hours as the French working man does in 72, because his forces are better husbanded, in consequence of resting one day in the seven."

The celebrated John Stuart Mill says:

"The operatives are perfectly right in thinking that if there was no Sunday rest, seven days' work would have to be given for six days' pay."

And Paley, long ago, put the same truth more strongly, when he said:

"An addition of the seventh day's labor to that of the other six would have no other effect than to reduce the price."

An attack, Sir, upon Sunday rest is an attack upon the interest of the laborer, because Sunday's rest is the poor man's blessing and the poor man's day. To-day, Sir, in English-speaking lands, there are 2,500,000 people, to say nothing of those engaged in domestic service and in works of necessity, who are deprived of their Sunday rest—2,500,000 persons who are deprived, through the laxity of the laws with regard to this matter, of that great blessing which is their right. Now, Sir, there is a marked contrast between the mode of the observance of the Sabbath in Anglo-Saxon countries and upon the continent of Europe; and those who wish to introduce here the continental Sabbath in place of the Sabbath that we now enjoy, wish to confer upon this country a curse rather than a blessing. What is the character of the continental Sabbath? At most an hour in the morning is given to mass, and the rest of the day is dedicated to the world, the flesh and the devil. Horse-racing, parades, reviews, pic-nics, excursions, drinking, dissipation—a holiday for the rich, and a day of toil for the poor—these are the characteristics of the continental Sabbath. Another characteristic is, that the nations living under that Sabbath are yearly sinking into immoral-

ity and into crime. A very satisfactory proof of this will be shown by a comparison of the morals of the countries in which the British and the American Sabbath prevails, and the morals of countries living under the continental Sabbath. Take, as a criterion, the record of illegitimate births. They amount to 4 per cent. in London, to 34 per cent. in Paris, to 34 per cent. in Brussels, to 54 per cent. in Vienna, and to 72 per cent. of the whole number in Rome, against 4 per cent. in England. In some cities of the United States the continental Sabbath has been introduced. It has been introduced in Chicago, in St. Louis, in Cincinnati and in San Francisco; and in every one of those cities deaths by violence are more numerous in proportion to the population than in the worst governed countries in Europe, except Italy and Spain. The result of the introduction of the continental Sabbath into those cities is perfectly apparent. Look at Cincinnati, blood-stained and murder-cursed, with the worst classes of the population in possession of the city government, lawlessness and crime rampant and governing that city. Who are the champions of the continental Sabbath? Wherever you find the liquor dealer you will find one there. If you find a gambler, there is a champion of the continental Sabbath, and every prostitute is also a champion of it. Legislators of the type of Tweed and that villainous lot of New York aldermen who controlled the city under his *regime*—these are the advocates of the continental Sabbath. And what, Sir, are the characteristics of what they term a free Sunday? It is a Sunday free from rest, it is a Sunday free from religion, it is a Sunday free from mental culture, it is a Sunday free from moral improvement, it is a Sunday free for the employer to compel the employee to labor for him. These are the characteristics of the free Sunday, of the continental Sabbath. It is a sign of the march of improvement that there is a growing discontent with the continental Sabbath in Europe. The masses are beginning to realise that that mode of keeping the Sabbath is not one conducive to their welfare. They are beginning to chafe and grow restive under it, and agitation for its improvement is rife in that country. Sabbath societies have already been formed in Milan, in Rome and in Naples. In Germany the Catholics and Lutherans are petitioning the Government for a better observance of the Sabbath; and the Emperor William of Germany, and the Grand Duke of Baden, and the King of Wurttemberg, expressed sympathy with the object of these societies. Now, surely, I have given evidence enough to show that the continental Sabbath has proved to be a curse rather than a blessing on the continent. I might, Mr. Speaker, spend this whole night in giving evidence from great men, which point to the desirability of enforcing Sabbath observance. I will give a few of them. Blackstone says: "A corruption of morals usually follow a profanation of the Sabbath." De Tocqueville: "Despotism may govern without faith, but liberty cannot." Mirabeau: "God is as necessary as liberty to the French people." La Place: "I have lived long enough to know what at one time I did not believe, that no society can be upheld in happiness and honor without the sentiments of religion." George Bancroft: "Certainly our great united commonwealth is the child of Christianity, and it may, with truth, be asserted that modern civilisation springs into life with our religion, and faith in its principles is the life-boat on which humanity has, at divers times, escaped the most threatening perils." Franklin: "What are laws without morals, and whence shall we get morals except from religion?" Washington: "Reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle." Daniel Webster: "The longer I live the more highly do I esteem the importance of the proper observance of the Christian Sabbath, and the more grateful do I feel towards those who impress its importance on the community. Mr. H. Stewart, in an address at the Sabbath Con-

Mr. CHARLTON.

vention at Rochester, in 1842, said: "Every day's observation and experience confirm the opinion that the ordinances which require the observance of one day in seven, and the Christian faith which hallows it, are our chief security for all civil and religious liberty, for temporal blessings and spiritual hopes." When Sir John Sinclair wrote an essay against what he considered a Puritanical observance of the Sabbath in Scotland, his friend, Adam Smith, though an apologist for Hume, said: "Your book, Sir John, is very ably composed, but the Sabbath, as a political institution, is of inestimable value, independently of its claims to Divine authority." Sabbath observance has been advocated by such men as Gladstone, Disraeli, Shaftesbury, Argyle, Bright, Lincoln, Garfield and thousands of others. The action of the British Government in late years has been such as to show unmistakably the desire of the ruling classes in England to honor and observe the Sabbath. Three times, as I mentioned a short time since, has the British Parliament refused to consent to the opening of the British Museum on Sunday. The proposal has been defeated in each instance by an overwhelming majority. In the House of Commons it was defeated with only forty-eight votes in the affirmative, and in the House of Lords with but thirty-nine in the affirmative. When the Electrical Exhibition was held in Paris in 1881, the English and American Governments united in closing their exhibits on that day, and Mr. W. W. Aterbury, secretary of the New York Sabbath Association, in a letter to Secretary Blaine, called attention to the fact that the English and the United States Governments, at the time of the World's Exposition in London, honored the day by closing their exhibits, and he requested Mr. Blaine to instruct the American Minister at Paris that the same step might be taken with respect to the Electrical Exhibition. This is Mr. Blaine's reply:

"DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

"WASHINGTON, July 18, 1881.

"Sir—Your letter of the 14th instant, calling the attention of this Government to the propriety of respecting the Sabbath in the American section of the International Exhibition of Electricity, which is soon to be held at Paris, has been received.

"I have to inform you, in reply, that your timely suggestion meets with my cordial approval, and I have accordingly instructed Mr. Morton, the American Commissioner-General, and Mr. Walker, the Honorary Executive Commissioner, to adopt measures to secure the proper observance of the Sabbath in the American section of the Electrical Exhibition.

"I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"JAMES G. BLAINE."

When application was made to Senator Hawley, then president of the Centennial Exposition, to open the exhibition on the Lord's Day, his noble answer was: "Before God, gentlemen, I would not dare to open the Centennial gates on the Sabbath." So much for the utterances of great men upon this question. With respect to the observance of the Sabbath and the rules for its observance, and the tendency to set those rules at defiance, a new element has been introduced within late years. That new element is the supposed necessity for railway work. There are 900,000 railway employees in Great Britain, the United States and the British colonies, and in consequence of the action of the railway authorities with respect to work upon the Sabbath, at least one-half of those 900,000 are constantly employed on the Sabbath day. Their employment is a matter of great hardship. They are subjected to loss of their weekly rest. The consequence is a deadening of moral influences, and, to a great extent, loss of self-respect. This is a condition of things which does not meet with the approval of the railway employees. Nine out of ten feel it is a great hardship, and express their opinion against being compelled to work on the Sabbath. I have here a petition adopted by 450 locomotive engineers of the New York Central Railway, to Mr. Vanderbilt, for the cessation of Sunday labor. It is a document which covers the whole ground, and I will ask permission from the House to read it. In this document these railway engineers set forth to

this railway magnate their reasons for asking for a cessation of Sabbath work. They point out the evils of the system under which they are required to perform Sabbath labor. After pointing out how the running of trains on Sunday had become a great hardship, they continue:

"We have borne this grievance patiently, hoping every succeeding year that it would decrease. We are willing to submit to any reasonable privation, mental or physical, to assist the officers of your company to achieve a financial triumph; but after a long and weary service, we do not see any signs of relief and we are forced to come to you with our trouble, and most respectfully ask you to relieve us from Sunday labor, as far as it is in your power to do so. Our objections to Sunday labor are: First—this never-ending labor ruins our health and prematurely makes us feel worn out like old men, and we are sensible of our inability to perform our duty as well when we work to an excess. Second—that the customs of all civilized countries, as well as all laws, human and Divine, recognise Sunday as a day of rest and recuperation; and notwithstanding intervals of rest might be arranged for us on other days than Sunday, we feel that by so doing we would be forced to exclude ourselves from all church, family, and social privileges that other citizens enjoy. Third—nearly all of the undersigned have children that they desire to have educated in everything that will tend to make them good men and women, and we cannot help but see that our example in ignoring the Sabbath day has a very demoralizing effect upon them. Fourth—because we believe the best interests of the company we serve as well as ourselves, will be promoted thereby, and because we believe locomotive engineers should occupy as high, social, and religious positions as men in any other callings. We know the question will be considered: How can this Sunday work be avoided, with the immense and constantly increasing traffic? We have watched this matter for the past twenty years. We have seen it grow from its infancy until it has arrived at its now gigantic proportions, from one train on the Sabbath until we now have about thirty each way; and we do not hesitate in saying that we can do as much work in six days, with the seventh for rest, as is now done. It is a fact observable by all connected with the immediate running of freight trains that on Monday freight is comparatively light; Tuesday it strengthens a little, and keeps increasing until Saturday; and Sundays are the heaviest of the week.

"The objection may be offered, that if your lines stop the receiving points from other roads will be blocked up. In reply, we would most respectfully suggest, that when the main lines do not run, tributaries would only be too glad to follow the good example. The question might also arise, if traffic is suspended twenty-four hours, will not the company lose one-seventh of its profits? In answer, we will pledge our experience, health and strength, that at the end of the year our employers will not lose one cent, but, on the contrary, will be the gainers financially. Our reasons are these: At present, the duties of your locomotive engineers are incessant, day after day, night succeeding night, Sunday and all, rain or shine, with all the fearful inclemencies of a rigorous winter to contend with. The great strain of both mental and physical faculties constantly employed has a tendency, in time, to impair the requisites so necessary to make a good engineer. Troubled in mind, jaded and worn out in body, the engineer cannot give his duties the attention they should have in order to best advance his employer's interests. We venture to say, not on this broad continent, in any branch of business or traffic, can be found any class in the same position as railway men. They are severed from associations that all hold most dear, debarred from the opportunity of worship, that tribute man owes to his God, witnessing all those pleasures accorded to others, which are the only oasis in the deserts of this life, and with no prospect of relief. We ask you to aid us. Give us the Sabbath for rest after our week of laborious duties, and we pledge you that, with a system invigorated by a season of repose, by a brain eased and cleared by hours of relaxation, we can go to work with more energy, more mental and physical force, and can and will accomplish more work and do it better, if possible, in six days, that we can now do in seven. We can give you ten days in six if you require it, if we can only look forward to a certain period of rest. In conclusion, we hope and trust that, in conjunction with other gentlemen of the trunk lines leading to the seaboard, you will be able to accomplish something that will ameliorate our condition."

This memorial from the locomotive engineers to W. H. Vanderbilt covers the entire ground. It was a reasonable petition, an unanswerable petition, but a petition which was not granted by that magnate, though perhaps the time will come when he will answer for that failure to do his duty to his men in a court where the great railway prince will stand on the same level with the poor engineer-driver. There are some hopeful features, with regard to railway work on the Sabbath, and that is the evidence that almost all the railway managers are ill at ease with regard to this infraction of Sabbath laws. The editor of the *Chicago Railway Age*, Mr. E. H. Talbot, in 1883, opened a correspondence with various railway managers throughout the United States, with reference to the question of Sunday railway labor, asking their opinions as to whether the evil should not be lessened, and as to

whether Sunday traffic could not be abandoned. Many of these replies are of very great interest—of sufficient interest to warrant me, I think, in troubling the House with a few of them. I have one here from Mr. L. J. Sargeant, traffic manager of the Grand Trunk road. He says:

"GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY OF CANADA,
"TRAFFIC MANAGER'S OFFICE,
"MONTREAL, 26th May, 1883.

"To the Editors of the *Railway Age*:"

"I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter dated 21st instant, addressed to Mr. Hickson, and to inform you in reply, that it is not the practice of this company to run passenger trains on Sunday, excepting for the purpose of completing continuous journeys. Such trains, started on Saturday night, are permitted to go through to destination.

"As regards freight trains, we find it impracticable to suspend that service wholly on Sundays, and should only be able to do so by common agreement between all railway companies.

"On the whole, it is conceivable that the public may find the total suspension of trains on Sunday not to their benefit, as, for instance, in the case of a through train, which, if stopped on its journey, might cause serious inconvenience. At the same time it would be proper, both in the interest of railway employees and for the general benefit, that Sunday labor should be kept within the smallest practicable limits.

"Yours truly,
"L. J. SERGEANT,
"Traffic Manager."

Here is another communication from the manager of the Northern Pacific, dated St. Paul, 16th May, 1883:

"The next question is: Has your company taken any action towards diminution of Sunday labor?"

"I answer: Not officially, but it is understood, as the wish of the management, that the heads of departments shall reduce the amount of Sunday labor in their respective departments as far as practicable. My opinion is most decidedly that the Sabbath rest is an absolute necessity for the maintenance of mental and physical vigor, and that the rule of Sabbath rest cannot long be violated with impunity. Men who conscientiously favor Sabbath observance are likely to be more faithful in the performance of duty than those who are not troubled with conscientious scruples.

"Yours truly,
"H. HAUPT,
"General Manager."

"Editor *Railway Age*."

The next communication was from Mr. Ledyard, president of the Michigan Central and the Canada Southern roads:

"MICHIGAN CENTRAL RAILROAD COMPANY,
"DETROIT, MICH., May 14, 1883.

"To the Editors of the *Railway Age*:"

"I have your letter of May 11, relative to the action recently taken by the president of the Louisville, New Albany and Chicago Railway Company, in ordering the suspension of all trains upon the Sabbath day, and note your request that I shall reply to certain questions, as stated in your letter.

"1. If all railroad companies competing for the same class of traffic from and to common points were in accord, it would be practicable, to a very large extent, to abandon the running of railway trains on the Sabbath day. The chief difficulty is, that in these days of sharp competition time has become such an important element that if one railroad company would voluntarily cease its traffic for one day during the week, while others continued, it would lose largely thereby. Yet, for example, were each of the trunk lines to absolutely refuse to exchange traffic of any kind with their connections, from 6 p. m. Saturday until Monday morning, it would be a simple matter for these trunk lines, as well as for their western connections, to so arrange the movement of traffic as to practically do away with the running of Sunday trains.

"2. There is no question as to the desirability of prohibiting Sunday work on railways. The law of nature, to say nothing of the higher law, requires that man should have rest one day in seven. Is there any reason why a railway engineer or conductor is not entitled to his rest as much as a merchant or manufacturer?"

"3. This company has endeavored to so arrange the runs of its trainmen and engineers as to bring them home on Sunday, but little can be done in that direction without the concerted action on the part of all companies interested in the same traffic.

"4. I do not believe at the end of the year the loss in traffic would be appreciable, were all Sunday work stopped, and in the better morale of the men the railway companies would be abundantly paid for doing away with work on this day.

"Looking at the question from either a moral or economical standpoint, no candid person can uphold the running of trains on Sunday. What is there in the essence of a railroad company different from any other business, which will require an exception to be made of it and its employees to work when others are allowed and expect rest?"

"The effect of this constant and never-ending work is not only injurious to the men themselves, but most deplorable to their families. If it is true, as Lord Bacon says, that a man who has a family has given a hostage to fortune, it is equally true that he should be allowed to live,

at least, part of his time with those for whom he has to care, and certainly should have, at least, one day in seven, which, under our system of railway labor, he cannot have, to devote to his own and private matters.

"I am glad you have taken the matter up, for I believe if it is presented to our managers in the best light, whether from a moral or economical standpoint, a few moments reflection will show to each of them that we are all committing a fearful mistake in allowing the continuance and rapid growth of this Sunday work.

"Yours truly,
"H. B. LEDYARD,
"President."

Following is a short communication from Mr. Rutter, president of the New York Central. He says:

"It would be a great relief to managers and employees if all traffic on our railroads could cease during Sunday. I believe that every man is entitled to one day's rest in a week. It was for this that the Sabbath day was created, and it is very much to my regret that I feel compelled to say that the stopping of Sunday traffic is impracticable.

"It is hardly necessary for me to raise all the questions that occur to me in connection with this, and I can only say, that if any plan can be devised for the stoppage of Sunday work on railroads, I will gladly cooperate in it."

Next follows a letter from Mr. Bennett H. Young, president of the Louisville, New Albany and Chicago Railway Company, who had the courage to totally suspend the Sunday traffic on his road, with the exception of one local mail train. It is a letter addressed to the editor of the *Railway Age*, as follows:—

"Some weeks since I felt impelled, by various reasons, to order the discontinuance upon the Louisville, New Albany and Chicago Railway, as far as possible, of all labor on the Sabbath day. This order was not the result of an impulse, nor was it issued without the expectation of sharp criticism and even unkind misconstruction; it was made because I considered it right, viewed either from a religious, political or practical standpoint. It has provoked more discussion than I anticipated, but the expression of a necessity for a day of rest on the part of other railway managers has been to me exceedingly gratifying.

"While admitting that this is an age of intense practicality, and that in the hurry and drive of the present of our country, many are disposed to forget all other considerations than those of gain, this discussion has demonstrated that upon one ground or other there is deep-seated in the minds of the business men of this country a desire to observe a day of rest. For one, I do not hesitate to say that I consider the Sabbath a Divine institution, and that a disregard of the day is a violation of God's command, and that the mere fact of operating a railway for public necessity is no excuse for the dishonor done to the precept of our Maker.

"As religious bias must more or less affect particular views on this subject, many would be disposed to put aside those considerations and demand some more practical argument on the question. In the discussion of so broad a subject points can only be stated.

"1. Then, I suggest that without a day of rest man can neither enjoy health nor freedom. The Sabbath is essential to religion, and religion is essential to freedom, good government and prosperity. History contains no example of a free, progressive and successful people who did not recognise God. No thoughtful man can controvert the statement that religion is dependent upon the observance of a day of rest. Blot out the Sabbath in this country, and with it the influences of religion for a period of fifty years, and the face of our social, moral and political condition would be entirely changed. The testimony of all railroad men in this discussion has shown that a day of relaxation or rest is essential to the proper and faithful discharge of the duties which devolve upon railway employees; and if this were not so, human experience fully establishes this principle.

"2. Whatever may be the religious views of men, it has been universally conceded that religion makes a man better qualified for the discharge of every duty, and that in every sphere in which he acts the impulse of a Christian life is for good.

"If railways teach their employees to violate the Sabbath, and also with it to violate the laws of the State, and thus dull the obligation they feel both to God and to the State, they must necessarily have less respect for the laws of the railway itself, and less sense of obligation to their employers. No man who has any intimate connection with railways can fail to observe the lack of interest on the part of the employees in the corporate welfare, and this is in a large degree attributable to the indifference of the corporate managers themselves to the rights, privileges and consciences of their employees. With the eradication of religion goes all idea of future punishment, and this renders men less controllable and less amenable to reason. Religion is a safe-guard for property as well as liberty. One church is worth a dozen policemen; and the social and moral power of religion in the discharge of the duties devolving upon men is simply immeasurable.

"I see that in one of your late issues it is rumored this order of mine will be rescinded. I have only to say that, so far as tried, the results are more than satisfactory; no injury or loss has been sustained; the employees have in many ways expressed their gratitude and thanks for

Mr. CHARLTON.

this privilege which has been extended to them in the way of cessation of work on Sunday; and that so long as I remain in the management of the road no change will be made.

"Truly yours,
"BENNET H. YOUNG,
"President."

Two months after, the *Railway Age* contained an editorial giving the results of this action of the manager of this road—an editorial entitled, "Two Months of Sunday Observance:"

"The two months which have passed since President Young issued an order forbidding the running of Sunday trains, except those carrying mail, on the Louisville, New Albany and Chicago Railway, have been the most prosperous of any in the history of the road. President Young recently telegraphed: 'Our June business has been larger than ever before, and the aggregate earnings the largest on record.' While the experience of one railway for two months is by no means conclusive of the question at issue, yet it certainly tends to refute the position taken by so many managers, that a single railway or a portion of the railways of the country cannot afford to cease Sunday work, and that Sunday observance is not practicable unless all railways unite in it. The Louisville, New Albany and Chicago road has discontinued Sunday traffic and has increased its business, and there is no indication that its earnings for May or June are one dollar less than they would have been if its employees had been worked seven days in each week. The results of the reform inaugurated by the management of this important line will be watched with great interest. While the religious element in the problem should not be ignored or undervalued, the decisive point will doubtless be the economical results of the experiment. Meanwhile it is very gratifying to know that the best of employees of one railway in this country have been permitted, during bright May and delicious June, to enjoy the sweets of Sunday quietness and rest without doing financial injury to any one."

The last quotation I shall give with reference to Sunday work is an article from President Samuel Sloan, of the Delaware, Lackawana and Western road. This is a road which occupies a very enviable position in regard to Sunday labor. It is a road in which the late William E. Dodge was largely interested, and which has, since it first commenced running trains, scrupulously abstained from Sunday work. It is a road now reaching from New York to Buffalo, with western connections, and is one of the most prosperous in the United States. Mr. Sloan says:

"It seems to me that all railroad managers must sympathise with efforts to diminish 'Sunday labor,' now, I regret to see, on the increase. In my judgment the necessity, so much urged, does not exist, nor do the public demand from railroad management more work than ordinary labor. Railroad men have a right to rest one day in seven and to observe the Sabbath as much as any other fellow-citizens. It must be, and is conceded by all interested, that health and good discipline are promoted by this rest. Without repeating the excellent suggestions made by prominent railroad officials in the foregoing communications, I think that it would be an easy matter for the Trunk Line Commission to take up the subject, and refer it to a committee to report some regulations or agree upon certain trains that may be deemed necessary to meet any reasonable demands of competing interests or the public wants in regard to perishable property.

"SAMUEL SLOAN,
"President."

So much for the positions and opinions of railway managers. The quotations I have made from a great mass of communications from railway managers show most conclusively that these men, as a rule, feel that the position occupied by the corporations in the United States is not a desirable one. They evidently feel that in depriving their employees of Sunday rest, and in transacting the great mass of business transacted on the Sabbath, they are guilty of wrong-doing, and many of them feel the desire, and have taken steps in the direction of carrying out the desire they feel, to lessen the evil. No doubt it would be desirable to introduce a Bill upon this subject, of wider scope than the one presented tonight to this House, but this is probably impracticable. All the railways in Canada have absolute control over their local business, and the forbidding of excursion trains on the Sabbath will not imperil the interest of any trunk line in the Dominion, but if we went further we might seriously interfere with railway corporations whose operations are, to a great extent, through business, and being thus intimately united with the traffic in the United States, the co-operation of the United States railways would be required. But

we can deal with the question so far as the Bill now presented to the House deals with it, and it is to prevent this form of Sunday desecration, these excursions by railway or steamer, that this Bill is introduced. Many arguments are adduced in favor of Sunday excursions. They are said to be conducive to health and rest, and that it would be a hardship to deprive the people at large of the privilege of going upon Sunday excursions. I propose, for a few moments, to examine into that assertion and see whether it rests upon adequate grounds. Rest and health, I think, we will find when we examine into this question, are not promoted by Sunday excursions, but that as a rule they have a directly opposite effect. So far from promoting health and rest, they are often drunken saturnalias, resulting, more often than not, in riot and even in robbery and murder. Let me give a specimen of Sunday excursions. It is rather an aggravated specimen, but it will answer as a specimen of the whole class :

"FREE LIQUOR, SABBATH-BREAKING AND MURDER.—On the Sabbath, August 31st 1884, in the afternoon, a barge towed by a steam tug made fast to a pier at the foot of West Eleventh street, in New York. She had returned prematurely from an excursion on which she had set out in the morning. Scarcely were her lines made fast when a crowd of drunken men poured hurriedly ashore and rapidly dispersed. Many of the men were without hats or coats, and the faces of many were bruised and bleeding. The dresses of the women were disordered, and their hair fell tangled about their shoulders. On board, the evidences of a fierce fight were everywhere apparent. The deck was strewn with broken glass, with sandwiches and boiled hams, and was slippery with ice cream and beer. In the cabin the dead body of a middle-aged man lay on the floor, his three sons sobbing beside him."

Then it goes on to describe the excursion of the employees of the Empire steam laundry, New York. They were going down to Linden Grove, on Staten Island, for rest and health; they went well primed with whiskey and beer, and were not long out when the men became infuriated by liquor and engaged in a free fight, in which the women also took part. A poor and inoffensive German, who had charge of the lunch counter, being unable to fill twenty orders at once, was attacked by these people with beer bottles and clubs, mangled dreadfully and beaten into an almost unrecognisable mass of flesh. This was a fair specimen of Sunday excursions, such as sail every Sabbath day from New York to Coney Island and Staten Island. The Rev. Mr. Crafts, of New York, who has taken great interest in the Sabbath question, has addressed enquiries to a great number of employers in various parts of the Union. He has addressed enquiries to about 150 large employers of labor, the object of these enquiries being to ascertain whether the employees who spend the Sabbath in this way or the church-going employees are the most valuable laborers, and the answers are almost uniformly to the effect that the church-going people are the most valuable. One employer, who employs 200 men, says, "Church going men are 25 per cent. more effective as laborers than those who spend their Sundays in Sunday excursions." A German pastor, who has charge of a large church in New York, says: "Those who spend Sundays in pic-nics require all day Monday to get over the effects of their recreation." The general testimony on the subject is that Sabbath observers and church-goers, whether laborers, mechanics, merchants or professional men, are in far better condition to enter on work when they spend the Sunday in church-going, than those who spend the Sunday, even in comparatively innocent pleasure. Pic-nics, no doubt, are tiresome, while, on the contrary, short practical sermons are restful. Colonel Fairbanks, of the standard scales business, says :

"Those who attend church and Sunday school on Sunday are the most valuable in our business. I can tell the difference between them and others in the work in the shop."

Church-goers can be recognised in a crowd, for they are clean, healthy and prosperous. Mr. Clem Studenbarker, the manager of a very extensive wagon factory in Ohio, says :

"My observation is that clerks and mechanics who spend their Sabbath in church and Sabbath school work are the best fitted for the work in the office, or in the shop, on Monday morning."

The celebrated Hugh Miller, the great geologist in Scotland, gives the following very interesting description of the appearance of a train of Sunday excursionists returning to Edinburgh after a day in the country :—

"There did not seem to be much enjoyment about the wearied and somewhat draggled groups; they wore, on the contrary, rather an unhappy physiognomy, as if they had missed spending the day quite to their minds, and were now returning sad and disappointed to the round of toil from what ought to have proved a sweet relaxation and relief. A congregation just dismissed from hearing a vigorous evening discourse would have borne to a certainty a more cheerful air."

But it may be asked what reasons may be given for suppressing Sunday excursions? I would answer that they are open to several objections. They are open to this objection: They rob one class of employees of their Sunday rest in order that they may minister to the pleasure of others. I refer to the men employed upon railway trains and steamers. These men are prevented taking Sunday rest in order that the passengers by train or steamboat may enjoy Sunday pic-nics. The next reason is, such excursions are fruitful of disorder, vice and crime; the next is, because such excursions invade the Sabbath quiet and morality of places to which they go, and the next reason is, because they secularise the Sabbath, and, by breaking down its sacredness, they prepare for the abolition of the rest to all classes that the Sabbath is designed to give. It may be said: It is unnecessary to deal with this question by law; it is a moral matter; let public sentiment settle it. In relation to that, I may answer that the Sabbath cannot be preserved without law. It has been found necessary to put laws upon the Statute Book with regard to Sabbath observance in England since 826; in the fourth century, Constantine passed a law in regard to Sabbath observance; and it will be found that, where there are no Sabbath laws, there is practically no Sabbath. The Christian sentiment of Canada, I believe the universal Christian sentiment of Canada, is in favor of this measure. I believe I am warranted in this assertion by the pastoral letter of Archbishop Taschereau, by the utterances of His Holiness the Pope, of Cardinal McCloskey, of Archbishop Gibbon, of the Bishop of Buffalo, all these high church dignitaries expressly prohibiting Sunday excursions and declaring them to be mortal sins. I am warranted by the concurrent testimony of the Protestant divines in this country, and by the demand of the great mass of the Christian people of this country. I am warranted in saying that the Christian sentiment of Canada, of all sects and classes of believers, asks for this Bill from this House. We fortunately, as a people, enjoy a very high character with respect to Sabbath observance. It is said that the city of Toronto enjoys the proud position of being the city of all the cities upon the face of the globe where the Sabbath is observed most strictly; and this characteristic applies to such cities as Hamilton, London, in a great degree to such cities as Ottawa and Montreal, to the cities of the Maritime Provinces, and even to Quebec.

An hon. MEMBER. Even?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; the mode of spending the Sabbath in Quebec is perhaps not quite as strict as in Montreal or in Ottawa, but, as compared with other cities in other countries, there is not a city in the Dominion of Canada that does not occupy a favorable position in regard to the Sabbath. Now, we have a right to ask, with all the concurrence of testimony from the various prelates and divines in this country and the evident pressure of public sentiment in this respect, that this Government shall do all it can possibly do to preserve this noble record which this country has, and I have the honor to present this Bill to the House of Commons for its second reading to-night. The Bill pro-

vides simply that Sunday excursions by steamboats plying for hire, or by railway, or in part by railway and in part by steamboat, starting and returning the same day, shall be prohibited; and it provides a penalty of \$500 for an infraction of this law, to be collected upon complaint of any individual in the county, city or town from which the excursion starts, one-half of the penalty to go to the informer or prosecutor and the other half to the municipality of the county, city or town in which the action is brought. The Bill does not apply to ferries or to steamboats employed thereon, but simply and exclusively to excursions by steamboat or railway, or in part by steamboat and in part by railway. Mr. Speaker, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is not my intention to detain this House at any length and to discuss the different points, to analyse or to criticise the different quotations that the hon. gentleman, in his learned essay on the Lord's Day and the day of rest, has been giving to the House for the last few minutes. I, as all in this House must have like myself, admired the earnestness of the hon. member, his researches, his deep conviction on the subject that he has so cleverly treated. The Lord's Day and the day of rest are the consequences of the law of labor which was imposed upon humanity and which, drawing man towards the earth that he was obliged to till, made his eyes not to look towards heaven but to look to the ground where he had to work; and, as a relief from that first servitude, the Lord said that at least one day out of the seven days of the week, or at certain hours, man should have not only the privilege, but that the order should be given to him, to raise his forehead, to raise his eyes to heaven and to think of Him who had punished him and who might also save him and his posterity. Nobody can deny the good of the institution. It is of Divine institution. No one can deny the good, in a humanitarian sense, which proceeds from that law of having man to rest one day. The law of nature would require it. Constant labor would not be good for the good workingman. I have admired, and I have agreed with the hon. gentleman, and all those whom he has quoted, in saying that the best workingman is the man who has taken his good rest during the Sunday, who has attended to his religious duties, and who, on Monday, goes back to his work with his heart light, with his mind not taken up with any bad ideas, but ready to begin again the execution, the fulfilment of that law of labor which is part of the law of the salvation of man. I have been not astonished but pleased to see the numerous quotations made by the hon. gentleman. I must say that the authority of many of them might be perhaps contradictory if, on the application of the principle which is involved, we were to come to the orders and prescriptions given by those whose authority he has quoted. We have had from the Genesis to Mirabeau. The authorities are not very similar in their moral tone, perhaps, but it appears they came to the same point. We have had from Mr. Louis Blanc as from the Pope. They are not exactly nearly related. We have had a good many of them; but to what does all that tend? It tends to say a thing that nobody contests—that there should be a day of rest, that there should be a day of prayer in the week. The hon. gentleman has said that law is necessary to make Sunday observance one of the institutions of this world. I regret it. I regret that the policeman should be required to force a man to understand the Divine commands of his Master. I would be sorry to see that the policeman is necessary to make people understand that the man is not a brute, and that even for the brute rest is necessary. Then these two principles are not at all contested, of the day of prayer and the day of rest. Shall we, by a law, prescribe what is a day of rest? My hon. friend cannot, more than I could or anybody in this House, say what a day of rest must be. One would like to

Mr. CHARLTON,

rest in one manner; another prefers another manner. One would like to rest sitting in his own house; another promenading outside. One may think that reading a book, be it the Holy Book or be it only any other book, in one's house, closeted in one's room, is not perhaps as right a way of having a good day's rest as taking outside the fresh air, either on the river, or in a promenade, or even a drive. The manner in which this rest should be taken is prescribed, and the direction for it are given by those who have the morality of the people in charge; that task does not belong to us. In the next place, Mr. Speaker, what rule ought we to follow in the religious observance of Sunday? Here again we cannot agree in this House, and fortunately we are not called upon to discuss, still less to decide, that question. I am one of those members of the House who cherish most deeply, in a mixed community like ours, the liberty of conscience, of creed and religion. On every proper occasion I have stated that whatever was the creed or the religious opinion of my fellow-countrymen, I would respect it. But if we were to frame a law for the compulsory observance of the Sunday we would be infringing upon liberty of conscience, and if we were to adopt the principle involved in the proposition of my hon. friend, we should also infringe civil liberty. I cannot consent that he shall dictate to me what is the true and proper way of observing the Sunday. The hon. gentleman said the best workman is the man who attends the Sunday school and reads his Bible on Sunday. If he does that on Sunday he certainly does a good thing. But, Mr. Speaker, I know very good workingmen, fathers of families, who have brought up their children in the fear of God, and in the spirit of obedience to the laws of the country; and these men, after attending mass for an hour and listening to a sermon—not always so long, perhaps, as the lecture we have heard to-night, but as good and as sound—did not think they were offending their Maker, because they afterwards enjoyed a few hours recreation and passed the day as they did in the good old times whose praises have been sung by men who were the friends of morality, when we read of the parson who, on coming out of church, would stop to listen to the fiddle and to watch the boys and girls dancing on the green. These people were just as good tillers of the land, just as industrious and just as good fathers of families as those who pass the day reading the Bible in their houses. Far from my mind is it to find fault with those who believe that the latter mode is the best, but it is largely a question of taste. The hon. gentleman has given a description of a Sunday whiskey excursion in New York, from which, however, I do not think our country is threatened at the present time. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we ought not to judge a question of this kind by an example which is exceptional even in the country from which it is taken. I have read in books trustworthy statements that at certain so-called religious meetings, an excitement prevailed at certain moments which was anything but religious in its nature. I do not believe all that is said about revivals, but I do believe that at some of these meetings things take place which are certainly not edifying to those who witness them. But we have no right to judge of the opinions and convictions of the people who are attending these meetings. Revivals may not always be quite free from harm, but still I would not ask for legislation to regulate them. Then, Mr. Speaker, if we are not able to decide upon the true and precise interpretation of the Lord's command with reference to the observance of Sunday, I think we are hardly able to decide that point by legislation in this House. I may be told, perhaps, that we are not asked to make such a definition. Mr. Speaker, if we accept this Bill I do not see why we should not go farther. If we say in this House that steamboat and railway excursions shall be prevented on Sunday, why may we not say that no one shall go outside his own house

on Sunday? We might as well say to the citizens that the observance of the Divine command forbids him to walk outside his house, or to play music on Sunday, or to do many other things which people think they have a right to do. It would be a violation of their liberty to do this. Now, Sir, our federal constitution has settled this matter for us, and we are fortunately precluded by that instrument from legislating in reference to it. In order to ensure that harmony which should prevail in a community like ours, composed of various creeds and nationalities, a community that has grown to be so strong and so prosperous, those who framed our constitution have provided that matters like this should be left to the Provincial Legislatures, and that the Federal Parliament has no right to interfere in any way with those rights which belong first to the family, second to the municipality and thirdly to the Province. I say that this proposition infringes the religious rights, it infringes the municipal rights and the municipal liberties of the citizens; and I know that I am not speaking alone when I say that it infringes on provincial liberty. If the people of Ontario or of any other Province desire to observe Sunday in a particular way, let them enjoy that right; certainly I have no desire to interfere with them. But I cannot see what right a majority in this House have to say to the people of Quebec, for instance, that they have no right to run a railway, on Sunday, from one part of the Province to another, or to run a steamboat from the city of Montreal to St. Lamberts or Longueuil, or from the city of Quebec to the Island of Orleans, or the Falls of Montmorency, or Lévis or St. Romuald. Let each city, each corporation, each Province, make its own regulations. The hon. gentleman said that preventing a man from having his rest on Sunday is to take away the liberty of the laborer, who has a right to one day's rest in seven; that it is an attack upon the law of labor to deprive the laborer of his day of rest. He has gone further; he has said that Sunday was the great school of the people, and that the question of the observance of Sunday was one of the greatest educational questions that could be brought before this Parliament. Certainly, I believe that the people ought to be educated in the observance of Sunday, and perhaps I would go further than my fellow-countrymen generally go in that sense. The hon. gentleman says that the city of Toronto was known all over this Dominion as the queen city for the observance of Sunday, and he could not help saying also that Ottawa was remarkable for this, and so was Montreal and Quebec. I am sorry he did not mention the city of Three Rivers, represented in this House by my colleague the hon. Minister of Public Works. I am sure if he omitted to mention Three Rivers, it was through a slip of the tongue or forgetfulness on the part of the hon. member. We do not want a law when, as the hon. gentleman has stated, the highest religious authorities are already endeavoring to prevent—what?—not to say that such a thing is a crime; not to say that amusement on Sunday is a sin, but to say that excursions where whiskey and its immoral accessories prevail, are excursions which should not only be discountenanced but should be forbidden, and forbidden under the most heavy penalties of the Church. The law has nothing to do with that matter, except as regards the keeping of the public peace. If the people are educated in this matter, there is no need of law; we can safely trust to the religious authorities for the good work of teaching their people the due observance of Sunday. I understand the motive of the mover of this resolution, and far from blaming the hon. gentleman, I think that, from this discussion, a great deal of good will come. I think it is well that it should be known throughout the land that here the legislators are thinking of this desirable result, the observance of the Lord's Day, a day of rest after the week's labors. It is desirable that the people should know that the representatives whom they have sent here to make the laws of the country have not

been forgetting this matter; and it is pleasant, I must say, to see a layman rising in his place, as the hon. gentleman has done, to come and assist in the crusade which archbishops, bishops, priests and clergymen have entered upon, not of prohibiting outdoor exercise on Sunday, but of seeking to suppress abuses. I invite those who are generally exceedingly particular on the question of the rights of the different Provinces to support me in saying that this legislation is not such as comes within the power of this Parliament, and that each Province should attend to it for itself. I cannot resume my seat, Mr. Speaker, without referring to something that has been said by the hon. member. He has allowed himself to be carried a little too far. For instance, in his comparison of the different countries of the world where Sunday observance was the rule, and those countries where there was no Sunday observance, some remarks have been made which the hon. gentleman could have omitted. The hon. gentleman referred generally to Sunday observance in England. I have not travelled much, but I have been in London a few Sundays, and I have never seen so many trains, in any other city in Europe where I have travelled, as left the English metropolis on that day. I am perfectly sure that there was no increase of crime engendered by those excursions, which had for their purpose and object to give fresh air to those who had worked hard all the week long in the unhealthy districts of the great city. The hon. gentleman has endeavored to show by statistics the increase of crime in countries where Sunday was not observed after the manner of the hon. gentleman. I must say that statistics of the kind he submitted to the House are very fallacious. The amount of crime in certain countries on the continent of Europe is not due and cannot be ascribed to outdoor excursions on Sunday. I desire, in conclusion, again to draw the attention of hon. members of this House to the fact that such legislation as is proposed does not belong to this Parliament, but to the Legislatures of the different Provinces. If it is intended to regulate the religious observance of the Sabbath, it belongs to the church authorities or to the family, and we should not interfere. If it is to prevent accidental misbehavior and preserve peace, it becomes a police and municipal regulation that belongs to municipal corporations. If it is to regulate the relations of master and servant, or to protect the laboring classes, it affects civil rights; and the subject is one that belongs to Provincial Legislatures. I think the measure is *ultra vires*, and we would not act in accordance with constitutional principles in legislating on the matter.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I think if the hon. gentleman who brought in this Bill can fairly be charged with taking up the time of the House unnecessarily, in proving what we are all ready to admit, the wisdom of Sunday observance, on economical, to say nothing of religious grounds, I think the Secretary of State has transgressed in another direction. The gist of his argument is this: You must not infringe the liberty of the subject by any such legislation as is proposed. I contend that this legislation in no sense tends to impair the liberty of the subject. All it does is to say that one particular thing shall not be done, not because it might not be desirable in many cases, and attended sometimes with advantage, but because it will necessarily bring with it certain specified evils, which the country has a perfect right to legislate against. If the argument of the Secretary of State is worth anything, and can fairly be pushed to anything like its logical conclusion, we might just as well say that Parliament should not legislate against selling liquor on Sunday, and in other directions for the observance of Sunday. The hon. gentleman entirely failed to catch the point of the Bill, and his argument will fail to convince hon. members that this measure should be rejected

on the special ground adduced by him. There is one point which may be fairly considered. We all, naturally, when we argue a question of this kind, look for an example to Great Britain, where there has been legislation for many years; where there is a very large population, and where there are conditions in many respects similar to ours, and in many other respects entirely dissimilar. All these measures are matters of compromise, and the arguments in regard to them cannot be pushed to their legitimate conclusions; otherwise, it is impossible to avoid coming to an absurdity whichever way you push the argument. But, in regard to England, and London particularly, we easily see the difference in the position of the people there and the people in this country. In London the population is as large as the whole population of this country; it is crammed together within a very small compass, and Sunday trains may be necessary in order to allow people to get out into the country. There are, moreover, a large number of inhabitants who otherwise would find it impossible to obtain that advantage. It may be proper, in such a case, to make a compromise in that direction. You may say the advantages are greater than the disadvantages that follow. But can it be said that the residents of our towns and cities require Sunday trains in order to enable them to obtain that recreation which is necessary to health, and which people are reasonably entitled to enjoy? There is no analogy between the two cases. It is a matter of compromise, whichever way you put it, and a compromise which is legitimate and proper in the case of London, Liverpool, Manchester or Glasgow, is not reasonable when we come to apply it to the towns of this country. The principal objections to what this legislation seeks to prohibit are two: first, we cannot grant to those who enjoy the pleasures, if pleasures they are, of Sunday excursions, without at once trenching on the liberty of the subject in another direction, because the employees of railways and steamboats tell you that in order to run those trains and work those steamboats you deny them Sunday rest, and infringe on their liberty as much as, in the other case, you would infringe on other people's liberty. For the sake of giving a possible advantage to a certain number you inflict a disadvantage on a certain other number. Here is another question of compromise. You must distinctly and clearly establish that the benefits you confer are less than the wrongs you inflict, before the House is justified in saying that a Bill of this country should not be passed. The condition of our people does not require such a compromise, and there is no necessity, as regards the general welfare of the community, that a certain number of persons should be compelled to violate their consciences, and be placed at a disadvantage with every other class of labor. I think this is the principal point we should consider; at any rate, it is one important point, and it weighs with me very strongly. The other point to which I allude is this, that it is a dangerous thing, in legislation of this kind, to know exactly where to stop. If you once admit the principle of steamboats or railways running pleasure or excursion trains, you do not know where it will land you. This is the great argument which was brought up in England against doing that which would have been an exceedingly beneficial thing in itself, that is, the opening of museums and other such places of amusement on Sundays. It was felt in England and, I am sure, many hon. members and many other people will feel the same thing here, that the moment you allow the principle laid down by the Secretary of State to guide your legislation in this matter, there is no knowing how far it will lead you; and as there is no corresponding advantage to be gained, compared with the positive evils which may arise, it is better for us to take early steps, such as it is proposed to take by the very reasonable provisions of this Bill, to prevent that being done which otherwise is very likely to be done. For those rea-

Mr. O'BRIEN.

sons, on those two grounds, altogether irrespective of other considerations and the common arguments as to Sabbath observance, I, for one, shall heartily support the Bill of the hon. member from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton).

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The speech of the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill has been addressed to the whole subject of Sabbath observance, but the Bill is confined to only one branch of that question. The first clause provides:

"Sunday excursions by steamboats plying for hire, or by railway, or in part by any such steamboat and in part by railway, and having for their only or principal object the carriage of Sunday passengers for amusement or pleasure only, and to go and return on the same day, by the same steamboat or railway, or any other owned by the same person or persons or company, shall be unlawful and shall not be deemed a lawful conveying of travellers, within the meaning of any statute of Canada, or of any Province of Canada, permitting the conveyance of travellers on the Lord's Day."

The second clause goes on to say that the owners shall be liable to be sued in a civil court by civil action for a large sum of money, and this sum is recoverable in any court of competent jurisdiction, in the place in which the steamboat or train employed on the excursion started, or through which it passed, or at which it stopped, and the money recovered shall be divided, one moiety to go to the plaintiff, and the other moiety to the municipality of the city, town, village or place from which the unlawful excursion started. The Bill is limited to excursions, and it is provided that such conveyances shall be considered to be unlawful, and that the owners of them shall be subject to a civil action. It seems to me that the constitutional point taken by the Secretary of State is a good one; that this is a matter affecting civil rights. If Parliament should take the responsibility of declaring that such excursions, or any act of non-observance or breach of observance of the Sabbath, was a crime, it might thereby be brought within the criminal law, and therefore within the competence of this Parliament. It seems to me that the mere fact of its not being declared to be a crime, but merely to be an unlawful act, and the action to be brought a civil action for damages, gives away the case, so far as the competence of the Dominion Parliament is concerned. The hon. gentleman, in fact, declared in his speech that he did not propose to interfere with vessels sailing on a long voyage, or railways carrying through traffic. That might interfere with our relations with the United States, or with the great currents of trade. Well, it might be, Mr. Speaker, that under the authority of several decisions, that the effect of this through traffic, this wholesale traffic, being the traffic which the hon. gentleman does not wish to interfere with—that traffic might come within the Dominion law; but these excursions, such as in Toronto harbor, or those my hon. friend has spoken of from Montreal or Quebec, certainly ought to be within the governance and control of the Provincial Legislature, and the provincial administration of affairs—within the cognizance and control of the municipalities. It appears to me that the Bill is *ultra vires*.

* Motion for second reading negatived on a division.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew), moved the second reading of Bill (No. 25) further to amend the Patent Act of 1872.

Mr. CARON. I regret to say that I cannot agree with my hon. friend that this Bill should be placed on our Statute Book. This legislation may be looked upon in Canada as new legislation, but it is legislation which was attempted to be introduced into the United States by the Bill presented last year to Congress, and called the Voorhees Bill, which was rejected by the Senate of that country. The principle of the Bill would have this effect: that though the seller of the patented article might not have

the right to sell it, still the sale would be valid, and the real owner would not be able to obtain redress from the person found in possession of such patented article. Viewing it as I do, from a purely legal point of view, I do not see why an exception should be made, with respect to the rights of patentees—I do not see why the principle of law which applies in every other contract, in every other line of business, should not also apply to this. It seems to me that the purchaser of any patented article should be called upon to look after and protect the interest of the public carefully, in so far as purchasing an article which he has no right to purchase. The principle of the law of contract should apply to this matter as it does to every other. The patentee under the present law obtains for a certain limited period of time the exclusive right of disposing of the article which he patents; and I would ask my hon. friend how he can expect that the Parliament of this country will apply to these persons a different principle from that which prevails in every other business transaction? Why should the patentee, who, through his skill and labor, has succeeded in producing an article which may be of considerable use to the public, not be able to protect himself like the owners of any other article, if it has been unlawfully acquired by any other individual? And when it comes to a question affecting the patent rights of a patentee, why should the whole brunt of the battle be left to him? Why should the patentee be called upon to go beyond what other owners of property are required to do to secure their property? According to the information given to me by the Department, I find that occasional, but very occasional isolated cases occur, in which damages for infringement are claimed from innocent users. But such cases are very rare, and the effect of the proposed law would be to throw difficulties in the way of honest patentees obtaining their just rights. I do not believe that the Bill proposed by my hon. friend would be an improvement on our present law. I do not see why the owner of a patent should be deprived of his property or his right because somebody buys it in ignorance. The purchaser of those rights should be called upon to take the necessary precautions to ascertain whether what he is purchasing he is entitled to purchase, and whether he can do it without infringing upon the rights of other parties. As I view it, the risk should fall upon the purchaser, and the patentee should never be called upon to assume all the burden of protecting his own patent. I believe that the present Bill would lead to endless litigation. I believe that the purchaser of any patent rights, when called upon to account for the infringement of the rights of the patentee, would invariably bring up a plea of having been an innocent purchaser of those rights. The law, as it now exists, I believe, has not proved to be inconvenient. I know that some cases may be quoted, and will no doubt be quoted; but still, judging from the results of the law as it now exists, I believe the present Bill would not be an improvement on it; and consequently, I must say I do not think that this Bill should be placed upon the Statute Book.

Mr. MULOCK. I agree very largely with the remarks which have fallen from the Minister of Militia. We have on our Statute Book a Patent Act which is designed to encourage inventions, and for a certain time to protect the inventor. Now, it appears to me that if this Bill were passed in its present form, it would practically repeal the Patent Act. There would at once spring up a new class of inventors, a class of men whose ingenuity would be directed to making use of the inventions of others and selling them to the public, concealing from the public that they were selling to them articles manufactured under a patent. I would like to know how many persons who buy patented articles are aware that the articles are patented. No one, in fact, is aware, when he is buying an article that is patented, that he is paying for a patent at all. Occasionally

there are exceptions to that rule; but we take goods and chattels from hand to hand, trusting to the title of the vendor, believing that he has a good title. I sympathise with the object of the mover of this Bill, but I think he is taking the wrong course in order to provide a remedy. I fancy that what he has in his mind is the case of the sale, very recently, of certain patented articles—I think they were purifiers, which were sold, I think, in good faith; but it was found afterwards that the manufacturers of those articles had infringed certain patents, and I believe the purchasers were compelled to return the articles or pay for them a second time. Now, if the mover desires to provide a remedy, I think his plan would be to propose some scheme whereby greater penalties might be imposed on persons who infringe the Patent Act; and if it is necessary to do so, let the vendor of a patented article who has no right to sell it be punished severely, in order to enforce the patent law. In that way the innocent purchaser will, in most cases, be protected, and the patentee also will be protected. But if this Bill is passed, we might as well, I think, at once repeal this Patent Act.

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot agree at all with the expressions given vent to by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock). He asks, how many know that the articles they are using are patented? and in answer to that he says, very few. Then, if men unfortunately violate a law simply because they have no means of ascertaining the fact, and have to pay, in consequence, heavy damages, this is, I think, an injustice. I think that the reference that the hon. gentleman gave himself is one of the strongest reasons why a law of this nature should be passed. During the last few years an invention has been introduced into the mills in the various parts of Ontario. The gentleman who manufactured this invention sold the articles to millers at a heavy price, and the millers, believing they were not violating any patent law in purchasing them, put them in their mills. Shortly afterwards they were notified that they had violated the Patent Act, and would have to pay heavy damages for the use of this invention. What was the result? They were compelled to pay, in many instances, damages as high as \$100 and upwards. These men purchased and used the invention in good faith, believing they were not violating the patent or any other law—believing that the party who sold them had a perfect right to do so. I believe it would be quite right to punish the party who sold an invention, knowing that in so doing he was violating some other man's patent; it would be well to punish him, but I believe that the people who were led unwittingly to purchase the invention in good faith ought not to be punished. We can apply this rule to many other lines. Mowing machines and binding machines are often made up of various patents, and what farmer can tell when he is violating or when he is not violating the rights of half a dozen men who have patented different parts; yet are we to be told that he must go to the trouble and expense of ascertaining from the Department here whether he is violating the law or not? Are we to be told that the duty must be imposed upon him of investigating, when purchasing a machine, not only the machine itself, as a whole, but every part of it that is patented, before he can have the right to use it without leaving himself open to actions for heavy damages? You may apply this to other machines, to threshing, mowing, sewing machines; in every instance the rule holds equally good. That duty should not be imposed on those who use the machines. I would inflict a heavy penalty on those who violate the law in selling and manufacturing them. The party who exercised his ingenuity or skill in making an invention would thus have all the redress he required against the party in the first instance who violated the patent, and then against the party who sold the article in

violation of the patent. If those which oppose this measure knew of all the practical instances during the past year in which injustice was worked against the people who had used pieces of machinery in good faith, and were compelled to pay penalties ranging from \$50 to \$150 in consequence, they would be inclined to agree with the mover of this Bill, that it is in the right direction, that it is what he should do in protecting people who may be brought into conflict with the patent law, without any knowledge on their part and without any legitimate means of knowing whether or not they were violating the law.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I propose to offer very few observations on this matter which I have brought before the attention of the House. In dealing with this question I will not, as my hon. friend the Minister of Militia did, deal with it from a legal, but will treat it from a common-sense point of view. It will, I think, be admitted that there are a great many articles patented in the Patent Office of this country for which patents have been obtained and which vary to a very limited extent from previous inventions. Some slight modification or addition to an article that has been manufactured and sold in the open market for a long period of time may be made, and a patent may be obtained for that invention; and it seems to me that it is a very great hardship that those who purchase those patented articles in the open market, with the conviction that the persons who are selling them and who manufactured them had the right to sell and manufacture them, should be compelled to pay damages for the innocent use of the articles, many of which are used in every-day life. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has instanced several cases in which great hardship arose, through the purchase of articles for ordinary domestic use, agricultural implements and numerous articles used by the people every day, the purchasers of which were subjected to penalties, though they had practically no means of ascertaining that they had violated any law. It has been stated by the hon. member for North York, (Mr. Mulock), who spoke upon this subject, that the proposition I make would practically repeal the patent laws. I deny that. I say that the owner of a patent right would be amply protected by the penalties imposed upon the manufacturer and vendor of the articles patented. An instance has been adduced, that of the middlings purifiers, about which there was a great deal of trouble and difficulty within a very recent period. Now, the course which was adopted in reference to the imposing of penalties upon those who used the middlings purifiers, created a strong suspicion in the public mind that the owner of the patent right was acting in collusion with the manufacturer, and that a very large number of those articles were allowed to be put into the mills and refused by the mill owners for a certain period, and when they had been practically used by the millers all over the country, the owner of the patent came down and demanded compensation for the violation of his rights. It was from that point of view, in relation to an injustice of that kind, the possibility of collusion between the owner of a patent right and the manufacturer and vendor, that I was induced to bring this Bill before the House. The Minister of Militia has said if this Bill should pass into law the purchaser of the patented article will, although he might know that he had purchased it in infringement of the rights of the patentee, set up the claim in court that he did not know that the article was patented; but if the hon. gentleman had read this Bill, he would have seen that objection was covered. I propose that:

"1. Notwithstanding anything contained in section twenty-three of 'The Patent' Act of 1872, no person who procures and uses any invention for which a patent has been obtained, from any person not authorised to make or use it by the patentee, shall be liable for damages for so doing, if he proves to the satisfaction of the court before which the suit is brought that he was ignorant of the fact that such invention was one

Mr. SPROULE.

for which a patent had been obtained, or that the person from whom he obtained it was not so authorised to make or use the same.

The Bill proposes, therefore, that the burden of proof shall be placed upon the purchaser of the patented article, so that he shall not be able to set up the defence that he purchased this article innocently, without proving it to the satisfaction of a court of competent jurisdiction. The objection may be raised, and I think there may be something in the contention, that as regards patents that are not now existing the passage of this measure may limit or restrict the rights that have been obtained to some extent in the nature of a contract; but as regards future contracts, I do not think there can be any objection to this Bill being passed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Although I cannot add very much to what has been said, I desire to express my concurrence in the principle of the measure before the House. It is a mistake to imagine that the patentee will be without means of redress in the event of this measure becoming law. He has, of course, the right of redress against those who sell the patented article; but not only that, he has the right to interfere and protect his property in the patent by preventing a sale, on application to the proper court. On the other hand, a man to whom an article is offered has no means of ascertaining whether it is or is not a patented article, and the case put by my hon. friend from Grey must commend itself to all. The other day, in Toronto, a suit was brought by the patentee, or rather by the acquirer of the patent for an American invention, and, if that is successful, I believe it will appear that every agricultural implement which has been manufactured in Ontario for the last four or five years has been manufactured in violation of the patent rights, and every farmer who has bought these mowing or reaping machines will be liable to be followed up by this person who has purchased the right, because he has bought, in the open market, without any notice or question of right, an agricultural implement which has been in universal use. I submit that these considerations are sufficient to induce this House to pass a measure for the protection of people of this kind. What is a man to do? He is offered an article. He finds it is exposed for sale and advertised all over the country. Is he to come to Ottawa to make an examination in the patent office, in order to see whether it is patented or is an infringement of a patent? These cases cannot be tried in a court in less than a week. The case I referred to took ten days, in order to test a single matter, whether it was or was not a violation of patent rights. On the other hand, is it too much to expect of the patentee, if he has a patented article or a valuable invention, that he shall see that no one is infringing it by disposing of it, or if so, shall apply to a court and prevent the sale and prevent its going into use? For these reasons I hope this Bill, the principle of which I think is so just and fair, will receive the approbation of a majority of this House. It is a principle well known to the law, a principle in regard to real property with which we are all familiar. If a man purchases real property and acquires the legal title, and is able to plead that he is a purchaser for value and had no knowledge of the equitable title, he is protected in his purchase, and that, I venture to think, is applicable to this. It is almost impossible to discover the right of the patentee unless he himself brings it to the notice of the public. Then a man purchases with his eyes open, but, if he is ignorant of the patent right and purchases in the open market, I think, under the circumstances, he is as much entitled to protection as any other purchaser for value without notice.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the observation of the hon. gentleman who proposes the Bill, with reference to existing patents, is one to commend itself to the attention of the House. I do not think it possible to take away the rights which, under the law, we have given, subject to that and to

various questions of detail with which I will not now trouble the House. If he proposes to refer the Bill to a select committee, as I presume he does, I am, for my part, rather in favor of the principle of the hon. gentleman's measure. I do not think it is now in the condition in which it ought finally to pass the House, but if it is referred to a select committee, with the view of its being carefully scrutinised, and its action limited only to future patents, and some further precautions are taken, which I need not now discuss, I should support the second reading. One question was brought out by an incidental suggestion of my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). There is a question whether the hon. gentleman's Bill is to apply only to cases where the purchaser does not know it is a patented article, or whether it may not fairly extend to cases where it is sold to him as a patented article, but it subsequently turns out that the patentee has not a good title, but is infringing another title; where there is a fight between two patentees; one says "the invention is mine;" the other says, "the invention is mine;" they have both patents, and the law is to decide, and the unfortunate purchaser for value may be ground to the dust between them. Also, as the hon. gentleman's Bill stands, it would apply to persons who received gratuitously the patented article. I am not very well satisfied that I would go so far as that. I think I would only deal with persons who bought the patented article in the ordinary market. But these are matters of detail, and if the hon. gentleman proposes to refer the Bill to a select committee, I shall be in favor of the second reading.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I intend to propose to refer it to a small select committee.

Mr. COLBY. I suppose, if the hon. gentleman is going to refer the Bill to a select committee, he would have no objection, first, to amend it in the sense suggested.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no means of amending on the second reading.

Mr. COLBY. It strikes me very forcibly that, under the existing law, having declared at the last Session that all patents shall be presumed to have been issued for fifteen years, as far as patents issued up to the present time are concerned, the law could hardly come fairly into operation until the expiration of fifteen years from the date of existing patents.

Mr. BLAKE. It may come into force with reference to all patents issued from this time.

Mr. COLBY. But it would give no practical relief to the suffering public who have purchased these articles under patents issued during the existence of the law. Consequently, it will give no remedy, in some cases, for fifteen years.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes; it will give a remedy in reference to all patents that come into operation from the day the Act passes.

Mr. COLBY. I said *quod* those patents which have already been issued, and which, of course, constitute a very large number of them. I think this Act strikes at the root of the whole system, as we now understand it, which gives an absolute property to the patentee. It is a matter of very serious consideration, and it may be a serious question whether patent laws are desirable in the interest of the public at all. It opens a very broad field for discussion and involves very grave questions of policy. This country, like every other civilised country, has recognised the rights of inventors, and has given them an absolute property for a limited time. It is to be an absolute property in all its consequences according to the laws of England, of the United States, of the continent of Europe and of Canada. This proposition is certainly a very novel one.

It is not consistent with any provision, so far as I am aware, which exists in any patent law in any civilised country. It is of very far-reaching consequences, and involves more, I think, than would appear from the one clause which it contains. The whole question of the expediency of giving property and rights of a valuable nature to inventors is involved. Of course, it may be fairly referred to a committee, but I think that the consideration of the committee would, in the end, be directed, perhaps, to the whole policy of the patent law.

House divided on motion of Mr. White (Renfrew) for second reading of Bill.

YEAS:
Messieurs

Armstrong,	Edgar,	Ray,
Anger,	Ferguson (Welland),	Rinfret,
Bain (Wentworth),	Gillmor,	Rykert,
Beaty,	Gordon,	Somerville (Brant),
Béchar, d,	Harley,	Somerville (Bruce),
Bell,	Hay,	Sproule,
Blake,	Hilliard,	Stairs,
Bourassa,	Innes,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Bryson,	Irvine,	Taylor,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Laurier,	Vail,
Cartwright,	Livingstone,	Vanasse,
Catudal,	Macmaster,	Wallace (York),
Cochrane,	McCarthy,	Watson,
Cockburn,	McMullen,	Weldon,
Davies,	McNeill,	Wells,
Dawson,	Mills,	White (Renfrew),
De St. Georges,	Paterson (Brant),	Wigle,
Dundas,	Platt,	Wilson,
Dupont,	Pruyn,	Wood (Brockville).—57

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,	Desaulniers (St. Maurice),	Macmillan (Middlesex),
Amyot,	Desjardins,	MacMillan (Vaudeuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dickinson,	McDougald (Picton),
Baker (Missisquoi),	Farrow,	McDougald (C. Breton),
Baker (Victoria),	Gagné,	Massue,
Belleau,	Gigault,	Moffat,
Benoit,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Mullock,
Bergin,	Gunn,	Paint,
Blondeau,	Hall,	Pope,
Bourbeau,	Hesson,	Riopel,
Bowell,	Hickey,	Robertson (Hastings),
Cameron (Inverness),	Holton,	Royal,
Cameron (Victoria),	Homer,	Scriver,
Carling,	Jenkins,	Shakespeare,
Caron,	Kranz,	Small,
Chapleau,	Landry (Kent),	Smyth,
Cimon,	Langelier,	Taschereau,
Colby,	Langevin,	Tyrwhitt,
Costigan,	Lesage,	White (Cardwell),
Coursol,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Hastings),
Gurran,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Wood (Westmoreland),
Guthbert,	Mackintosh,	Woodworth.—70.
Desaulniers (Maskingé)		

Motion negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 27th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company — (Mr. Tyrwhitt).

TRAFFIC IN INTOXICATING LIQUORS.

Mr. SMALL moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 70) to make further provision respecting the traffic in intoxicating liquors. He said: The object of the Bill is to compensate hotel keepers and tavern keepers for loss in consequence of the diminution in value of real estate, by reason, of the operation of the Canada Temperance Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

APPELLATE JURISDICTION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 68) to limit the appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court as respects matters of a purely local nature in the Province of Quebec.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question as to the right of the hon. member to introduce this Bill has been questioned, because he has introduced a Bill on the same or a similar subject, which Bill is still pending before the House. The vote of the House, the other day, was that the Bill should not be read a second time on that day. It is still competent for the House, notwithstanding its vote, to give the Bill a second reading, and go into committee upon it and amend it. So that it will be, in effect, the same as the Bill for which leave to introduce is now asked. The House, therefore, is not precluded from further consideration of the question. It is the final rejection, and not the pending of a Bill which creates the difficulty as to the introduction of another Bill on the same subject, and that difficulty does not exist in this case. In addition, however, to this reason, the Bill is altered in a material point, both in body and title, and therefore, according to Lord Brownell and other authorities, it may receive a second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hastings) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 71) to amend the criminal law of Canada. He said: The Bill which I propose submitting to the House and which I trust will commend itself to the favorable consideration of hon. members, is an Act to amend the criminal law in so far as it relates to the punishment of a notorious class of offenders who are causing more terror even than dynamiters, namely, burglars. Depredations by this class of individuals are daily becoming more bold and frequent. I notice, that only a few days ago in Toronto, four houses in one street were burglarised, one of them being the residence of a sergeant of police. I know that business men in nearly all the large towns and cities throughout the Dominion—and what I say will be substantiated by the members from Montreal—are necessarily put to a large expense by being compelled to specially guard vaults, safes and other places where valuable securities are kept; and this is done by means of a net work of electric wires connected with a larger wire having communication with a central office and also with the police station. When an attempt is made to burglarise premises which possess such an arrangement, an alarm is given and a messenger can be despatched to the scene of the burglars' operations. These men ransack our private dwellings, as I can speak from experience, break open our sideboards and cupboards, secretaries and places in which we store our plate and valuables, and they even enter the precincts of our sleeping apartments, and if we presume or undertake to protect and defend our property, it is a matter of indifference whether they dispatch us with the pistol or bowie knife. I know that ladies, when burglars have entered the premises during the absence of the head of the family, have become so much alarmed that their

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

health has become irreparably impaired and their lives are scarcely worth living. In the city where I reside, many of our commercial men leave their houses at 3 o'clock in the morning—notwithstanding that the gas is kept burning, and police are on duty—for the purpose of seeing that their business premises have not been disturbed or property carried away. The law as it at present stands leaves it discretionary with the judge to punish these men, when convicted, with imprisonment for a period of from two to fourteen years. In three-fourths or even five-sixths of the cases we find that the men arrested for burglary have already served a short term of imprisonment, either in the central prison or penitentiary. This vocation seems to have become chronic with them; they are either indisposed or are incapable of pursuing any other calling; and I propose by this Bill that it be not left discretionary with the judge, but that it be made compulsory for the judge who tries, to send a man, and before whom he is convicted on this crime, to the penitentiary for life. I think that is the only way we can wipe out this crime in this country. Burglars are now a terror to the community at large, and while it is competent for any hon. member to make the minimum punishment seven or ten years, I propose submitting the Bill as at present framed, which makes it compulsory for a judge to send a prisoner, convicted of burglary, to the penitentiary for life.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPERINTENDENTS OF LETTER CARRIERS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House resolve itself into committee, to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to provide for the appointment of one or more superintendents of letter carriers, at a salary not to exceed \$800 each, as may be determined by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MULOCK. I do not know the reason for the motion itself, but one feature in it I think is objectionable. It asks the House to sanction the appointment of "one or more superintendents of letter carriers." "More" is a very vague term, and I do not think the House should be asked to clothe the Government with such power as that.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. There are a number of letter carriers in large cities such as Montreal, Toronto, Quebec and Ottawa, and it has been found necessary that a very few—I cannot state the number exactly, but the Postmaster-General will be here directly, and he can give the information—superintendents of these letter carriers should be appointed. It stands to reason that the salary of those officers should be a little above that of the letter carriers, and the demand is made that they should have a salary not to exceed \$800. The salary of the letter carriers can go up to \$600 or \$650, and this would give the Postmaster-General the power to appoint one or more of them as superintendents. It is impossible to state the number that would be necessary, but I suppose one for each important post office, and their salary would be according to their experience, from \$350 or \$400 up to \$800.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not speak as to the salary. I spoke as to the unlimited number. I do not think that the House should authorise the Government to appoint an unlimited number of officers. If, as the Secretary says, only one is required for each city, then there is something to limit the number, but it should be in the resolution. Under this resolution you could appoint every man in the city superintendent of letter carriers.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have you no confidence in them?

Mr. MULLOCK. I do not think, if we have confidence in hem, it is a constitutional way of proceeding.

Mr. BLAKE. It is not a question of confidence or want of confidence in the Government. It is a question of what amount of power should be given to them, and the hon. gentleman who occupies a neutral position in this House should be as jealous as we who are opposed to the Government, of the power which is proposed to be given to them. The Secretary said that, if the Postmaster-General were here, we would hear from him. I am sure that we shall all be glad to hear from the Postmaster-General, and I am sorry—Oh, here he is.

Mr. CARLING. We have a superintendent of letter carriers for each city. In some cities we have clerks who have been acting as superintendents, and what we ask is to be allowed to promote one of the most efficient of the present letter carriers to be a superintendent of letter carriers at an increased salary. We only want one or two additional to those we have.

Mr. BLAKE. But you have some superintendents now?

Mr. CARLING. They are acting superintendents, though they are really clerks.

Mr. BLAKE. There is no authority at present in the law to appoint any person superintendent of letter carriers. The law authorises the appointment of certain persons as letter carriers, and at present the hon. gentleman appoints some of them acting superintendents. He wants to legalise that, and to appoint some at an increased salary. He intends to appoint one in each city.

Mr. CARLING. Those who are superintendents in the cities of Montreal and Toronto will continue superintendents, but, in one or two cities, the men who are superintendent letter carriers are letter carriers, and we have no opportunity of promoting them or of giving them more salary.

Mr. BLAKE. Is there a law authorising the appointment of superintendents of letter carriers in Toronto and Montreal?

Mr. CARLING. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Are they to be appointed under this Act?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Postmaster-General has the power to appoint a number of letter carriers, the number required, according to the size of the city and the number of deliveries. It is found to be absolutely requisite for the sake of regularity that some person should have in large towns general supervision of the letter carriers. We hear of letters being dropped, and of letter carriers misbehaving themselves, and so on. As the law stands just now, there may be no superintendent of letter carriers taken from that body. We may have one of them who fulfils the duty, but he gets no additional salary. The consequence is that a third-class clerk is taken and is appointed to perform the duty of superintendent of letter carriers; but the Postmaster-General desires that he may be authorised to take the most deserving of the letter carriers themselves, and appoint him as superintendent. He cannot do that now, because he must pass the qualifying examination under the Civil Service Act. Though he may be just the man to supervise the letter carriers, he must first pass the examination for clerk; so this Bill is for the purpose of enabling the most deserving of the letter carriers to be promoted and given an adequate salary.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the Postmaster-General more than any of us should thank the hon. gentleman for his intervention. But the point of the case is this: under the law as it now stands the office of the superintendent of letter carriers is not a legal office, and it is proposed to

establish that office as a legal office. It is proposed to make such an officer a new officer, and it is proposed to do that for the cities as well in which there is a person, without statutory authority, acting as superintendent of letter carriers, as in certain other cities. There are two cities in which persons are acting as superintendents of letter carriers, named by the hon. gentleman, Montreal and Toronto. He says in one or two more there are clerks also who are acting in that way, and therefore there are at least three or four cases, and perhaps more, in which it is designed, under the authority of the Act to be based on this resolution, to appoint superintendents of letter carriers. Now, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mullock) pointed out the vagueness of the proposal of the Administration. The proposal is to appoint one or more superintendents, by his own admission, and yet the hon. gentleman intends to appoint at least four more—and I do not know how many more—but he only speaks of one or more. I do not like to use the word "deceptive," but when you have at present more than one acting in that capacity, and you only ask for authority to appoint one or more—certainly I think we ought to have further information. Is it intended to have a superintendent of letter carriers in all cities in which the system is prevailing? If so, then we could understand it, and then the proper course for the Government would be to say that it shall be lawful within any city in which the system of letter carrying is adopted to appoint a superintendent; if it is not intended to do that in all those cities, in which city is it intended to do it? How many offices do you intend to fill? So far as that portion is concerned, of the hon. gentleman's explanation on behalf of his colleague, it is with reference to the expediency of evading the provisions of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman will understand the matter better by looking at it not at the point of view of a nomination, which may be discussed when the Estimates providing for such nomination comes before us, but only with the view of limiting the salary if the nomination is authorised. There is at the end of the Civil Service Act a schedule giving letter carriers as officers of the Civil Service, a salary of \$350 a year, with an increase of \$30 per year till the salary reaches \$650. To that schedule we intend to add the provision that, when appointed, superintendents of letter carriers shall have a salary not to exceed \$800. An hon. gentleman who rose a moment ago stated that this Bill is rather vague and that the House would like to know how many letter carriers are to be appointed. The Postmaster-General answered that he did not know exactly and could not know. There are at present in Montreal and Toronto third-class clerks who are acting as superintendents of letter carriers. They receive a salary as third-class clerks, and at the same time are acting as superintendents, so that their salaries reach \$1,000. But under the Civil Service Act these letter carriers do not have the privileges of third-class clerks. The Postmaster-General says: We may want one or two, or three, or four, of those letter carriers in the future to act as superintendents, and we ask the House to say that the salary of these officers shall in no case exceed the sum of \$800. I think the House cannot ask more than that. We are not now discussing the Estimates.

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention to make any new appointments. We ask to be empowered to promote men to that position, and give them an additional salary. In the case of Ottawa there is a very deserving superintendent of letter carriers who has been acting as such for many years, but he has no more salary than any of the other letter carriers. We want to give him a slight addition to his salary, as he has greater responsibility than any of the others. It is intended to make no new appointments.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State, says one object is to limit the salary. But these resolutions ask to authorise the creation of the office, and to assign a maximum salary to the office so authorised to be created. It is not a limitation but an extension; it is to create an office or offices, and we are now asked to provide for the appointment of one or more superintendents of letter carriers, and it is proposed that the salary of this office shall not exceed \$800 per year. Then, as I understand it, the system is not to be very symmetrical. In some cases the superintendents are to be clerks in the Civil Service, and their remuneration is to go on under the Civil Service rules, and may get beyond \$800 a year; but in other cases the superintendents are to be chosen from amongst the letter carriers, and they are to be under a different set of regulations.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has only repeated what I have said. I say there is no mention of any special appointments at the present moment. I say that parties acting at the present moment as superintendents of letter carriers shall not be entitled in the future to a salary of more than \$800. We desire to avoid the necessity of taking third-class clerks and giving them a salary of \$1,000 as superintendents of letter carriers; and therefore the Postmaster-General asks to be authorised to promote letter carriers to that position instead of appointing third-class clerks.

Mr. MULOCK. Under this resolution the Government could appoint any number of superintendents. It is true, as the Secretary of State says, we are not now passing the Estimates, but if we were passing the Estimates, and an Order in Council were brought down, saying that half a dozen superintendents had been appointed, we would be referred to this resolution, and would be told that the appointment has been made under its authority.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. My hon. friend should remember that third-class clerks now receive a minimum of \$400 and a maximum of \$1,000. Every year we will come to the House and say: We want so many superintendents of letter carriers and we shall ask the authorisation of Parliament to appoint them. Here we fix the salary of those clerks, and whenever the Estimates are brought down my hon. friend will be able to see how many superintendents or letter carriers have to be provided for in those Estimates.

Mr. MILLS. According to the explanations given by the Secretary of State, it appears these officers will have little to do. In the cities of Montreal and Toronto the Postmaster-General informs us that third-class clerks are in the habit of discharging the duties, and the position of third-class clerk is better than that of superintendent that he proposes to create. He does not propose to call parties in Montreal and Toronto superintendents; he proposes to continue third-class clerks in the discharge of these duties; but in other cities letter carriers who have been in the habit of discharging the duty of inspector are to be named and are to be paid a better salary than they are paid at the present moment as ordinary letter carriers. In fact all those that are in better circumstances, who are better situated officially than by this resolution they could be, are to be allowed to remain as they are; those that cannot be paid the amount the Government would like to pay them under the law, as it now stands, are to be provided for by this particular resolution. That is the proposition. Now the hon. gentleman admits by bringing down this Bill that this is an unnecessary office, that it is wholly unnecessary to create any such office. He says that in Toronto and Montreal third-class clerks discharge those duties, and will continue to discharge them, while in the other cities, in Ottawa, London, Belleville and Brantford, those duties are now being discharged by ordinary letter carriers. But the fact is that those whom the Gov-

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

ernment wish to favor have perhaps been active political agents; they have done service outside, and they are to be paid specially the sum of \$800 a year. It is perfectly clear that this is a job, and that the Government are engaging in it for the purpose of rewarding those who have done them political service.

Mr. BEATY. With regard to the superintendent of letter carriers I am prepared to show that it is quite an important matter, a matter of necessity to have proper superintendence over the numerous letter carriers in Toronto. The administration of the post office affairs in this respect is so large, the letters carried so numerous, and so important to the citizens that it is necessary to have constant supervision over these officers. I think the amount asked will not exceed what will be requisite even if a subordinate officer be appointed, and the office is one that certainly requires to be filled by one who understands his business, and who can efficiently administer the duties under his charge.

Mr. BLAKE. No doubt the hon. gentleman will propose an amendment of the procedure, because the hon. Minister has stated that no change whatever is to take place in Montreal or Toronto.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Perhaps since the hon. gentleman desires it he will ask us to appoint third-class clerks for this service at an outlay of \$1,000 instead of paying \$800 as we now propose.

Mr. LANDERKIN. It is perfectly plain that the Government are going to appoint more officers, and my own opinion is that it is time to stop. For years past, you, Mr. Chairman, have occupied the Chair of this House with the greatest dignity, and this Government the other day seemed to vote non-confidence in you, and appoint another in your place. They were anxiously looking after the health of Mr. Speaker, who certainly does look like a delicate man, and they thought it was necessary to appoint a Deputy Speaker, and now they are about to appoint another officer. I call the attention of the Postmaster-General to the fact that there are many places in the rural constituencies that have not one mail a day, and I think further expenses should not be incurred in the cities until adequate mail service has been given to every rural constituency. I know many places where they only get two mails a week. It is quite proper that the cities should get a good mail service, and I favored their getting it, but when they are running up to such an enormous expense it becomes the Government and the House to halt and to look after the interests of those places which are deserving of a better mail service. There is no doubt that this is done for a purpose. There is no doubt that the member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty) will come up with a friend of his to take the office when it is created.

Mr. CARLING. I am surprised at the remarks which have been made by the leader of the Opposition, by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. gentleman who has last spoken (Mr. Landerkin). There is no intention or desire to create a new office; that has been stated distinctly by the Secretary of State as well as by myself. It is only intended that in the city of Ottawa where we have an excellent man who is superintending the letter carriers—

Mr. MILLS. Let him alone.

Mr. CARLING. I am going to. We are only taking the power to give him an addition of \$200 a year. I do not want any more men and do not intend to appoint them. In Montreal a third-class clerk is acting as superintendent of letter carriers, and if he conducts that business efficiently we will continue him until perhaps he is promoted to another class, and when he is promoted to another class of the service we may promote one of the most efficient letter

carriers to take his place, whose salary will not exceed \$800 a year. A third-class clerk may get \$1,000 a year while a letter carrier can only get \$800.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Will the Postmaster General inform us how many cities or places in the Dominion have this letter carrying service?

Mr. CARLING. The service is in force in the cities of St. John, Halifax, Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, London and Winnipeg.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I fear the practical result will be that the good nature of my hon. friend will be taken advantage of, and as soon as the Bill is passed application will be made to have one of these deserving letter carriers appointed in each place as superintendent at a salary of \$800 a year; and so good natured a man as the Postmaster General is will find himself unable to deny the requests of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Beaty) and others. We know how it is—

Mr. BOWELL. Yes, you have been there yourself.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—and it is not one but a whole dozen who will ask to have the additional amount.

Mr. LANDERKIN. The more I look into this matter the more manifestly unfair does it appear to be that these new offices should be created with a salary of \$800 a year. I am aware, and the Postmaster General is aware, that in many places the whole time of the mail carriers is occupied, or nearly the whole time, and they get sometimes less than \$100 a year to carry the mail. A mail carrier in my constituency who carries the mail from Ayton, about one and a-half miles, and goes twice a day, gets about \$49; and in Hanover something like \$99 is paid, and so on. These officers in rural constituencies are underpaid for their work, and here we are creating an officer who is to relieve the postmasters of Toronto, Halifax and other places of the responsibility which belongs to them, and still it is not proposed to lessen the salaries of these postmasters. Why should we create these offices at a time when the country is suffering from hard times, and thereby increase the expenditure of the country? I could not allow the matter to pass without rising and making a protest against it.

Mr. CARLING. The hon. gentleman must know that the mail carriers to whom he refers, who carry the mail from the town or village to the station are not salaried officers, but that they tender for the service, and if they take it too low it is their own fault and not the fault of the Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I wish to point out a mistake which the hon. gentleman has made. He stated that the members for the city of Toronto were consulted by the Postmaster General. I am one of the members for the city and I have not been consulted.

Mr. BOWELL. That is manifestly unjust.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Landerkin) says that some of the mail carriers get only \$50 or \$60, and the Postmaster General replies that the work is let by contract. Perhaps the Government will let this other work by contract.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Hear, hear. I will support that.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I know a man at Belleville who goes to the station four or five times a day, and who collects the letters from eight or nine boxes. He has to keep two horses, and all he gets is \$700 or \$800. I agree with the hon. gentleman opposite that it is time to know that there are too many officers in and around these buildings. I think it is time we should understand that the members should not press the Government to fill these offices, and they should curtail expenses everywhere and in every respect. I

believe what the hon. member opposite says, that the good nature of the Postmaster General will lead him to give to each city a new officer; and I think it would be better if the hon. Postmaster General would state now how many of these officers he intends to have. I agree that the members of the House and the Government should feel that we ought to curtail every expense in the country. The truth is, we are over-governed in this country. There is no people in the world who have so many men making laws for them. We have the Local Legislatures, and they are like five or six prodigal sons, as it were, coming here every Session begging. It is time that we should endeavor to curtail our expenditure, and if we are to continue to have Local Parliaments, they should collect by direct taxation what they require to manage their own local affairs.

Mr. BEATY. I was not aware until just now that Toronto had a fourth member to represent it. That being the case, and knowing the good nature of the Postmaster General, I shall take the hon. gentleman into confidence with me in order to get appointments.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The price is too high.

Resolution ordered to be reported.

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENTS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved that the House resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that each member of the Board of Examiners appointed for purposes of the Civil Service Act, shall receive a salary of six hundred dollars per annum.
2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the members of the Board shall be paid such travelling expenses while engaged in their work, as may be determined by the Governor in Council.
3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the Governor in Council may appoint a secretary to the Board, with a salary not exceeding one thousand dollars per annum, and a clerk having a qualified examination certificate, to assist the Board, and the latter shall be a third-class clerk of the Department of the Secretary of State.
4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that the minimum salary paid to a chief clerk shall be one thousand eight hundred dollars, with an annual increase of fifty dollars per annum, up to a maximum of two thousand six hundred dollars.
5. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that when the duties of any superior officer or clerk, during his absence or by reason of his demise, but not through superannuation, are continuously performed by an officer or clerk of an inferior class, or junior rank, during a period of more than three months, the officer or clerk performing such duties may, on the recommendation of the Deputy Head, concurred in by the Head of the Department, by Order in Council, and provided that funds are available under Parliamentary vote for such payment, receive in addition to his ordinary pay the difference between such ordinary pay and the pay of the officer or clerk whose duties he has performed for the time he has performed such duties.
6. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that all payments of money to permanent employés, other than salaries to be made under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, and whether specifically stated or not in the estimates submitted to Parliament, shall be made only under the authority of the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee.

(In the Committee.)

On resolution 1,

Mr. BLAKE. Explain, please.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The first resolution provides for the salary of the Civil Service examiners. Last year I put before the House a resolution providing for a more reasonable salary, but unfortunately some technical irregularity prevented it from passing. The demand is \$600 for each member of the Board of Examiners. They have heretofore been paid at the rate of \$5 a day, provided the number of days did not exceed 60 days in the year. This amount has proven to be not only inadequate, but completely out of proportion to the amount of work necessarily imposed upon the examiners. Some people may believe that the duties of these examiners are trifling. Let me tell the House that they have to attend to two semi-annual examinations

both preliminary and qualifying; that more than a thousand candidates have been examined during the past year; that there are extra promotion examinations, besides the two regular examinations in all the Departments, and besides special examinations ordered by Council when the interests of the service require it; that over 10,000 papers have to be examined and reported upon in detail by the examiners. Another report is to be put in form for publication, and a third prepared and arranged for Parliament. During last year the examinations of the month of June alone actually took of the time of the Civil Service examiners—counting the number of hours, because some of them belonged to the Civil Service—nearly eighty days for the completion of their work. Of the Civil Service examiners, one is in the Civil Service and another one is in a certain manner in the Civil Service, having a very small salary, I mean Doctor Thorburn, and the third is a superannuated officer. Some hon. member will perhaps remark that these gentlemen are under pay from the public and should not receive as high a salary in addition as \$600. Let me tell the House that if that service were done by outsiders—and to be done correctly as it has been, requires men of ability, men of knowledge, men of special qualities for the work, to avoid the difficulties and errors which might be committed if new hands or men not qualified were appointed—if we were to take outsiders, I am sure I do not exaggerate when I say that we would not be able to get men to do that work, who would be willing to give the time necessary for it, for a salary lower than at least double the salary which is fixed by this resolution. In the United States the salaries paid to public officers are not as a rule high, at least, the official salaries; well, the Board of Examiners who perform similar duties in the State of New York, where the population is a little under the population of the Dominion, are paid the following salaries: Three commissioners at \$2,000 each; the chief examiner at \$3,600; two clerks, \$1,000 and \$900 respectively; one secretary, who may be one of the commissioners, with an additional salary of \$1,000; and a local board of five examiners at a salary of \$5 per day about \$200 each per year. The Civil Service has I must say extended immensely of late, the organisation of the service has extended with the necessity of having good service, but the service has been well appreciated by the public and the result of the examinations show it. These examinations have to take place in the whole of the Dominion, in twelve different places, from British Columbia to Prince Edward Island; these examinations have all to be superintended and the work finally and accurately done by the examiners. I have said before that service is done in the State of New York at a cost of \$140,000, \$15,000 being put in the yearly estimates. Their commissioners and chief examiner receive \$9,600 a year, while here the same service is done for the paltry sum of \$600 for each of the three members of the board. It is as well I should state now that if the secretary be an outsider he will be paid at the rate of \$1,000, which is proposed to be his salary by this resolution, but I may add that should the secretary be a member of the commission the salary is fixed by an Order in Council at \$700 instead of \$1,000. My hon. friend from Renfrew has said that after all it is a large expenditure, that the number of officers is increasing, and the expense is beginning to be very large; but I do not think the House will conclude that the expense is very heavy when I say the fee of \$2 which is exacted from every candidate, either for qualifying examination or for promotion examination, covers the expense to the extent of \$2,500, leaving but a small sum to be provided to cover up the balance of the expense of the service as provided for by this resolution.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has said that two members of the board belong to the Civil Service, the third I presume does not.

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The third is a superannuated officer.

Mr. BLAKE. At present I think one of the members of the board is also secretary.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes; the superannuated officer.

Mr. BLAKE. He is the only one whose name I happen to remember and I thought that by the figures in the Public Accounts that he was receiving more than mentioned. The proposal is, instead of this smaller sum which the hon. gentleman has mentioned in the \$5 for each day to make it \$600, and he has said the June examination amounted to 80 days. That is the usual Civil Service computation of days; I presume, the usual number of hours a day.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman state what the whole year's work was?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have not exactly the amount, but I know that, during the year, putting it 160 days would be a low figure for the examinations.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman not think it is cruel to impose upon the civil servants half as much work again as they normally had to do?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That may be the case; we have had letters from one about it and may have the misfortune to lose him. I know that outside of the service nobody will undertake to do the work for less than \$1,200.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman speaks of 180 days. Is that the time occupied by the examinations themselves?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; that is the time taken to prepare the correspondence, answer the letters, meet together, give different decisions for the examination, and the correction of the thousands of papers they have to deal with during the year.

Mr. CASEY. As far as I understand, it is the duty of the secretary to conduct the correspondence. The other members of the board will simply have to direct him in a general way, and it is only in connection with the secretary's duties that this great length of time will be required; the other members have simply to prepare the examination papers, and correct the answers sent in. I am aware that is a very considerable job of work and that a liberal rate should be paid for it, but if I am not mistaken the proposed salaries to the Civil Service Board are very much larger than that paid to examiners at the Toronto University or Normal School, or other such institutions, where an almost equal amount of work has to be done. However, it is almost impossible to say, without more definite information as to the time required by the examiners, whether the salary is too high or not. I must call attention to the fact that one, at least, of the Board of Civil Service Examiners is already receiving a very considerable salary, that is Mr. DeCelles, the Assistant Librarian, a man in every way fit for the position, of course, but he is receiving already \$2,400 as Assistant Librarian and \$300 as Civil Service examiner. Well, if \$300 pays for 180 days of his time, he is very much overpaid on the other account. If \$2,400 is not too much for a year's work as Librarian, even \$600 would be a very insufficient pay for the other work.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Does the hon. gentleman mean to dispute the salary of the Librarian?

Mr. CASEY—Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, I think I have the floor—so there is a great inconsistency between the two salaries. If the salary paid to him as Assistant Librarian enables him to take the other work at a lower rate than it could otherwise have been done, it shows that there is something wrong somewhere; because, if a man is paid for a year's work, and not overpaid, at \$2,400, it does not seem

reasonable that he should be supposed to do 180 days' extra work for \$300 or even for \$600 additional. There is something incompatible in the figures. Of course, it is not to be supposed that during these 180 days Mr. DeCelles can do his work as Librarian as well as his work as examiner. It must be supposed that he devotes his time during these 180 days to the work of the Civil Service Board and some one else must do the work in the Library or it must remain undone. I do not say that it does, because I do not know anything about the work in the Library except during the Session. Therefore another great inconsistency appears. The fact of 180 days being taken from the duties of Librarian and given to the Civil Service Board is a very extraordinary state of things. As to Mr. LeSueur, he is superannuated with an allowance of \$1,024, and he gets \$1,000 as member and clerk of the Civil Service Board. I do not remember exactly why he was superannuated, but it is generally taken for granted when a man is superannuated that it is because he is unfit for further service in the Department, and, if afterwards a superannuated official is taken into the Government employ, it is to be understood that he has again become fit for Government service; and he should not get the two salaries at the same time, one on the ground that he is unfit, and the other on the ground that he is fit for the public service. The two things are perfectly inconsistent. If the officer is taken on again, it implies that he is fit for work, and the superannuation allowance should be stopped or he should be given no further allowance for the work he is called upon to perform. As to Dr. Thorburn, his connection with the Civil Service is comparatively slight as Librarian of the Geological Museum, and the amount he receives for it is comparatively small, \$600 a year, I think. The hon. gentleman says that, if outsiders were engaged to do this work, very large sums would have to be paid to them. He mentions \$1,200 as the least which, in his opinion, would secure them. I have a very considerable acquaintance amongst gentlemen of the class who would naturally be called upon to do this kind of work—scientific examination work—amongst professors and tutors of colleges and others who have a very considerable amount of spare time during the vacation when their work in the colleges is not required. I am prepared to state my opinion, which is only an opinion of course, but based on my knowledge of those gentlemen and of what they could do in a certain time, that an equal number of them could be selected who would get through the work done by the Civil Service Board in one third of the time the Minister says it occupies. I could name a dozen of them any three of whom would get through the work in 60 days, as professors work, not as Civil Servants work, for the difference is very remarkable. I could mention a number of these men who are much more highly qualified than those who are now on the board, who have higher scientific attainments and greater experience in examining students, who would be glad to take this work for \$600 or even a less sum.

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. CASEY. I contend that it would be much better for the interests of the service if outsiders were taken to perform these duties instead of members of the service. It is quite inconsistent with the theory of a Civil Service Board of Examiners that they should themselves be members of the service. The examinations in the main are for entrance. No departmental knowledge is required to test the fitness of the individuals who present themselves. The peculiar departmental examinations such as those for the Inland Revenue and the Surveying Departments must be always to a great extent got up in the Departments themselves, and that could be done just as well by a board of scientific men outside the service, with the assistance of the departmental head, as by a board of men in the service. I therefore say that outsiders could do the work

as well as gentlemen in the service, and outsiders could be got who have higher scientific acquirements than any in the service whose time could be devoted to this work, and it is better that the examinations should be held by those who are not connected with the service, who have no reason for favoring anyone, and who are not hampered with any of the red tape which gets tangled around anyone who has been for any length of time in the public service. For these reasons, I think I am justified in urging that the proposed allowance of \$600 is excessive if it is given to those who are already in the Civil Service or are receiving superannuation from the Government; further, that no officer receiving a superannuation allowance should be employed at a salary by the Government; further still, that outsiders should be employed for this purpose and could be obtained of the highest quality for a less price than the hon. gentleman proposes to pay to members of the service.

Mr. CURRAN. The gentleman who has just resumed his seat has informed us that he possesses a certain amount of information which he has not vouchsafed to this House, but which would be more important than anything he has said. He has made, no doubt, a very facetious speech, and we have listened to him with that enjoyment which his utterances always ensure to this House. He states that he knows some gentlemen who would undertake this work for a comparatively trifling amount, but he has not stated who these gentlemen are, though I requested him to do so. I take it that this is a very justifiable application which is made to this House with regard to the salaries of these gentlemen. I do not at all agree with the statement that superannuated officers, those who have discharged their onerous duties for years but may not be in the possession of robust health should not be employed in duties of this kind if they possess the necessary qualifications, and it is confessed on all sides that the gentlemen who occupy the present position actually do possess those qualifications. But I rose more particularly to draw the attention of the hon. Minister, and through him of the examiners themselves, to a point which has been discussed to some extent in such papers as the *Montreal Star*, the *Post* and others, with regard to a subject that might relieve the examiners of some of their anxiety and labor. The complaint has been made, and I think it is a just one, that perhaps too much time has been spent over the preparation of questions submitted to those who aspire to the Civil Service; that the questions have very often been of a catch nature; that they have extended into a range of knowledge that is never likely to be required. I think if there was less soaring in that respect, possibly a great many desirable persons for the Civil Service would not be barred out. For my part, whilst approving of the motion before the House, I hope that the objections which have been made to some of the examination papers will be taken note of, and that in the future those papers will be of such a practical nature as will enable all those who are really fit for the service to obtain access thereto.

Mr. CASEY. In reply to the hon. member's request for names I can only say, of course, that I did not suppose he could expect me to make free with the names of the distinguished gentlemen whom I had in my mind's eye when I spoke. But if the Minister would like to enter into negotiations with any of these gentlemen I will be happy to give him privately their addresses, to enable him to ascertain on what terms they would undertake this duty. If I found they would not undertake it on the terms he proposes, I would acknowledge my mistake. In regard to the catch questions stated to have been given by the board of examiners, I must say that I have heard the same complaints made by parties thoroughly competent to judge. I have not examined the last lot of papers, and cannot, therefore, speak from personal knowledge, but I have been told

by parties well qualified to judge that many of the questions were of a nature such as those that schoolmasters like to argue amongst themselves at a teachers' meeting, in order to show their intellectual dexterity, and that they were not of a nature to test the average general knowledge of the applicants. This fact alone, I think, would justify us in saying that in some particulars the duties of the board of examiners were not so much onerous as the hon. gentleman stated, as they are erroneous—in the words of a friend of mine, who was once mayor of a western village.

Mr. DAVIES. I think it is desirable that we should find out just now how much this increased expenditure is to be of which the hon. Secretary of State has spoken. Whether there is to be an increase in the efficiency of the board of examiners is another question. If I understand the hon. member aright he proposes that three examiners shall be paid a salary of \$600 each; that they shall have a secretary and a third-class clerk. This board costs us yearly \$3,600, and I suppose he intends to continue the system of sub-examiners in every Province of the Dominion. Last year I noticed by the Auditor's report that we paid \$1,625 to the examiners' secretary, and the hon. gentleman now proposes to pay \$1,800 to three examiners, and \$1,000 for the secretary, which makes, in other words, an increase of \$2,000. Last year we paid Mr. LeSueur \$1,000, Mr. DeCelles \$300, Mr. Thorburn \$300, and \$25 to a special examiner, making \$1,625. He now proposes to pay \$1,800 to three examiners, \$1,000 to a secretary, and \$1,000 to the clerk.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No; that is not the case.

Mr. DAVIES. On the face of it, the hon. gentleman proposes to make an increase of \$2,000 at least. I wish to know from the hon. gentleman if it is also contemplated that these gentleman who are paid these \$600 apiece are to be paid travelling expenses? Whence comes the necessity that they should travel if he has examiners in several Provinces? I noticed last year that in addition to their salaries we have paid Mr. LeSueur \$200 for travelling expenses, \$144 to Mr. DeCelles, and \$50 to Mr. Thorburn. That may be all right; it may have been necessary, or it may not—I do not know; but I think the Commons should be afforded some information from the Secretary of State when proposing these alterations as to whether this state of matters is to continue. Does he propose to pay these travelling expenses in addition to the salary? And why is it necessary for them to travel if he has sub-examiners in the several Provinces who were paid \$967 last year? If I understand the proposition, the hon. gentleman proposes to increase the cost next year to a sum in the neighborhood of \$8,000. That is a pretty material increase, which is on a par with the increases which are proposed from time to time in the other Departments. I do not notice, when hon. members speak of economy from time to time in the abstract, that they rise to make any opposition to special instances of additions to the expenditure. Professions of economy are indulged in by hon. gentlemen opposite, but when an absolute increase is proposed in any Department there is not a voice raised in opposition. This may be right; but the explanations have not satisfied me, and I do not think they have satisfied the committee.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It seems to me that the proposition of the hon. gentleman, the Secretary of State, is objectionable on more grounds than one. All of us who have anything to do with the Public Accounts have observed that a most pernicious practice is increasing in the management of our public affairs. Constantly we find gentlemen who have one salary for a distinct piece of work, are getting another salary for other employment which, in many cases, they cannot perform without very considerably neglecting the duties which were at first assigned to them. Now, this appears to be a case very much in point. If I

Mr. CASEY.

understand the Secretary of State aright, one of these gentlemen who ought to be pretty fully employed at his legitimate work is expected to work 180 days in the discharge of these duties. If I am wrong in drawing that inference, the hon. gentleman can correct me. Now, if I say we have an officer here, in our employment, who has got 180 days to spare, the probability is that that officer, whoever he may be, is either considerably overpaid or underworked—it does not matter which. However, my objection is to the principle of giving two distinct salaries for distinct pieces of work to members of the Civil Service. It is a mistake in itself which has led to serious abuse, and which will likely lead to much greater abuse in the future. As to the point taken by my hon. friend behind me, the member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), I would call the hon. gentleman's attention to this: How the matter is arranged now, I am not quite sure, but within a few years, unless I mistake, in the practice of the English service where the examination is a very much more serious matter than it is with us—inasmuch as it is a competitive examination, which is a totally different thing, and a much more serious matter—than a pass examination, which is all that we, at the present time, insist upon, I think the examiners are generally taken from among the ranks of the tutors and professors in the great English universities, and it is done for the express reason of preventing the examination from being conducted by persons who may be supposed to be unduly under the influence of the existing Government. It is desirable, I think, that we should follow the English precedent, which the First Minister is always so desirous of following. I will tell the Secretary of State where I think he could obtain an extremely suitable corps of examiners, and the cost would certainly not be in excess but probably less than the sum he now proposes to pay. Most of our colleges and universities are in the habit of granting long vacations to the students, and by consequence to the professors. I am quite sure from the various universities in Quebec and Ontario, and probably in the Maritime Provinces, the Secretary of State would have no trouble in obtaining half a dozen or even a dozen examiners, perfectly qualified to conduct such examinations as these and quite ready to carry them on, for sums considerably less than he now proposes to pay. More than that, those men are specially fitted for the work. I do not suppose either the First Minister or the other members of the Government expect to obtain men for the Civil Service, at an average salary of \$500 or \$600 to start upon, better educated than those who matriculate at our ordinary universities. I take it that the standard will be much about the same; the standard for the Civil Service will not be higher, and I am giving the Ministry the benefit of the doubt. Those gentlemen to whom I have referred are in the habit of conducting precisely similar examinations of large numbers of young men who propose to enter the various universities. Selections from among them I am sure—and it could be made by the Government if they like, among their own political friends—I suppose they have some in the universities—would give more satisfaction than the perpetuation of this mischievous practice which is now creeping in among us and which threatens, as is apparent from a perusal of the report of the Auditor-General, to develop into a positive abuse of very serious magnitude—this practice of paying two salaries to gentlemen who already receive an adequate salary from the Dominion; or, what is just as bad, of paying very large amounts for extra work. Why, we have found that gentlemen have been paid for extra work done after hours a sum quite equivalent to the total salary they receive per month and per year. I do not think it is desirable to see this state of things perpetuated on the Statute Book, as the Secretary of State proposes, especially when he can obtain gentlemen perfectly qualified to discharge all the not very

onerous functions of setting papers for a pass examination—which, I repeat, is a totally different thing from a competitive examination—out of the ranks of gentlemen who are in the habit of doing this work constantly in the discharge of their ordinary vocations, and who, during the vacation, would have ample time to attend to such work.

Mr. McMULLEN. In connection with this matter I beg to call the attention of the House to a matter which has already been alluded to by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). According to the Auditor-General's report there are 140 civil servants on the list during the last fiscal year, who received an average salary of \$1,349.66, and in addition \$57,794.18 was paid them for extra services. I think it is decidedly wrong that when men are engaged as civil servants to perform duties connected with the Department, and they are employed during a few hours after the ordinary routine which they have to do has been finished, they should be allowed to draw extra wages. It appears to me to be very absurd, and it will so appear to the people of the country. Suppose a farmer hires a man to plough, and he engages him to go and pick stones or do some other farm work, would the man think of saying that he was engaged to plough, and if he did anything else he wanted extra pay? No farmer would consent to pay extra wages in such a case. The Government has no right, when men are hired for the Department to devote all their time to the service of the country, at least a certain number of hours each day, to pay them for extra services. The idea of paying out of the revenues of Canada \$57,794.18 to 140 civil servants for extra services is an outrage and a wrong which should be condemned. I hope the House and the country will take notice of these facts, and if hon. gentlemen opposite will persist in following this course, I trust that the punishment they deserve will be meted out to them.

Mr. CASEY. Will the hon. Minister tell me approximately, from his recollection of the facts, how many men went up for examination during the past year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am very glad that this debate has arisen on this question, and I feel perfectly at ease in answering the hon. members who have taken part in it. If there is any branch of the public service in which there has been an improvement, it is the Civil Service examinations, and if there is one branch in which hardship and low pay to those engaged in it have prevailed, it is in this branch of the public service. The first objection taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is, that it is not right that Civil Service examiners should be members of the Civil Service itself or superannuated officers. I am sorry to say that if we did not use the services of those gentlemen we would have to pay a good deal more, notwithstanding the offer made by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman has said that professors in our universities might, during the holidays, conduct these examinations. If he knew anything about the work of the Civil Service examiners the hon. gentleman would be satisfied that they would not leave their occupation as professors to endure the trouble and difficulty which fall upon examiners throughout the entire year. These examiners were chosen in 1832. I do not say I would not, myself, prefer to have an efficient board entirely outside of the Civil Service, but then we would be obliged to pay something like what the State of New York is paying. Hon. gentlemen opposite may think it is an extraordinary fact; but if we are to have the work efficiently done the services of such men as are suggested would be worth dollar for dollar what such services are paid for in the State of New York. Here we have the experience of men who have been organizing the service. The service is just in the way of coming to a fair state of perfection, and there are innumerable details in regard to it which require

a great deal of attention and work. Another objection made by hon. gentleman opposite is, that because officers are members of the Civil Service they should not be paid for extra work. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen), said that if a man agreed to work for a farmer as a ploughman and he was put to other work and was called on to work at night, all this would be included in his day's work. If a farmer hired a farm laborer to do day work and he were to give him two or three hours extra work, he would have to pay him extra. Laborers and others who are engaged in the ordinary avocations of life, if they work outside their regular hours are allowed for such work, and why should not the civil servants, who have leisure time, be allowed for their services during that time? But the main point is this: I say that the salary of \$600 is a minimum, and that it is really a ridiculously low salary for the work, and I know what the work is, for I have looked into it and have seen these men at work. I repeat that it is a mean salary; it is under the value of their actual services; they are not paid enough for their work, but still they consent to do it. The hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey) says that if the Librarian gets \$2,400 for a year's work, and only gets \$600 for the time he works in connection with the Civil Service examinations, it shows that he is paid too little for the latter work. That may be, and I think it is the case. My hon. friend asked me about the secretary of the board, who is now paid \$1,000. The secretary, Mr. LeSueur, is an able man; he is one who has devoted a great deal of trouble and pains to his work—far more than might be expected from his salary, and I may say that he is not likely to remain as secretary. I hope he will, for the good of the service, continue to serve both as commissioner and secretary. So far as Dr. Thorburn is concerned, nobody who knows him will deny that he is a most efficient man, and one who is exceedingly well qualified for his position. The position which he holds in the Civil Service is a very small one, as he receives, I believe, but \$600 as librarian of the Geological Survey branch. I repeat that we could not at the present moment ask strangers—members or professors of universities—we could not have them to perform this work. These gentlemen would be travelling all the time—if not every week, surely more than once during each month; they have to consult with the Department, and have to exercise a constant supervision over this particular branch of the Civil Service. They have to get information; new applications are made; demands by members are made, and they are obliged to attend to all this work. There are preliminary examinations, entrance examinations and promotion examinations—there being as many as four examinations for promotion, and the examiners would either have to come to Ottawa or else their duties could not be attended to. I say it is impossible to have such work done so well and so cheaply. The increase will not be \$3,000, as the hon. member for Queen's said. There will be \$300 for each of the three commissioners, making in all \$900. This year Mr. LeSueur being there, we add \$700, so that that sum represents his increase as commissioner and secretary. I think I can say, Sir, that with a population of 4,000,000 people, with seven Provinces over the whole breadth of the Dominion, that the sum of \$2,500 is an expenditure which cannot be considered as excessive, when the fee alone collected from candidates covers the amount.

Mr. McMULLEN. The Secretary of State has told us that when these civil servants are paid extra salaries they are paid for work performed outside the ordinary number of hours during which they are supposed to work as civil servants. I beg to call his attention to the fact that the assistant law clerk of the House of Commons, who gets a salary of \$2,000 a year, appears by the Auditor-General's report to have got \$2,500 for his work in connection with

the consolidation of the statutes. Now, are we to understand that this sum of \$2,500 was paid for work in extra hours during the year's service, and \$2,000 as his salary for the same time.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Is that in connection with the Civil Service Board?

Mr. McMULLEN. It is in the Auditor-General's report, page 18.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I thought we were discussing the Civil Service examiners?

Mr. CASEY. So we were, but the discussion has taken a general turn, which has been followed by the hon. gentleman himself, and he pointed out that when civil servants were paid extra, it was for work done in extra hours. The hon. member for Wellington (Mr. McMullen) gives the case of one civil servant who has been paid \$500 more for work done out of hours than for the salary he earned during his office hours. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman admits that the work done by the Civil Service examiners was not done out of hours. He stated in his speech that this money is paid for work done out of hours, but in his former remarks he admitted it was not, because he told the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) that his calculation of the number of days that these gentlemen were employed was based on the ordinary Civil Service day—so many days of so many hours each—and the only inference anybody could draw from that statement is that he admitted that they occupied so many ordinary civil service days in doing the work of this particular branch.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say that, and I was not so understood by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake).

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. CASEY. Then it was a misunderstanding on my part, and that argument vanishes. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he can tell me approximately the number of men examined by the board last year.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Between 1,000 and 1,200, I think.

Mr. CASEY. The average severity of the examinations not being higher—unless they have changed utterly within the few years past—than those ordinarily conducted in a good high school in Ontario, and no doubt in Quebec and the other Provinces as well, the examinations are of such a nature that a schoolmaster could conduct them with efficiency. And it has cost in salary \$1,625. It is proposed, as near as I can make out, that the salaries alone for the future shall come to \$3,800. After the hon. Minister's explanations, I believe it is not intended to appoint a clerk in addition to Mr. LeSueur this year, but the hon. Minister takes power to do so, and when Mr. LeSueur is superannuated for the second time the clerk will be appointed. When I spoke first on this matter I was not able to speak positively of the cost of the examination of students at Toronto University. A friend of mine has since looked up the records of that institution, and informs me that the amount paid to the examiners is under \$1,200, and that about 800 students are examined annually. Of course, the great bulk of that examination is done at one time. There is a second examination, but the number of students is not nearly so great. The examiners prepare the questions and look over the answers, just as the Civil Service examiners do, and they have to be much more highly educated men than the Civil Service examiners, because they have to examine in classics, in science, and in the higher arts. As a rule, the examiners are not professors, and I think the highest pay for any one of them is from \$80 to \$100. Even supposing it would be fair to count the cost of holding two Civil Service exam-

Mr. McMULLEN.

ations in the year, at double the cost of the university examinations, that would only be \$2,400 for examining 800 students, instead of \$3,800. If \$1,200 is the actual cost there for higher examinations, it is monstrous to take \$3,800 for examining young men in the rudiments. In answer to my suggestion that professors and tutors might be engaged, the Minister says they could not give up their chairs. I never proposed anything so absurd. What I proposed was, that they should occupy their time out of hours, as the Civil Service examiners are doing, and that they should do the work in their vacation, when their Sessions are not going on. The hon. gentleman says that the Civil Service Board have to do more—that they have to supervise the Departments and listen to the demands of members. I never heard that the Civil Service Boards had any powers of supervision; I did not think they could interfere with the discipline of any Department under this Act. As a matter of fact they do not interfere to put one clerk up and another down. As to listening to the demands of members, I think that it is something that the Civil Service Board should not do. They should not have any communication with the members of the House or the members of the Government as to their duties. They should be as independent of the Government and of the members of the House as judges, and the fact that they do listen to the demands of members shows that the whole thing is a farce. We know that the influence of members of the Government must be overwhelming upon gentlemen who are appointed by that Government during pleasure, first as Civil Service employees, and next as members of this board. That is the reason I advocate that outsiders should be appointed, and appointed during good behavior, as judges are, so that they would be entirely independent of the Government and of members of the House. I admit that the secretary, because of his extra work in looking after the papers, should be paid more than the others. There is no reason why those who prepare the papers should be present where the examinations are held. In fact, in the case of the university examinations, they usually reside elsewhere; and they might as well reside at Montreal, or Halifax, or Victoria, for the efficient performance of their duties. I have heard it asserted and not denied yet that these Civil Service examinations which cost so much are not always final. I have been informed that in the Department of the Interior, on one occasion, certain gentlemen who wished to be clerks failed to pass, and that new papers were provided for them in the Department itself. The board were requested to substitute these papers, and the gentlemen, having passed under them, were admitted as clerks in the Department. We have all read, from time to time, in the press, and perhaps some of us know of cases, of men having been appointed to positions without examinations at all. That broad and generous clause allowing men to be appointed for special qualifications, has been strained to the utmost, and men have been appointed without passing any examinations, and on the certificate of a Minister that they had special qualifications, although no special qualifications were required for the place. That provision was only intended to cover the case of a man required for certain technical work that nobody in the Department could do; and it has been strained time and again, and the hon. Minister cannot deny it, to procure the entrance to the Civil Service of gentlemen who had no special qualifications, except the political influence at their back. As to the present expenses of this commission, I am told that an office has been rented for Mr. LeSueur, as secretary of the commission, at a rent of \$300 a year. Now, I certainly think that the Civil Service Commission should be provided with quarters in the public Departments; I do not see why it should be necessary to rent an office outside. I hope the hon. Minister will be prepared to deny that statement. As he does not deny it, I suppose that statement is correct.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If I were to rise to deny every statement of the hon. gentleman, we should be here till 12 o'clock and I do not intend to detain the House.

Mr. MULOCK. I do not pretend to know exactly how these examinations are conducted, and in making any observations, I do so in order that the hon. the Secretary of State may, if my suggestions are worth anything, to some extent adopt them. I am told that the examinations are not held at regular intervals, but at the will of the member of the Government in whose charge they are. Now, it appears to me that it would be better and more convenient for those who are at school if the examinations were held at periods which would be selected with some regard to the curricula of the schools. In the Province of Ontario the public and high schools have regular terms, and the long vacation commences towards the end of June; so, I think, towards the end of June or early in July would be the most convenient time for the examination of students who attend the public and high schools in the Province of Ontario. It may be that they are held at that convenient time now. If so, I apologise for making the suggestion. If it is thought desirable to have a second examination in the year, another term of our schools concludes near Christmas, and there are two or three weeks of holidays before the re-opening of the schools again after Christmas. If, therefore, two examinations in the year are necessary, perhaps it would suit the public service, as I am sure it would suit the examiners, if those two periods were chosen. Then, as to the system of holding examinations, I think it is reasonable that they should be held at different points in each Province. I do not think it is necessary at all that the examiners themselves should be present at such examinations. The papers could be transmitted in various ways safely, received and placed in safe hands, and the examination conducted with absolute safety and efficiency at various points. The whole examination could be thus directed from a central point, say Ottawa, if that is thought desirable, and then there would be practically no travelling expenses. I have had some experience in this matter for some years, and I think that examinations could be conducted in the public interest in the way I have indicated. Then as to the source from which examiners should be chosen, I would not venture to make any suggestion as to the source from which they should be chosen, outside of this Province, as I am not acquainted with educational institutions outside of Ontario; but if it is intended to appoint examiners familiar with the school system, I think we could do better than appoint permanent examiners. I think that, in itself, it is a mistake to appoint men permanently to the office of examiners; experience has frequently, in our Province, shown it to be a mistake. In Ontario we have an excellent field from which to choose examiners. I believe that there are not less than 5,000 public school teachers in Ontario to day, I cannot say how many high school teachers there are, but there are a hundred head masters, and perhaps as many more assistant masters, so that you could very well choose examiners from the source to which I refer—the public school teachers and the high school teachers of the Province of Ontario. They are acquainted with the system of teaching there and would make efficient examiners, and you could easily change them when occasion required. There is another advantage in that system; you would have independent men as examiners. They do not run in a groove; they would be faithful and reliable men; and in addition to that consideration, there is this one, that the Government of the Dominion would thus, to some extent, recognise that great and useful class. If I had the power—it is not one of my aspirations—to make such appointments, and if I were considering the interest of the public service and my position as well, I should feel that I was not only doing good to the

public service, but also doing an excellent thing to popularise the Department by saying: Here are a few prizes; true, they are not much, but they are open to the whole army of teachers that are taking care of the youth of Ontario.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). And the Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from Brant says, "and the Dominion." Well, my remarks may apply to the other Provinces, but I will not take the liberty to refer to the educational institutions of the other Provinces, for I am not acquainted with their machinery. I think it would be wise if the appointments were made from the source I have named, and the examinations conducted as I have suggested, and no persons permanently appointed. It is necessary that the chief clerk or secretary should be permanently appointed, though he may be attached also to some other office in the service.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am thankful to the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) for his suggestion on the subject of sub-examiners, though, perhaps, it may be a question whether teachers would be the best judges of the qualifications necessary for the Civil Service. I think that to choose teachers as sub-examiners would be a recognition of the services that the important profession of teachers render the country, and it would be useful in putting in their way the slight remuneration of salary as sub-examiners. I also agree with my hon. friend that changing the sub-examiners is likely to procure impartiality, though there cannot be a great deal of partiality exercised by them, because they do not correct the papers. Still there may always be something done in the way of favoritism. In one point I do not agree with my hon. friend, and that is as to the time of holding the examinations, which he said was at the will of the Minister. The time of the examinations is left to the Government, but two epochs of the year have been fixed, and I will explain why they were chosen. What has probably misled my hon. friend is this: There are promotion examinations that take place at the will of the Minister, but not as a matter of favor on his part. They are fixed as a matter of necessity for the public service. In several Departments there may be, at any time, important vacancies to be filled up, and which must be filled up before the period fixed for the general examinations. The Governor in Council, in such a case, has a right to fix a day for promotion examinations, but not for the entrance or qualifying examinations. My hon. friend said the time for examinations might be fixed so as to coincide with the holidays of the different universities and colleges. We thought of that, but came to the conclusion that what was specially important was this. Outside the Session—for examinations must not take place during the Sessions, because we want to be able to lay the report of those examinations before the House—outside the Session we thought the best time was when travelling was most easy for the candidates. We must not forget that those young men who come here to be examined are not of the richest class and their travelling expenses are very onerous to them, and we have taken the time best suited to them for travelling, some time in the month of May, after the opening of navigation, and some time before the late fall season. I am not one who likes to have any extravagance in the service. If my hon. friend wishes that the future may bring to him what he does not expect to have very soon, the position I occupy, he may be sure that it will not be the extravagance of the Civil Service or of the Department I control which will bring that future. If the hon. gentleman were in my place he would say, as I do, that the Civil Service work is done as cheaply as possible, and I may say that in the future I will always be pleased to take suggestions such as those made by my hon. friend. I wish to say, in conclusion, that the increase proposed is only this: The examiners, now at \$300 a piece, will be at \$600 a piece,

making a difference of \$900; and to this we have to add \$700 for the secretary, who is one of the commissioners. The whole of the salaries will then be \$1,800 for the commissioners and \$700 for the secretary, making \$2,500; and the fee of \$2 per examination covers the whole of that expenditure.

Mr. DAVIES. Does that include the clerk?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am not Finance Minister, but three times six make eighteen, and \$1,800 and \$700 make \$2,500, according to my mode of reckoning, and we collect more than that in fees; but if we were taking a secretary outside of the commissioners, we would have \$300 to add to that.

Mr. DAVIES. But I referred to the clerk.

Mr. IVES. I think we have wasted quite as much time here as the increase would amount to.

Mr. DAVIES. Why waste more, then?

Mr. IVES. I rose only to prevent a longer speech, which you would have made if you had got the floor. There is only one point I would like to refer to, and it is a point of considerable importance. It is said that a very large sum of money is paid annually to civil servants for work over time and out of hours. I think it is rather an important question whether that amount of money produces the same desirable results as it would if, instead of employing the present corps of civil servants out of hours, it were applied to the employment of an additional number. I think the course of hon. gentlemen on this side, when they were in power, was to appoint a considerably larger number of civil servants instead of paying those in the service for extra work. I must say that I like the course which hon. gentlemen on this side of the House pursued when they were in power, because it certainly affords a better opportunity for those of us who have friends to get them appointed to office. Now, if we go to the members of the Administration to get an appointment, we are told that the offices are full, and we find when the Public Accounts come down, that the Departments are not full, that the offices are not full, that it is necessary to overwork the men in their offices to such an extent as to pay them a large proportion of the total amount for extra hours. If this extra work brought about the speedy demise of these gentlemen whom we would be glad to get rid of in order to get places for others, there might be some compensating advantage in that, but they grow fat on it; they appear to be healthier every year; the older they grow the more healthy and the more happy they appear to be, and therefore I think the adoption of the course pursued by hon. gentlemen on this side when they were in power, of filling the public Departments with civil servants instead of overworking those who are in them and paying them for extra time, would be more pleasing to those supporters of the Administration who have friends, of whom I am one.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I would suggest that the hon. gentleman who spoke last should compare the lists of office holders as they existed when we left office, and as they exist now, and he will find that we neither resorted to the one plan nor to the other, but had the work done in a proper manner by a more limited number of servants.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I can inform my hon. friend (Mr. Ives) that he is doing a gross injustice to the hon. gentlemen opposite. To the best of my recollection, we had about 370 gentlemen employed in these buildings, and now, I think, he will find that at least 600 are employed. Surely, in six years, an addition of nearly 60 per cent. to the staff is as much as my hon. friend can expect his friends to do; and, if he will look further, and look into the extra lists, he will find that, for one extra clerk that we employed, they employ three, and pay them about three times as much per head as we ever paid them. So I think that his charge

Mr. CHAPLEAU.

on the hon. gentleman is not as well founded as I should have expected from a gentleman of his general accuracy.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friend the Minister who has charge of this Bill has told us that, if he replied to all the insinuations and statements I made, we would be here till twelve o'clock, and so he would treat those insinuations and statements with silence. I did not make insinuations. I made statements, which I believe to be true, which I believed to be true at the time I made them, and which I am now sure are true, because he cannot deny them consistently with truth, and I am bound to do him the credit of believing that he would not infringe upon the truth in order to be able to deny them, and therefore they must be true. One of these statements was—

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Dispense.

Mr. CASEY. What did the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said "dispense."

Mr. CASEY. We will dispense with the hon. Minister presently. One of those statements was that the power of appointing men for special qualifications had been strained so as to bring in men who had no special qualifications, simply to do ordinary departmental work. That is not denied, so it is correct. Another statement was that an office had been rented for this commission at \$300 a year in the city of Ottawa. That has not been denied, therefore it is true. I claimed, and I still claim, that that is a misuse of public money. There should be room for Mr. LeSueur, who is not a very large individual and would not require a very large office, somewhere in the Departments. But this is not the only office for which room is required outside the Departments. The Chinese commission also have had rooms rented for them outside, and by a strange coincidence the rooms for the two commissions are in a building owned by the same person, a most estimable man, whose only failing is that he is a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite, an influential supporter of theirs, whom it is worth their while to oblige, and it is in his building that these commissions, and I do not know how many other commissions, have got their offices—Mr. McLeod Stewart's building. These statements, which are not denied and are therefore correct, show a state of things which is not consistent, I take it, with the public interest. But the hon. gentleman seemed to think he would shorten this discussion by attempting to snub me in a manner by no means courteous—I speak in a parliamentary sense. I think the hon. gentleman will find it a failure in this House to try to shorten discussions by affecting contempt for, or disregard of, what is said on the other side of the House. He will find the charges which he attempts to push aside with contempt renewed by other gentlemen, until he is forced to attend to them, and is placed in the ridiculous position of being compelled to give attention to what he at first affected to despise. That has been the case with the hon. gentleman before, and that is the case on this occasion. Whenever I have occasion to discuss anything with the hon. gentleman, he seems to get into that snappish, uncomfortable frame of mind which he is in this afternoon. I should be inclined to attribute that to something especially irritating in my way of treating public questions, were it not that he is the only Minister with whom it takes place. When I have to discuss matters with his colleagues and fellow-countrymen, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and the hon. the Minister of Militia, I always find them ready to discuss those matters and to give me information, and to discuss with the utmost courtesy any point I may bring up, and to listen to any suggestions which they may think useful, or, if they do not think so, to tell me why. I am now forced to the conclusion that the cause of the difference is that the hon. gentlemen to whom I last referred are almost invariably well prepared in regard to

the matters which they bring before this House. They are full of information, more especially the hon. Minister of Public Works. They can give us the utmost satisfaction with regard to all the details of their Departments; while the hon. Minister who is in charge of these resolutions has shown himself unable, or at least unwilling, which amounts to the same thing—when it is his duty to state what he knows—to give us information on some of the most important points of this question. I am therefore sorry to be compelled on this occasion, as I was last year, to refer him to his colleagues for a lesson as to the manner of conducting public business before this House. It is true he has conducted public business very successfully for a number of years in another sphere, but in this arena he has yet to win his spurs; and I think as a young Minister in this House he could not do better than to follow the example of his grave and reverend seniors—like the hon. Minister of Militia, who now sits smiling at me.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I beg to move the first resolution.

On resolution 2,

Mr. BLAKE. Is it intended that these travelling expenses shall be paid on a different scale to that which is provided by the Order in Council and which regulates travelling expenses generally?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. They will be regulated by the Order in Council. That provides, I think, for the allowance of \$3.50 per day for travelling expenses; and instead of paying them, as in the past, upon vouchers, &c., for their travelling expenses, they will be allowed the regular rate fixed by Order in Council.

On resolution 3,

Mr. DAVIES. I asked a question with regard to travelling expenses; I wish to know why it is necessary for the gentlemen in Ottawa to travel if you have sub-examiners in the several Provinces.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. We have found that in large cities like Toronto and Montreal, the sub-examiners were not able properly to organise the examinations and to carry them on without making many mistakes. It must be remembered that a very large quantity of papers have to be distributed to the different sub-examiners, and it has been found necessary that the secretary should remain here while one of the examiners goes to Toronto, or Montreal, or wherever he may be required. The examiners do not travel for their own pleasure; they prefer remaining here, but it has been, and will be, found necessary for one of them to visit the large centres in order to put the machinery into working order.

Mr. CASEY. The information as to the salary should properly come in here. I did not quite understand the hon. Minister's explanation, but I make out there are three salaries at \$600 a year each, and one salary at \$1,000, for the secretary of the commission, and another person who is to be a third-class clerk in the Department of the Secretary of State whose salary may reach \$1,000. All this makes \$3,800. Of course, I understood that it is not all to be taken this year, that there was to be a saving on Mr. LeSueur's salary, but the resolution gives the power to use that amount of money in the future, and probably it will be found necessary to do it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Last year we provided for the salary of a clerk at \$600. I may inform the hon. gentleman that I made the appointment during the year, but I did not pay all the salary voted by Parliament. The clerk has been paid \$500, and it is not the intention to raise the salary to more than \$600. But it was necessary to put that officer, seeing that he would be subjected to a qualifying examination, into the rank of a third-class clerk, for it is thought that he will be a link between the Department

and the Board of Civil Service Commissioners. The expense of the secretary will be borne as part of the expenditure of the board.

Committee rose and House resumed.

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

After Recess.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 9) respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Bill (No. 62) to amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Watson.)

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMENDMENT.

House again resolved itself into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions (p. 273) respecting the Civil Service Act.

On resolution 4,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The fourth resolution is to provide that the salary paid to chief clerks shall be from \$1,800, with an annual increase of \$50 per annum until a maximum of \$2,600 was reached. I do not, however, propose to insist upon this resolution; still, I think it is but due to the House to give an explanation of the reasons why it was inserted. The office of a chief clerk is an important one, requiring long service, and I thought that commencing his duties at a salary of \$1,800, and rising to a maximum of \$2,600, the salary would not be too high, in view of the fact that the officer would have been many years in the public service before he reached the position of chief clerk. I did not consider the salary too high; moreover, in view of the fact that the difference between a chief clerk and a deputy head would still amount to \$600. However, in order not to change anything as regards the minimum and maximum of the salaries of the different clerks, the Government have decided that they will not insist on this resolution, and I therefore ask permission to withdraw it.

On resolution 5,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This is the old law with a slight change.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It looks to me as if it would be quite possible, in the case of a junior clerk entering upon the performance of higher duties, to leave him for an indefinite space of time receiving full pay for the office whose duties he was performing.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is only during the fiscal year, and it is only provided where funds have been voted by Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. Suppose, for some reason the Government choose unwarrantably to delay for thirteen or fourteen months the filling of an important office like the librarianship of Parliament. It is for their convenience that the office has not been filled. It is provided that an inferior officer shall discharge the duty and shall be paid the salary of the superior officer. I think it is very advantageous that offices should be promptly filled, if they are to be filled at all. It is sometimes said that it is rather economical not to fill offices, because the salary is not going on. But my belief is, that so long as the office is necessary—and if it is not necessary it should be abolished—it is really better for the public service that the office should be promptly filled,

because the administration of the office suffers seriously from the absence of the officer, and particularly when the officer is a superior officer. But these arrangements do not occur from economical views or are they attended with economical results. The objection I have to this resolution is, that it really proposes we should, in a sort of way, give our warrant and sanction to the custom of leaving offices unfilled for a long period of time, and I think that is very objectionable.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But the hon. gentleman promises that the office will be filled ere long; it is only a period of thirteen months that the office has been vacant.

M. BLAKE. Is it the case that the hon. gentleman does not feel able to fill an office within three months?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. When offices are not filled it is not because the Government is not placed in the condition to fill them. The Government only abstains from doing so when there are difficulties in the way. In discussing the estimates of my Department the hon. gentlemen will see that, in cases where offices have become vacant, I have not thought proper and I have not given the salary to the succeeding junior officer.

Mr. BLAKE. But the hon. gentleman says wherever offices became vacant by reason of decease.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. But not by superannuation. Demands were made on me which I have not complied with.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's virtue has sustained him up to a certain point; but he is afraid that he will fail, and he asks our assistance to keep him in the correct path. So far, I am quite prepared to sustain him. I feel the hon. gentleman has rightly estimated the difficulty of long continuance in the path of virtue, and he has a right to call on us to help him. Will the hon. gentleman be able to resist the suggestion which is, no doubt, pressed on him to a considerable extent, how to delay filling appointments when to that is added the circumstance that somebody else is getting the salary. The hon. gentleman has said that the offices are not filled for want of opportunity to fill them. I suppose there is such a multitude of applicants that the difficulty is to make a selection, but I should think the combined energy, intelligence, perspicuity and power of the fourteen gentlemen who comprehend the Cabinet, should enable them to make choice of a librarian or a chief clerk in three months, and certainly in fourteen months.

On resolution 6,

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This resolution provides that when a vote is given by Parliament it need not necessarily be expended, but the case shall be decided by Order in Council.

Resolutions ordered to be reported.

CARRIERS BY LAND.

Mr. McCARTHY moved the second reading of Bill (No. 5) respecting the liabilities of carriers by land. He said: In moving the second reading of the Bill which I have had the honor to introduce to the House, perhaps a brief explanation, although not necessary, may as well be given. The Bill, Sir, has already been before this House, and had reached the motion for the second reading when a question arising as to the constitutionality of the measure, it stood over from time to time, in order that the First Minister might say what he thought with regard to that disputed point. I desire, however, to recall to the recollection of my hon. friends what the measure is. The Bill respects merely carriers by land. The reason I limit it in that way is that there is already a measure on the Statute Book providing for the regulation of carriers by water; though, I think,

Mr. BLAKE,

perhaps, if I had to commence again, it would be better to make the one set of rules and the one law to regulate carriers, whether by land or by water. I do not know that there is any good reason for separating the regulations respecting carriers in one way from those respecting carriers who carry in another way. However, if the Bill receives the assent of the House, it may perhaps, on reference to a select committee, be so altered as to embrace both these kinds of carriers. Now, it is well known, of course, that in common law—and in that respect I do not find that the civil law differs much from the English common law—the liabilities of carriers is to deliver the goods with which they are intrusted to the consignee, unless they are prevented by what is called the act of God or the Queen's enemies. That was at an early time—or in the early part of this century, at all events—found to be a hardship, and the law was limited by a statute brought in, I think, in 1830, whereby certain classes of goods—goods of large value and put up in very small parcels—were excepted from that general rule, and it was provided that unless the value—if it was beyond £10—was specified to the carrier, and he was paid an additional compensation for the risk he undertook, he should not be responsible for a greater amount than £10, no matter what the value might be. The earlier sections of this Bill are a re-enactment, substantially, of the Act to which I refer—the Act of 1830; and it is to that extent in aid of the carrier. It provides that it shall be necessary to point out, when goods are delivered to a carrier, that they are of such a value, and that such a fair additional rate as he may choose to ask shall be paid; else, he shall not be responsible beyond a given amount, which is fixed in the Bill at \$50. The next and other provisions of the Bill are in the other direction. In the 6th section of the Bill it is provided that a carrier shall not be at liberty, by simply putting up a notice limiting his liability—he shall not be at liberty by a notice put up in his office, which people perhaps will not read, though they may have an opportunity of reading it—to say: You must understand that I am not going to be responsible for the goods you hand me to carry, except under certain circumstances. The Bill provides that the carrier shall not be at liberty simply by a notice to limit his ordinary and common law responsibility. But it goes on to say, that such a provision may be made by a contract signed by the party; and the contract must not only be signed, but the judge before whom it may afterwards come must deem it to be a fair and reasonable contract, in order that it may have force. The difference, therefore, is this: That at common law a carrier is responsible in any event, except in those two extraordinary circumstances, when he is, by the act of God, as it is called, or the act of the Queen's enemies, prevented from delivering the goods and fulfilling his bargain. This Bill stipulates that he shall not be at liberty, simply by a notice, in any way to define or cut down that responsibility. But it does not prevent him from making a special contract, to be signed by the consignor—it does not prevent such a contract as that being made—but it does provide that if that contract is not just and reasonable, if the judge before whom any disputed cases comes to be tried, does not pronounce that special contract to be a just and reasonable one, it shall not be binding. I think that these few observations will sufficiently explain the object of the measure, and the general features of the Bill which I have the honor to promote; but if the House will pardon me, I will read an extract in a recent case in the House of Lords, where this principle of the measure is very clearly stated:

"The real question," says Lord Blackburn, in quoting from an earlier case, "is whether the individual and the public are sufficiently protected from being unjustly dealt with by the parties having the monopoly. The mischief was supposed to consist in giving a practical monopoly to the railway companies by compelling people to enter into contracts, whether they willed it or not. The Act says, 'if you have signed a

written contract expressing a certain condition, a judge or a court shall see whether it is reasonable or not.' Crompton, J. says, and I think rightly, that in order to judge whether it is reasonable or not you must look at this consideration: Are the individual and the public sufficiently protected from being unjustly dealt with by the effect of that monopoly."

Now, that is the whole object and necessity of this measure. Practically, the railway companies are the carriers in this and most other countries at this time, and practically, therefore, they have an absolutely monopoly. As a matter of fact, when persons desire to send goods, the companies place before them a certain written document, and unless they sign this document they will not carry the goods, and people are therefore compelled, in order to have their goods carried—without scrutinising very closely what they have agreed to—sign this document, and in the end, they may find that they have signed away the right to hold the carrier responsible, no matter what may happen. I say that this is manifestly unjust. The carrier should be responsible for his negligence, but I think he should not be deprived of the liberty of making a contract which will, to a certain extent, reduce the company's liability of which I have spoken. So much for the general features of the measure. But the other question upon which the Bill of a former Session stood over yet remains to be discussed, and I have a few words to say with regard to that. It is said by some, and by a gentleman for whose opinion I have the highest respect, that he did not think this measure was within the competence of this Parliament, that it was a measure of a local character, which could only be carried into law in the Local Legislatures.

Mr. CASGRAIN. In part.

Mr. McCARTHY. Perhaps in part. I understood him to argue in whole. However, whether in part or in whole, I join issue with him in that particular contention, and I will briefly state why I think this Bill is within the competence of Parliament, and within the competence of Parliament alone. Now, I do not pretend to say it is not a matter of civil right; and every matter, probably, may be brought within that category. But matters which belong to the Parliament of Canada, although they entrench upon civil right and contract, nevertheless can be dealt with by us. Take the great question of bankruptcy and insolvency; it is impossible to deal with it without entrenching upon matters of civil right and contract. But the law is now clearly defined, that matters of that kind are within the competence of Parliament, so far as it is necessary to the carrying out of the particular jurisdiction invested in us; and it would be a great misfortune if we had not the right to deal with this question. What is the law of carriers? It is a law regulating commerce and trade. In fact, you cannot imagine any matter more properly commercial in its character than the law regulating carriers. It would be a great misfortune if these matters had to be dealt with by the different Provinces and not by this Parliament, which gives law where it has a right to give law, over the whole Dominion. A law passed in the Province of Quebec might be a good law, and yet it might differ very much from the law in the Province of Ontario; but we know that carriers carry goods from one Province to another, and if the law is good for Quebec—and I am happy to say I believe the law there under the code is very good—that law would regulate the consignment of goods from the Province of Quebec to the Province of Ontario. But suppose a man living in the Province of Quebec has goods consigned from the Province of Ontario, where the law is not so good, he would find his right determined, not by the law at the place of delivery, but by the law at the place where the contract was made. Now, it is absurd, it seems to me, that there should be different laws in the different Provinces of the Confederation. We have several Provinces now, and are likely to have more. In the case of the Pacific Railway, for instance, which will run through Ontario and Manitoba, and on west to the Pacific,

there would be a different law regulating its carrying for every different Province through which it will pass. Well, a condition of that kind is not one to be envied, and I am glad to think that it is not one which the constitution requires us to be governed by.

Mr. AMYOT. Would the hon. gentleman prefer a legislative union.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am not speaking of a legislative union at all. I am speaking of such matters as under the constitution are to be regulated by this Parliament; I am not going beyond the line of the system we have. My hon. friend knows that the law with regard to bills of exchange and promissory notes has to be regulated by this Parliament.

Mr. AMYOT. That is provided for by the British North America Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. Precisely. Trade and commerce are also provided for by the British North America Act; and the question is, does this come within the meaning of the words "trade and commerce." Now, I will read, if hon. gentlemen will pardon me, an extract from a judgment of a judge of the State of New York, not bearing exactly, of course, upon the constitutionality of this Bill, but giving a good reason why this Parliament, and not the Local Legislatures, should deal with it. Speaking of this question of carriers, he says:

"It is a question in relation to which, almost above all others, the law should be uniform throughout the commercial world, especially among the different States of the Union. It relates to questions which, in their nature, expand themselves over and through extensive districts of country and to places widely separated from each other. None can fail to perceive the great inconvenience that must result from having different and hostile rules on the subject prevailing between the different Atlantic cities, or between them and the western States."

Now, every word of that applies with equal force to this Dominion, and I believe it would be a great misfortune, as I have said, if the law on the subject were not within the purview of this Parliament. I have heard no good argument to lead me to a different conclusion, and I am fortified in my opinion by the judgment of one of the judges of the Court of Appeal in the Province from which I come, who spoke as follows:—

"Mr. Bethune's suggestion, that the interference with the defendants' right of contracting against their own negligence is *ultra vires* of the Dominion Parliament, would not, even if we could adopt it, help the defendants. No good reason has, however, been given for holding Dominion legislation to be *ultra vires*, and there would be obvious inconvenience in having the liability of the carrier in respect of goods or passengers differing in different stages of the one journey under the statute law of each Province through which the railway passed."

I do not mean to quote this as a decision; it is merely an expression of opinion; but it is an expression of that judge's opinion, Mr. Justice Patterson, that the law is one within the competence of this Parliament. For these reasons I submit the law is a good law. I submit that it is in the interest of the people of this country and of the carriers themselves that the law should be clear and well defined. I think this Bill imposes no undue burdens upon the carrier. So far as small parcels are concerned, it places the carrier in a fair position, and it provides that the consignor shall not be bound by a notice unless he makes a contract, but the contract that he makes shall always be subject, in case of dispute, to the decision of the court that it is just and reasonable as between the consignor and the carrier who takes his goods. The other question is one which each hon. member shall have to think out for himself. The Bill deals, I think, with a matter which is purely and clearly a matter of trade and commerce in its widest sense; it is inter-provincial in its character, and that is a character which appertains to this Dominion. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BOSSÉ. I regret to be obliged to oppose this Bill, not because I do not believe its provisions to be good in

themselves; on the contrary, I believe its provisions are as good as they can possibly be made; but the principle of the Bill, I believe, is against our constitution. It regulates accessories of trade and commerce; but this House has no right to legislate on civil rights, unless they become accessories to the main principle; and this House cannot legislate upon the subjects of contracts apart from the general principle of trade and commerce. This is a measure by itself, not upon general principles, but merely upon special civil contracts over which this House has no jurisdiction; and it is for that reason, I believe, that last year the Bill was not persisted in. I raise this question, not merely as a constitutional, but as one in which our Province is more specially interested than any of the other Provinces. We have on this matter our own special legislation, which has been borrowed from the code Napoleon, which is the best of all codes, a code that has been taken for a model for the laws of many other nations, in the making of which the best legal talent were engaged, in which all the judges of France took part, and which has been made clear by the French jurisprudence. We have, in our Province, the benefit of the experience and the jurisprudence of the whole of France since 1804, and the benefit of the experience of our own Province since 1866, when our code, founded on the code Napoleon, came into force. Now we have in our code ten articles embodying all the laws with reference to common carriers, not only that portion of the law to be found in this Bill, but the whole law; and that law comprises every section, every line of the Bill now before the House. I wish that the promoter of the Bill had read those articles. He would then have found the whole law which he intends to become the law of this country, and he would have found the whole of that law comprised in a little more than fifteen lines, condensed as much as possible, and made as clear as the wisdom of the most eminent legal minds could make it. Now, I say it would be an act of injustice to our Province to deprive us of our present legislation, which combines the experience of the jurisprudence of France since 1804, and our own experience and jurisprudence since 1866, and to give us instead a new law, formulated in different terms, a law which would compel us to begin over again and establish a new jurisprudence. For these reasons I hold that our Province is much more interested in this than the other Provinces, and should the Bill go into committee I will there move to substitute our own articles of the code for the different portions of the Bill, because I believe our own articles contain better provisions than those found in the Bill.

Mr. CASEY. I take the object of the Bill to be to define more clearly than the present law does the obligations of carriers. Taking that to be the principle of the Bill, I am inclined to support it, and to urge that it should go as far as the committee, but I wish to call attention to one or two points which I think ought to be considered when it goes into committee, as qualifying my approbation of the Bill as a whole. As far as I can understand, as a layman, the first section of the Bill relieves the carrier, to a certain extent, of the liabilities under which he is at present, with reference to the enumerated classes of goods, unless the consignor is willing to pay a certain rate of insurance upon those goods as well as give notice that they are goods which require special care in handling. I do not know that it would be well to reduce the liability of the carrier to that extent, to give him the option of saying: I will treat these valuable goods with no more care than ordinary goods, I will not be liable for damages exceeding \$50, unless you pay a rate of insurance upon the goods. The consignor is compelled to pay insurance upon the carriage of those more especially valuable goods, and if the carrier be allowed, as provided in another part of the Bill, to dispense himself from this liability by special contract—if he is to

Mr. Bossé,

to obtain payment for the imposition of liabilities with regard to special goods—I think no contract into which a carrier may enter with a consignor, exempting the carrier from liability, should be valid unless some value is given by the carrier in return, in the shape of reduced rates. The same principle should apply in both directions. I doubt indeed whether it would be wise to allow this special exemption by contract at all, because it is always open to the carrier to say to the consignor: Unless you sign some contract of this sort I will not carry your goods, or will put obstacles in the way; and it is always easy for the carrier to make it unpleasant to the consignor, unless the latter will agree to such provisions as the carrier has, under the law, the right to make. I think there would be great difficulty in getting any special property carried, especially when the carriers enjoy a practical monopoly as our great railways do, unless the consignor is willing to sign any contract which is allowed to be made under the eleventh section of the Act. I have not the slightest doubt of the hon. gentleman's intention of making a great improvement in the state of the law, and I believe that on the whole this Bill does make an improvement, but I hope he will be able to explain why the changes I propose would not be desirable, when we go into committee, or willing to adopt them.

Mr. IVES. If the proposition of the hon. member were to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, as regards the particulars proposed in this Bill, I fancy that the hon. gentleman from Quebec (Mr. Bossé) would hardly contend that it was *ultra vires* of this Parliament to adopt such legislation as an amendment to the Consolidated Railway Act, for the reason that the incorporation of railways of a certain description is within the power of this Parliament; and for the reason just stated, and stated without dissent, that where we have power over the main subject we have power over the accessories, though the exercise of that power may affect civil rights—for both these reasons I fancy that the hon. member for Quebec Centre would not contend that we had not the power to pass this Bill as an amendment to the Consolidated Railway Act. So much, then, for that part of the Bill that relates to such railways as pass from one Province to another, the incorporation of which is within the power of this Parliament. That part of the Bill then, I think, is clearly within the power of this Parliament; the passing of legislation which shall regulate contracts to be made by railway carriers or companies, under powers of this Parliament, is clearly within our power, in my opinion. I have more doubt as regards that part which applies to coach lines and express companies and other lines, in respect to which we have not clear power over the main subject. But if we have the power, as I think we have, to incorporate in a general railway Act in the Dominion, the legislation proposed by this Bill, so far as it affects railway companies, then I think we may pass it in an independent Bill, as proposed, and I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill, reserving the right to oppose more doubtful provisions which seek to establish legislation affecting express companies, stage companies and other companies, that less clearly are within our power.

Mr. CURRAN. I shall add very few words indeed to the able argument of the hon. member for Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé). I think that it is evident, not only from the argument of my hon. friend, but even from the statement that has been made by the mover of this Bill, that the only means by which we can arrive at even the supposition that we have the power in this Parliament to legislate, as herein provided, is by implication, while by direct enactment this subject falls within the power of the Local Legislatures. His reference to the first clause fortifies the position taken by the hon. member for Quebec Centre. The whole drift

of his argument, I think, consisted in stating that this was desirable legislation; that it was very much to be regretted, indeed, that such legislation does not exist. I presume we have to take our British North America Act as we find it; we have to deal with the matter as is therein provided; and, under the provisions of that Act, I consider these contracts fall within the province of the Local Legislatures. For these reasons, I shall now move that this Bill be not now read the second time, but be read the second time six months hence. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has not, in my opinion, given any good reason for combatting the principle advocated by my hon. friend from Quebec Centre (Mr. Bossé) with regard to accessory legislation. He has, it is true, admitted that there are various classes of carriers who he believes come within the provisions of this Bill, and that this House cannot legislate upon. He has also expressed an idea that this might be made part of the general railway Act. Well, I do not propose to discuss, at this moment, what might be done under a different form, but taking the Bill as I now find it, and believing it to be *ultra vires*, as far as this Parliament is concerned, I now propose the motion that I have just mentioned.

Mr. McNEILL. The main questions involved in this Bill are, I think shortly, two. The first question is whether it be in the public interest desirable that public carriers should be responsible for damage, by their own negligence, done to goods entrusted to their care, or whether they should, on the other hand, be permitted to compel parties entrusting goods to their care to sign contracts or agreements exempting the carriers from all liability with respect to the safe carriage of those goods; in other words, whether they should be permitted to compel individuals who desire to have goods conveyed by this mode of transport to sign contracts exempting the carriers from the obligations imposed upon them by the law of the land. That is the first main question, and the second question is, I think, whether or not it is competent for this Parliament to deal with this matter. Now, with reference to the first question, I think it seems very reasonable and right, on the first blush of it, that carriers should be responsible for the safe conveyance, for the safe carriage of the goods that have been confided to their care, and for the safe carriage of which they are paid. It has always been held to be important in the public interest that this obligation should attach to carriers. It attaches to them by the provisions of the common law, and also by the provisions of our own statute, of an Act of this Dominion Parliament, which has been ratified again and again, the Consolidated Railway Act, under the 25th section of which, and the 3rd and 4th sub-sections, we find this obligation imposed upon railway companies at all events—I will deal with the other question as to other carriers hereafter:

"Such passengers and goods shall be taken, transported and discharged at and from and to such places on the due payment of the toll, freight, or fare legally authorised therefor. The party aggrieved by any neglect or refusal in the premises shall have an action therefor against the company, from which action the company shall not be relieved by any notice, condition or declaration, if the damage arises from any negligence or omission of the company, or of its servants."

Therefore, as I have said, this Parliament has already imposed this obligation upon railway companies as public carriers at all events, and I think it will commend itself to the common sense of every hon. gentleman in this House that, if any hon. gentleman, for example, were to purchase a piece of furniture here in Ottawa, and desired to have it carried away and delivered in some other part of the Dominion, the carrier who has charge of this piece of furniture and is paid for the safe carriage of it, should be held to be responsible for its safety, and if he damages or smashes it, as we know frequently occurs, he should be responsible and liable to the person who has paid him for carrying it. And so, if a cattle dealer purchases a quantity of cattle, and

wishes these cattle to be carried from Guelph, for example, to Montreal, and hands over these cattle to a railway company, and pays a large sum of money to this railway company for the carriage of these cattle, it is only reasonable and right that the company should be responsible to the cattle dealer if they, in the carriage of these cattle, make a smash of all this property. I think it is reasonable, and the law says it is right. The law of the land provides that this should be so. The law of the land says that the carrier is so responsible. But, then, these great monopolists, these great railway companies, come forward and say: It is perfectly true that such a legal obligation rests upon us, but we wish you to understand that, unless you relieve us of that legal obligation, we will not carry your cattle for you; unless you make a contract with us to relieve us of the obligation which the law of the land, and the House of Commons, has said devolves upon us, you may walk your cattle from Guelph to Montreal. The cattle dealer cannot walk his cattle from Guelph to Montreal, and the consequence is that he is compelled, he is coerced by these great monopolists, to enter into what is called a private contract, as to which I shall have a word to say by-and-bye. He is coerced to enter into an arrangement by virtue of which he is deprived of the right which the law of the land has declared he possesses—the right to recover damages if his goods are destroyed by the carrier who is charged with them. Well, that provision of my hon. friend's Bill, which I look upon as, after all, its main provision, says, that hereafter no such arrangement as this shall be binding upon a private individual, unless it is a reasonable arrangement; and the Bill goes further, and says that the court or judge before whom the matter is brought is to decide whether the special contract which the railway company compels this man to enter into is or is not a reasonable contract. Now, a similar provision has existed in the English law for many years—I think since 1854—and that provision has been found to work admirably and has given great satisfaction to the public at large. I believe that on a former occasion a good deal of exception was taken, on theoretical grounds, to this provision of the Bill. I think that such theoretical objections will not have much weight with hon. members of this House, provided they find that in point of fact the test of practical experience has proved that the provision is a good and satisfactory one. These theoretical objections, I think, are not at all interesting to us, except, perhaps, as a sort of intellectual gymnastics. But, Sir, the question comes up whether we have really power in this House to deal with this matter at all. I would say, in the first place, that I think it would be a very great misfortune if we were to decide that because there might be some doubt as to whether our action in this matter might conflict with the jurisdiction of the Local Legislatures, we ought to leave the matter alone altogether. I think it is quite clear to every hon. gentleman that the matter is one of vast importance to the people of this Dominion, and therefore, as I say, I think it would be very unfortunate if we were to decide that, simply because some doubt existed, we should leave the matter alone altogether. If the mere fact of such an argument being advanced were to be considered as conclusive in the matter, I think we should be reduced to a very helpless state in this House. It seems to me that the questions which arise, and that seem to threaten a conflict between the legislative powers of this Parliament and those of the Provincial Legislatures, are very numerous and varied, and if the mere objection that a possible conflict might arise between the two powers was sufficient to preclude this House from dealing with any measure brought down, we would be reduced very much to the condition of those interesting insects with which the country has become so familiar owing to the extremely well known and apt comparison of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). It would never do for us to allow ourselves

to be made flies on the wheel in that way. But, Sir, I cannot believe that this measure of justice which my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) has proposed, is beyond the competence of this House to deal with. That may, perhaps, appear to be a very presumptuous statement on my part. I hope it will not be so considered; however, I confess that in saying so I almost hope against hope, because I have thought very often that an attempt to reconcile the provisions of the 91st and the 92nd sections of the British North America Act, with reference to many matters, was very much like a plunge into the thickets of free will and predestination. Looking at the matter from one point of view, it seems to be perfectly clear that we can if we will, and looking at it from another standpoint, it seems just as certain that we cannot if we would. No doubt it is exceedingly difficult in many cases to pronounce any opinion for a person like myself who does not profess to be a lawyer, but in this case I think there cannot be much doubt. View the matter as we like, from any reasonable point of view, it seems perfectly clear that this is a matter which falls within the competence of this House to deal with. Now, Sir, that a safe and expeditious transport of goods upon reasonable terms is a matter of the utmost importance to every man, woman and child in every part of this Dominion, is a proposition so self-evident, I think, that it requires no argument to prove it; and that a carrier, however small his business may be, and however remotely he may be situated, forms, in fact, a link, if I may so express it, in the continuous net-work of the carrying trade of this whole Dominion, is a proposition that seems to me just as evident as the first. For instance, a public carrier in a remote part of my own riding of North Bruce, may find himself to be in point of fact simply a link in that great carrying system which commences on the one hand in Prince Edward Island in the east, and extends to British Columbia in the west. This is no fanciful supposition, because there are many of my own constituents who have relatives and friends in Prince Edward Island, and many of them also who have relatives and friends in British Columbia, and it is only a few weeks ago that a letter was handed to me at Dunblane post office, in North Bruce, with reference to the loss of certain goods which had been shipped at Paisley, in North Bruce, to some point in British Columbia. Therefore, the whole carrying trade of the Dominion is one system, extending from one ocean to the other. I say it is but reasonable and right that we should treat the whole carrying trade of the country as one continuous system. It seems to me that it is unnatural and artificial to suppose, and that it would be injurious to the interests of this country, as one united Dominion, to treat this system, which is important, as it is carried on in Ontario, to the residents of British Columbia, and important to the residents of Prince Edward Island, as it is carried on in Ontario—I say, it seems to be most unnatural that we should suppose that the system is not continuous, and can be divided into a number of separate carrying trades for each separate Province—that it is, in fact, if I may so express it, to be regarded as a sort of net-work which is co-extensive with the Provinces, and which terminates just at the boundary line of each Province, in place of regarding it as one continuous net-work, the strands of which pass over from Province to Province, as we know is, in point of fact, the case. Why, just in proportion as those strands of the net-work do pass over from Province to Province, just in proportion as they cross and re-cross and interlace one another, in that proportion, to a great extent, is the unity and solidity of this Dominion rendered a reality. And, I venture to say, that this Parliament, in the prosecution of the Intercolonial Railway, and of the Canadian Pacific Railway, has recognised the fact, that the carrying trade, to a very great extent, partakes of the very essence of the Confederation itself. Yet this is the trade as to which this Parliament is to have

Mr. McNEILL.

nothing to do. It seems to me it is monstrous to suppose that this Parliament, which has expended such enormous sums of money for the express purpose of providing facilities for the transmission of goods from one Province to another, and from one part of the Dominion to another, should have nothing to do with the laws which regulate it, that we are not to be allowed to interfere with it, even to the extent contemplated by this Bill, although the matter is of enormous and of common interest to every individual residing in every part of the Dominion. I say that hon. members representing Montreal ought to have a say in determining what the laws shall be, or, at all events, in determining that the laws shall be reasonable to which their constituents are to be subjected in the transportation of their goods, which business is so largely carried on from Montreal to every part of the Dominion. It is quite clear that if the different Provinces are to have different laws to regulate this carrying trade, you may have laws imposed in one Province under the color of such compulsory contracts as these, for the express purpose of giving special facilities to some particular city or place in that Province, to the prejudice of cities and localities in other Provinces. You may have laws passed in Ontario, for example, which would aim at giving special facilities and advantages in the carrying trade of that Province, to the great city of Toronto and to Hamilton or Guelph, and conflicting with the interests of those who have goods to send through the Province of Ontario from the city of Montreal. And thereupon, finding those laws so discriminating in favor of Ontario, you may have the Province of Quebec setting about to enact other laws to counteract the effect of Ontario's laws, giving special facilities to Montreal. So you may have a conflict going on through every Province. This matter lies at the very root of Confederation itself, and if you say that this Parliament cannot deal with this matter you strike a vital blow at the unity and solidarity of the Dominion. On these general principles and general considerations, it is to me quite clear that this is a matter which specially falls within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. I say, shortly, it is not a matter relating to locality or province, but is one of general interest to the Dominion, and it is a matter that is co-extensive, at least, with settlement; and you may as well say that you can properly control this trade by having a separate carrying trade for Ontario, for Quebec and for Prince Edward Island, respectively, as you may attempt to declare that the circulation of the blood may be fairly divided into the circulation of the head, of the lungs and of the trunk. The contention is an entirely erroneous one, especially when you recognise the fact that the Dominion has spent an enormous sum in order to provide due facilities for the carrying of goods and of persons throughout this country as a whole. I desire to ask the indulgence of the House while I look at this subject from another point of view. As the hon. gentleman has said, this is a matter which affects trade and commerce. Trade and commerce is one of those matters which falls specially within the jurisdiction of this House to deal with, and it is perfectly impossible to suppose that a matter of this kind does not fall within the heading of trade and commerce. If you so legislate as to injure the carrying trade of the country, you must to that extent injure its trade and commerce. It is quite clear that a good condition of trade and commerce is dependent on a good condition of the carrying trade. So far as that argument is concerned, it is impossible to gainsay it. I know that another argument has been adduced, and it was pressed with a good deal of force in this House, during the last Session of Parliament, at all events, and it has been touched upon to-night, and that is, that if you interfere with this matter you are interfering with civil rights. With respect to that matter, the hon. gentleman has said that if such an argument obtains it would be difficult to say what we can deal with in this House

—what is not a interference with civil rights. I should like to read an authority on this subject. In the decision in the case of Russell and the Queen, I find the following passage occurs:—

"Few, if any laws, could be made by Parliament for the peace, order and good government of Canada, which did not in some incidental way, affect property and civil rights. And it could not have been intended, when assuring to the Provinces exclusive legislative authority on the subjects of property and civil rights, to exclude Parliament from the exercise of this general power, whenever any such interference would result from it."

Therefore, I think that that is quite conclusive as to the fact, that the mere statement that this Bill may interfere with civil rights, is not a valid objection to the measure. But I think if you look at the case of Citizens and the Queen's Assurance Companies *vs.* Parsons, we shall find that that matter was very carefully considered by the judges on that occasion, and the question decided on that occasion had reference to an Act of the Ontario House, the preamble of which is as follows:—

"Whereas, the provisions of an Act passed in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of Her Majesty, entitled an Act to amend the laws relating to fire insurance, the Lieutenant Governor issued a commission to certain commissioners therein named, requiring them to consider what conditions are just and reasonable conditions, to be inserted in fire insurance policies on *real and personal property in this Province.*

And it was on that ground, namely, that the Act had reference to real and personal property wholly within the Province, that the decision was eventually given, as is expressly laid down in the judgment of the court.

"And whereas a majority of the said commissioners have, in pursuance of the requirements of the said Act, settled and approved of the conditions set forth in the schedule to this Act; and it is advisable that the same should be expressly adopted by the Legislature as the statutory conditions to be contained in policies of fire insurance entered into or enforced in this Province."

Well, when we come to see what the decision of the court was with reference to this matter, you will find, on page 278, what the court said:

"Construing, therefore, the words 'regulation of trade and commerce' by the various aids to their interpretation above suggested, they would include political arrangements in regard to trade requiring the sanction of Parliament, regulation of trade in matters of interprovincial concern, and it may be that they would include general regulation of trade affecting the whole Dominion. Their Lordships abstain on the present occasion from any attempt to define the limits of the authority of the Dominion Parliament in this direction. It is enough for the decision of the present case to say, that in their view, its authority to legislate for the regulation of trade and commerce does not comprehend the power to regulate by legislation the contracts of a particular or trade such as the business of fire insurance, in a single Province."

Which is exactly the contention I make here. This is not a matter in reference to the regulation of trade and commerce in a particular Province. It is a regulation with regard to a trade which is co-extensive with the trade—or rather, I should, perhaps, say, with the system, as it would, to a certain extent, be begging the question, to say trade, of the Dominion. At all events, it is an attempt to deal with a matter which affects the people in the Province of Quebec, in the city of Montreal, very much more than it affects very many people in the Province of Ontario, and therefore I say that the attempt to allege that the decision in this case of the Citizen's and the Queen's Insurance Companies *vs.* Parsons is in any way hostile to the provisions of the Bill is, I think, contrary to the fact. I think, from the decision of the court in that case, it is quite clear that it is specially and distinctly laid down that they were only deciding in those matters which dealt with trade which were confined to a particular Province, and within the limits of that Province. But, Sir, the 12th clause of this Act, which strikes at the special agreements made between individuals and these railway companies has been alleged to interfere with the right of private contract. Well, it seems to me that these contracts cannot fairly be considered by us as contracts at all. It seems to me that the very essence of a contract is absent in the case of these agreements, because the person making the agree-

ment is not a free agent at the time. The agreement is made under compulsion; there is no consenting mind—no more consenting mind on his part than there is in the case of a person who hands over his purse lest a worse thing befall him. I hold, therefore, that this argument as to the Bill interfering with the right of private contract is unsound, and should not have any weight in this House. I find that in making that statement I am supported by such high authorities as some of the most eminent law lords in England. I find that when this same question came to be argued in the House of Lords, in England, it was argued there by Lord Brougham himself that:

"The railway companies sought neither more nor less than to evade responsibility by this special contract—a contract forced upon a passenger—a contract upon which he entered under compulsion—a contract which might almost be said to be bad, on account of the *dress* under which the passenger was compelled to enter into it."

Therefore, it seems to me that the attempt to persuade this House not to deal with this matter, because we may, to some extent, interfere with contracts which are almost bad, is a very bad argument. I think my hon. friend deserves the thanks of the country, and I believe he has obtained the thanks of the country, for bringing forward this measure in the way he has done, and for the tenacity with which he has adhered to it. I am perfectly satisfied that every hon. member who supports this Bill will receive the thanks of his constituents for so supporting it. I have to apologise to the House for the length of time I have occupied, and I have only to say, in conclusion, that I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill.

M. McCARTHY. One word before the motion is put. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Quebec, that the law of that Province is a very good one, and needs little improvement, but it is no reason why we should not have a good law for the whole Dominion, that one part of the Dominion, the Province of Quebec, has a good law at present. Now, I think, in one respect, perhaps the amendment I propose is an improvement upon the law. Perhaps the law of the Province of Quebec is in one respect better than the proposal now before the House. All that, however, can be dealt with, if the principle of the Bill is accepted, by the committee to which the Bill is referred. By the law of the Province of Quebec it is possible for a carrier to make a man contract, as it were, by simply giving him notice; that is to say, if he is told, or has an opportunity of seeing a notice which is published, that the carrier will only be responsible under such and such conditions, provided the court decides that the consignor was aware of them at the time he sent the goods. That I do not believe to be a fair and reasonable state of the law, and I believe the Bill is an improvement, in declaring that the party shall not be bound simply by any pretense of notice given unless he signs a contract. The other part of the code of Quebec is perhaps an improvement on the English law:

"Notwithstanding such notice and the knowledge thereof, carriers are liable, whether it is proved that the damage is caused by their fault or the fault of those for whom they are responsible."

So that, whether the conditions be reasonable or not, in the opinion of the judge, if the goods are damaged through the fault of the carrier the carrier is responsible. These are matters of detail, however, which may be dealt with by the committee, and which do not affect the principle of the measure I have the honor to submit to the House. I think the question of constitutionality has been so fully dealt with that I need not add anything to what I have said already. I believe the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), put the question very clearly. We have already in the law with regard to railways a regulation determining their liability. The right to make that provision has never been questioned, except in the case to which I have referred, and when questioned there was overruled, so far as was

necessary, by the judge. If that can be done with regard to railways, why not with regard to express companies, and, if, with regard to them, why not with regard to any carrier? The argument appears to me to be practically conclusive, and I trust the House will accept the principle of the Bill and allow the details to be worked out by a committee, whether the railway committee or a sub-committee, as the House thinks proper.

Mr. ORTON. I would like to ask my hon. friend if clause 9 is intended to hold carriers responsible for the felonious acts or the neglect or misconduct of their servants or agents.

Mr. McCARTHY. The object of that clause is to put it beyond doubt that a carrier cannot make the excuse, if goods have been stolen, that it is a felony.

Mr. MILLS. The House has, of course, before it two questions, which are entirely distinct in their character. The first is, whether it has jurisdiction to deal with this particular matter; and the second is, with regard to the merits of the measure which the hon. gentleman has submitted to us for the second reading. Of course it is not necessary that we should go into the discussion of the merits of the Bill at all if in the opinion of the House it is *ultra vires*. I observe that by the second section the hon. gentleman provides that the Bill shall include railway companies, express companies and large coach proprietors. Why large coach proprietors and not small ones? Every department of the law is under the control either of the Local Legislatures or of this Parliament. If this subject is under the control of this Parliament, then the subject of small coach proprietors is as much included within the purview of this Parliament as those the hon. gentleman proposes to deal with; and whether we legislate upon the subject or not, that particular department of law, even though he may not have referred to it in this Bill, is part of the law of Canada, and not of the law of any one of the Provinces. It seems to me, taking that view of the case, that the hon. gentleman would go as far as to contend that a party carrying a parcel from one part of this city to another is doing so under a law within the jurisdiction of this Parliament, and not within the jurisdiction of the Province. Looking at the principle of the Bill, it seems to me that it does interfere with civil rights. It assumes the power to regulate the terms of a contract which one party may make with another, and so far as it does this, I think it encroaches on the powers and authority of the Local Legislatures. Now, this Bill is a part of the law of bailments; yet, the hon. gentleman will admit that there is a great deal in the law of bailments, hiring and letting, with which this Parliament would have no power to deal—that if any matters are matters of civil right and contract, such matters are. Then, take the question of goods *in transitu*. The hon. gentleman does not deal with that question in this Bill, but if the principle of this Bill were sound, this Parliament would have a right to deal with that subject, and not the Local Legislatures. Now, one hon. gentleman, I think the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), said the subject of this Bill was accessory to the law of trade and commerce. Well, Sir, if we undertake to deal with everything which may be an incident of trade and commerce, we might embrace almost the entire field of property and civil rights. I do not think we can deal incidentally with a subject of this sort, upon the theory that it is a matter affecting trade and commerce. I think there is an old case in which it was argued before the House of Lords that a certain measure was an interference with the terms of union between England and Scotland. It was a measure relating to trade in Scotland, and was confined to the kingdom of Scotland, but it was there said that the provision

Mr. McCARTHY,

relating to trade and commerce, and which provided that the laws on that subject should be uniform, did not embrace trade which was confined to Scotland. If you embrace within the definition of trade and commerce every kind of trade and all kinds of intercourse between one party and another, you would deal with the laws relating to retail trade, and the sale of goods in every town and city in the Dominion. Now, all these matters come under the law relating to civil rights; they are never regarded as being embraced in the term "trade and commerce." The hon. gentleman, in undertaking to include a number of those matters relating to the local trade of the various Provinces within the provisions of this Bill, undertakes, it seems to me, to deal with a subject with which this House ought not to deal, but which comes within the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislatures. Whether we might not undertake to regulate interprovincial trade is another question. The hon. gentleman's Bill, however, goes beyond that, and interferes with the domestic trade of each Province.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not intend to detain the House at any length. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend on my left (Mr. Mills) in everything he has said. It appears to me the general scope of the Bill is a good one; it appears to me that the Bill is in the interest of the general public, and if it is within our jurisdiction I, for one, will gladly vote for it. The limitation of the power of common carriers to impose contracts is, in my opinion, a good limitation, because the shipper of goods is, as a rule, to-day, compelled to agree to any contract the carrier may impose on him. The only question at issue is whether by this measure we would infringe unduly on provincial rights. We know very well, so far as the character of goods carried in this Dominion is concerned, that a very large portion comes within the term of interprovincial trade, and so far as this Bill deals with interprovincial trade I believe it to be *intra vires*. The mass of trade affected being so large, I hold that it is worth while to pass a Bill of this nature, so far as it affects interprovincial matters. The definition of what is trade and commerce has been given in the Parsons case, in which the Privy Council defined this term as follows: "The words 'regulation of trade and commerce' include political arrangements with regard to trade requiring the sanction of Parliament, and the regulation of trade in matters of interprovincial concern." In my own opinion, so far as this Bill attempts to deal with the carriage of goods within any city, or within the limits of any Province, it is *ultra vires*; but so far as it concerns interprovincial trade it comes within the jurisdiction of this Parliament. I therefore cannot vote for the six months' hoist, because I believe the Bill to be *intra vires* in the latter sense. I shall vote against the six months' hoist, and in committee I hope that it will be amended in such a manner that it will deal solely with interprovincial trade.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Curran :

That the Bill be read the second time this day six months.

YEAS :
Messieurs

Amyot,	Dawson,	Langevin,
Baker (Missisquoi),	De St. Georges,	Laurier,
Béchar, d,	Duport,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Belleau,	Edgar,	McIsaac,
Benoit,	Fisher,	McMullen,
Bergeron,	Fleming,	Massue,
Bergin,	Forbes,	Mills,
Bernier,	Fortin,	Platt,
Billy,	Gagné,	Ray,
Blake,	Gaudet,	Rinfret,
Blondeau,	Geoffrion,	Riopel,
Bossé,	Gigault,	Robertson (Shellburne),
Bourassa,	Grandbois,	Somerville (Bruce),
Caron,	Gunn,	Taschereau,
Cartwright,	Holton,	Tassé,
Casgrain,	Hurteau,	Trow,

Catudal, Chapleau, Cimon, Costigan, Coursol, Curran,	Irviue, Kirk, Landerkin, Landry (Kent), Landry (Montmagny),	Valin, Watson, Wilson, Woodworth, Yeo.—64.
---	---	--

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen, Baker (Victoria), Barnard, Beaty, Bowell, Burns, Burpes (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Victoria), Carling, Casey, Cochrane, Colby, Davies, Dickinson, Dodd, Ferguson (Welland), Foster, Gillmor, Gordon, Hackett, Haggart, Harley, Hay,	Hesson, Hickey, Homer, Innes, Ives, Jackson, Jamieson, Jenkins, Kaulbach, Kianey, Kranz, Lister, Macdonald (King's), Macdonald (Sir John), Mackintosh, McCallum, McCarthy, McDougald (Pictou), McDougall (C. Breton), McLellan, McNeill, Moffat, Mulock, O'Brien, Orton,	Paint, Paterson (Brant), Pope, Robertson (Hastings), Rykert, Scott, Shakespeare, Small, Somerville (Brant), Springer, Stairs, Sutherland (Selkirk), Temple, Townshend, Tupper, Tyrwhitt, Vail, Wallace (Albert), Wallace (York), Weldon, Wells, Wigle, Williams, Wood (Westm'nd)—74.
---	--	---

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to on a division, and Bill read the second time.

THE ESTIMATES.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the message, as follows:—

LANSDOWNE.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending 30th June, 1886, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 27th February, 1885.

Mr. BOWELL moved that the said Message and Estimates be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 2nd March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

RETURNS—SECTION B.

Mr. CASEY. I beg to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways to the fact that some of the returns ordered a fortnight ago in relation to section B, with reference to sums paid the Canadian Pacific Railway on account of work done between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, engineers' reports, etc., have not yet been brought down. Can the hon. gentleman tell me when we will have them?

Mr. POPE. I cannot say; we will bring them down as soon as possible.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE. Can the hon. gentleman tell me when we will have the return with reference to the Short Line Railway Company—the contract made by Sir Charles Tupper, which the hon. gentleman promised to bring down?

Mr. POPE. I will enquire and let the hon. gentleman know to-morrow.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 50) to incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Temple.)

Bill No. 54) to confirm the union of the Canada Congregational Missionary Society and the Congregational Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.—(Mr. Abbott.)

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Watson.)

LIFE BOAT—CAPE BRETON.

Mr. DODD asked, Is it the intention of the Government, during the present year, to place a life boat or a life saving apparatus at or near Flat or Low Point, in the County of Cape Breton?

Mr. McLELAN. The matter is in the consideration of the Government.

RAILWAY BELT LANDS—BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. HESSON asked, Whether the Homestead Act of Manitoba and the North-West applies to lands within the railway belt, British Columbia? If so, can entries be now made by proxy as permitted in Manitoba and the North-West. In case said lands are not open to homesteaders, are they now for sale, and at what price per acre and on what conditions?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Homestead Act of Manitoba will not apply to the lands within the railway belt. The lands are now being surveyed, and will soon be put in the market, and the price will then be settled on the completion of the survey.

LONG POINT FISHING GROUND.

Mr. JACKSON asked, For how long a period has the Government leased to the Long Point Company in Ontario, the fishing grounds convenient to Long Point, and what is the price received per annum for the same?

Mr. McLELAN. They were leased for nine years, from January 1st, 1880, until 31st December, 1889, at a rental of \$100 per annum.

CANAL TO THE MUSKOKA LAKES.

Mr. BAIN (for Mr. COCKBURN) asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to send an engineer to enquire into the feasibility of connecting the Lakes of Muskoka with the Severn River and Trent Valley Canal system by means of a very short canal, and if so, about what time will engineer be sent?

Mr. POPE. The Government are now considering the whole question.

POSTAGE PRIVILEGES.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to grant to the members of the several Local Legislatures of the Dominion, during the Sessions of the said Legislatures, the right of sending their letters and documents free of postage by Her Majesty's mail?

Mr. CARLING. It is not the intention of the Government to make any change with respect to mail arrangements with the Local Legislatures. At the present time, Votes and Proceedings, or other papers printed by order of the Legislatures, go free. The question has special reference to letters. It is not the intention to make any change in regard to them.

RAILWAY BELT ON VANCOUVER ISLAND.

Mr. GORDON asked, Has any application been made to this Government either through their agent in British Columbia or through any Provincial officer on behalf of any purchaser or purchasers of lands within the railway belt on Vancouver Island for a grant or grants under the Great Seal, as provided for under 47 Victoria, Chapter 6, section 7, sub-section 1? If so, have any such grants been issued, and to whom?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Several applications have been made—eight or nine—but no grants have yet been issued.

STATIONERY FOR HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, What is the total expense for stationery for the House of Commons during each of the past Sessions of the present Parliament?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that statement must be made by officers of the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Is that the only answer?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The only answer I can give.

Mr. SPEAKER. The expense is about \$20,000.

M. FABRE.

Mr. CASGRAIN (Translation) asked, Whether the Government have received a report from Mr. Fabre, their agent in Paris, and whether such report, if in existence, will be laid before Parliament during the present Session? What is the amount paid to Mr. Fabre for the last fiscal year, and to date?

Mr. CHAPLEAU (Translation). Mr. Fabre has, from time to time, held correspondence with the Department of the Secretary of State, since last year. The reports he has made will be brought down, if asked for by any hon. member. The amount paid to Mr. Fabre is that which is indicated in the Public Accounts for last year, to which there has been no addition since that time.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS FOR DUNDAS.

Mr. BAIN (Wentworth) asked, Does the Government propose making any provision this Session for the erection of public buildings in the town of Dundas, as implied in the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works in Committee of Supply last Session?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. As this is a new work I have to say that when the Supplementary Estimates come down I shall then be in a position to give a positive answer to the hon. gentleman's question.

ASSISTED IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. MACKINTOSH asked, Has the Government issued any instructions to the High Commissioner at London with reference to the class of emigrants to whom inducements are offered to emigrate to the Dominion? Has the Government decided upon discontinuing the policy of assisting immigrant labor coming to the Dominion? If not, is it the intention of the Government so to do?

Mr. POPE. The Department, in view of the fact that the work on the Canadian Pacific Railway will soon be completed, instructed the High Commissioner in December last that no more general laborers or navvies should be assisted or encouraged to come to Canada, neither mechanics nor artisans should be assisted. The Department also instructed that the greatest exertions should be made to induce agricultural laborers, agricultural families and female servants, both in the United Kingdom and on the Continent of Europe, to come to Canada. Having received from the working men a respectful remonstrance against assisting a certain class of laborers that come into competition with them, the Department is now considering the best means of assisting agricultural laborers, agricultural families and domestic servants, and excluding from all assistance or encouragement those classes complained of by the working men of the cities and manufacturing districts.

CLOVIS CARON.

Mr. BLONDEAU asked, What are the salary and the amount of expenses paid to Mr. Clovis Caron, fishery overseer, for the year 1883?

Mr. McLELAN. Salary, \$200 per annum, and expenses last year, \$81.43.

JULES GAUVREAU.

Mr. BLONDEAU asked, What are the salary and the amount of expenses paid to Jules Gauvreau, fishery overseer, for the year 1884?

Mr. McLELAN. Salary, \$100, and expenses \$51.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LABORERS' WAGES.

Mr. CHARLTON asked, Has the Government taken measures to secure the payment of wages to laborers employed in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway? If not, is it proposed to take such measures?

Mr. POPE. No, they have not.

EXCISE REVENUE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total revenue from Excise for the six months ending 1st January, 1885, also for the six months ending 1st January, 1884?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The total receipts for the six months ending December 31st, 1884, were \$2,863,290.87; for the six months ending December 31st, 1883, \$3,081,984.87.

DOMINION LANDS REVENUE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What amount has been received from all sources on account of Dominion lands up to date of enquiry? What amount in the seven months ending 1st February, 1885? What amount in the seven months ending 1st February, 1884.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The amount received to February 27th, 1885, was \$4,349,378.99. For the seven months ending 1st February, 1884, \$670,141.90; for the seven months ending 1st February, 1885, \$242,819.52.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—EXTENSION TO QUEBEC.

Mr. LAURIER asked, Has the Government received any communication from the Government of Quebec, asking that the sum of \$96,000 reserved last year by the Statute 47 Victoria, chapter 8, for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction, to the Harbor of Quebec, be paid to the said Government

or otherwise disposed of, and has any action been taken in such demand, and if so, when ?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government has received such a communication, but no action has been taken upon it.

REDUCTION OF LETTER POSTAGE.

Mr. CHARLTON moved :

For copies of all correspondence, memorials or communications received by the Government since January 1st, 1885, asking for a reduction of the letter postage of Canada to two cents per half ounce, or relating to any proposal for the reduction of letter postage.

He said : There is no tax that can be remitted or reduced by the Government, the remission or reduction of which would be received with greater favor than that of postage. In England, in Canada, and in the United States, the rate of postage has been reduced at various times, and always with excellent results and without material loss to the revenue. The last reduction which was made in England brought the rate down to one penny per ounce, and neither it nor the reduction in the United States from five to three cents was followed by loss of revenue. Canada followed the example of these countries in this respect, and reduced the letter postage from five to three cents without permanent loss of revenue or other serious consequences. Since then the United States Government have reduced the rate of letter postage to the English standard of one penny or two cents. That reduction took place in October, 1883, and there can be no question, Sir, that the example of the United States in this respect is one which it is desirable for us to follow. I suppose the question, however, with the Postmaster General is whether it is an example which we can follow without too great loss of revenue. I find, Sir, that under the operation of the reduced postage of the United States for nine months, according to the report of the Postmaster General to 30th June last, the shrinkage of the revenue amounted to $4\frac{7}{10}$ per cent., and it was held by the Postmaster General that, although the reduced rate was in force nine months, the effects of the reduction of revenue extended through the whole year. The estimate made by him is that the annual increase of postage under the old rate would have been 9 per cent., which, with the actual decrease of $4\frac{7}{10}$ per cent., would make a total of about 15 per cent. decrease. Even on this basis, however, the public were largely the gainers. The reduction in postage was $33\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the loss in revenue was 15 per cent., so that the net gain to the public was $18\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. There is reason to suppose, I think, that the loss to the revenue was not really as great as $14\frac{7}{10}$ per cent. I find, Sir, by comparing the postal revenues of the United States with those of Canada, that apparently the causes which operate in one country, operate in the other; that in the years in which the increase of postage is large in one it is large in the other, and on the contrary in years in which the postage collections are either reduced or nearly stationary in the United States, the same feature applies to the revenue in Canada. If we take, for instance, the year 1876-77, we find that the falling off of the postal revenues in the United States was \$1,102,612, or 4 per cent. In Canada in that year the increase was very slight indeed,—about one per cent., the total increase being \$12,405. In 1878-79, the increase in the United States was $2\frac{9}{10}$ per cent., and in the same year the decrease in Canada was $2\frac{9}{10}$ or \$35,372. In the year 1881-82, the increase in Canada was \$235,779, or $17\frac{4}{10}$ per cent., while the increase in the United States for the same year was $18\frac{8}{10}$ per cent. In the following year the increase in Canada was \$212,503 or $13\frac{4}{10}$ per cent., and in the United States $8\frac{6}{10}$ per cent., while in 1883-84, under the reduction in the United States, there was a decrease of

$4\frac{7}{10}$ per cent., and a decrease in Canada, without a reduction of postage rates, amounting to $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I think these comparisons will naturally lead us to the conclusion that the estimate of the Postmaster General of the United States that there would have been a natural increase last year of 9 per cent. was fallacious, and that while we had an increase of only $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent it will be reasonable to suppose that the United States postal revenue would be nearly stationary under the 3 cent letter rate. If this is the case the United States has not sustained a loss of more than about 5 to 8 per cent. on the gross receipts of the Department, and the public have gained $33\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. I think that a careful examination of these statistics may possibly lead my hon. friend the Postmaster General to modify somewhat his views of the probability of a large loss to the revenue from a reduction of the postal rate. There are certain causes which will tend to mitigate the evil consequence, financially, which would naturally result from the change. It is found in the United States that the adoption of the 2 cent letter rate has led to a large diminution in the number of postal cards used. The people instead of using so many one cent postal cards use more letters and pay the 2 cent rate. There is another circumstance that decreases to some extent and probably to a considerable extent, the postal revenue of Canada, and that is the fact that the business men of Windsor, Sarnia, Clifton, Fort Erie, and other places on the border, opposite to places in the United States where letters can be posted, are in the habit of sending their letters over the border in batches, prepaying them at the 2 cent rate. This habit I believe, entails a serious loss to the postal revenue, and it is a loss which would cease if we adopted a rate corresponding to the rate on the other side. I trust the postal authorities of this country will give the matter careful consideration, believing as I do that if it is carefully considered the difficulties which apparently beset the Government in taking the course I suggest will largely vanish.

Mr. HESSON. I am quite in sympathy with the objects of the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in this matter. I had previously purposed bringing the question more fully before the House after seeing the report of the Postmaster General, as I supposed I could obtain from it some information which might guide me in what I thought the Government might consider in connection with this matter. There is no question I think as to the desirability of reducing our rate of letter postage to meet the rate which has been established in the United States. The result of reducing the rate in that country has been that the loss of revenue has been much less than was anticipated, and if we follow the history of our own country in reference to postal changes which have been made from time to time, under the demand of the people for greater facilities, we find that the revenues of the Department have not suffered so much as was usually looked for. In 1859 the rate of threepence currency per half ounce was established. That rate continued until 1866, when the revenue amounted to \$813,726 and the expenditure to \$834,561, a deficit of \$20,834; but to this has to be added \$64,000, which was granted by the Legislative Assembly at that time to cover the cost of departmental postage which made the deficit something like \$84,000. I have not had an opportunity of comparing the charges which prevailed previous to that time; but coming to a later period we find that the balance against us, has sometimes been larger. In 1879, for instance, the revenue was \$1,534,363 and the expenditure \$2,167,266, leaving an adverse balance of \$632,903. Now, it is true that the balance is still very largely against us, although not to so great an extent as it was then; and when we look at the marvellous growth of the Post Office service in Canada, I think we will admit that nothing shows more strikingly or

clearly the substantial progress made by the Dominion. In 1884 the revenue amounted to \$2,330,741, an increase of \$795,378 over 1879, five years previous, an average increase of \$159,275 per annum. This is certainly a very large increase; and when we take into consideration the large extent of territory still unsettled, the great distance between settlers in many parts of Canada, and the mileage covered among a sparse population, it is certainly a very gratifying evidence of the prosperity of the Post Office Department that the expenditure has not increased at a greater rate than the income—in fact not so much, because the expenditure of 1878 was \$2,167,266, while the expenditure of 1884 was \$2,931,387, showing a difference of \$764,121 between the deficits of those periods, or an average of \$152,824 per annum. Now, there is really nothing in the fact of the deficit for the present year, representing as it does something like \$600,000, to deter the Postmaster General from taking a wider view of this question, and if possible making arrangements to meet the wants of the people of Canada by reducing the rate to a point equivalent to that fixed in the United States. The reduction of the rate to two cents per half ounce would, I believe, give a very largely increased revenue with a minimum of expenditure. The total mileage in 1879, I find, was 45,880,000; in 1884 it had arisen to 69,100,000 miles, an increase of no less than 23,220,000 miles in five years, or an average increase of 4,844,000 miles per annum. This is a very large increase, and indicates the great advance which has been made in this department of the public service. As to the effect of the low rate of postage on the revenue, I may instance the introduction of the postal card. It is not very long since that privilege was granted to the people. For some time it did not seem to take with the public to a very large extent. In 1879 there were only 6,940,000 used; but in 1884 no less than 13,580,000 postal cards were used by the public, an increase of 6,640,000 cards in five years, or at the rate of 1,328,000 per annum. The fact that the circulation of postal cards has doubled in five years is, I think, pretty clear evidence that the people are prepared to take advantage of a low rate of postage even in that to some extent objectionable mode of sending correspondence. Now, Sir, my confident belief is that if the two cent rate were established for letters, the postal card would not be so largely used as at present, the two cent covered letters taking their place. There might be a diminution in the cards; and I do not know that the Government derives any great profit from printing those cards and furnishing them to the public at one cent each; and they are quite as cumbersome to carry and deliver as a letter. When all this is taken into consideration I do not think the revenue is likely to suffer much from the adoption of the two cent rate. While on this subject I would say that if the Postmaster General cannot see his way to granting this concession at once, he might relieve a grievance felt by the public in being obliged to pay six cents on a letter exceeding half an ounce. For instance, a sender posts a letter which is a small fraction over the half ounce, putting on a three cent stamp, and it sometimes happens that it is sent to a second post office before it reaches the person to whom it is addressed, when he is obliged to pay six cents more upon it, thus making a letter cost nine cents because it is a fraction over half an ounce. The Postmaster General might, perhaps, find it convenient to grant the privilege, under the present rate, of sending a letter at one rate, so long as it is under an ounce weight. That, I am sure, would be a great convenience to the public. Although there is a very large expense for the past year as against one or two preceding years, it is largely owing to the enormous increase of new offices, no less than 444 having been established during the past year ending 1884, making an additional mileage of travel of 4,664,000 miles. This certainly will account for the very

Mr. HESSON.

large expenditure this year over income, but at the same time it is evident that the income is of solid growth, and that it is a very considerable increase over that of the preceding year. This is a cause I think for congratulation to the Postmaster General, showing as it does, that the revenue, although it has suffered to a heavy extent, will not fail in course of time to overtake the expenditure. There is no single portion of the Government service so valuable to the public as the postal service, and I would be very happy indeed if it were in the power of the Postmaster General to make a move in the direction indicated as early as possible.

Mr. CARLING. There is no objection whatever on the part of the Government to bring down any correspondence that may have taken place relative to the reduction of postage from three to two cents, but I think the time has not yet arrived when we should make this reduction considering that the expenditure is so largely over revenue as it is. The American Government, when they recommended the reduction from three to two cents, had a large surplus, a surplus of something over \$2,000,000; and according to the estimate of the Postmaster General of the United States the expenses next year over the revenue will amount to something over five million dollars. I think that with the large additional mail accommodation that is asked for by the people in all parts of the country, and with the desire of the Government to meet their desires as far as possible, this is hardly the time to make a reduction and thereby reduce the revenue so very largely as the reduction asked for would reduce it. The new post offices established during the past year, as mentioned by my hon. friend, number some 430, chiefly in the North-West and in the rural districts of the different Provinces. The Government are desirous of doing everything they possibly can to increase the mail accommodation in the rural districts and especially in the North-West. We have opened up that large country from Lake Superior to the Columbia River and in the course of a few months we expect to have a through line from one end of Canada to the other. When these new roads are established, the settlers going in will require still more mail facilities which will be a very large charge upon the revenue, and I think that under all circumstances the Government are wise in not at present counselling the reduction asked for, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that the Government have given the subject full consideration; and when the time arrives, which I hope is not far off, when the revenue will equal the expenditure, then I am sure that the Government will give the matter every consideration with the view, as far as possible, of meeting the wishes of the House with regard to reduction in rate.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION OF NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for:

1. Copies of all correspondence between the Government and the North-West Council respecting the representation of the Territories in this Parliament;
2. Copies of all petitions, representations and correspondence addressed to the Government or any member of it, on the same subject, and any replies thereto;
3. Copies of all petitions, representations and correspondence with the Government or any member of it, on the subject of the establishment of Local Governments in the Territories, and of all replies thereto.

He said: The right hon. gentleman, the First Minister will recollect that some time during the last Session of Parliament the council of the North-West council transmitted, I believe, to the Government, a minute of that council with respect to the representation of those Territories in the Parliament of Canada. I find on referring to that paper that there were a number of grievances complained of by the council, for which redress was sought at the hands of the Dominion Government. The sixteenth sub-section of the memorial is in the following words:—

"Your memorialists believe that the success of the North-West Territory is of such importance to the whole Dominion that the time has arrived when representation for the Territories should be had in Parliament. At the present time the people of the North-West Territory are without representation of any kind and have to depend solely on petitions and memorials to let their wants be known."

We know perfectly well from the newspapers published in the North-West that during the last year meetings have been held in almost every centre of population in the North-West at which resolutions were passed and transmitted, I believe, to the Government, asking the Government, as a matter of right, that representation should be given to the people of the North-West Territories in the Parliament of Canada. The hon. gentleman will recollect, on referring to the speeches—and some very able ones were made upon this subject—that the people complain, and I think very rightly, that the system in the North-West Territory is one of taxation without representation. The old principle and tyranny of the worst kind. The people in the North-West Territory complain that their grievances and representations are disposed of by Parliament in their absence and without giving them an opportunity in the face of Parliament of stating their case. They complain, and I think with good reason, that now their population exceeds the population which Prince Edward Island had when it was admitted into the Union with a representation of six members; they complain that their population is now, and I believe they state it correctly, at least ten times what the population of Manitoba was when it was admitted into the Union with a representation of four members. They complain, and I believe they are correct, that their population is now at least ten times the population British Columbia had when it was admitted into the Union with a representation of six members, and that they are yet without any representation. Being so far away from the centre of business, they add that any representation of their wants must be made known to the Government by petitions or remonstrance, or communication of some such kind. One can easily understand how the people in the North-West, most of whom are settlers from the older Provinces, and accustomed to local self-government as well as to parliamentary representation, should feel aggrieved at the fact that hitherto the Government have taken no tangible steps to give them representation in the Parliament of Canada. It will be recollected that, during the last Session of Parliament, the Minister of the Interior stated in the Senate Chamber, in reply to a question submitted by Senator Plumb, that the Government were prepared to earnestly consider the question of the representation of the people of the North-West Territory in the Parliament of Canada. I am not aware that the Government have taken any steps in that direction so far. I know that the Acting Minister of Railways has introduced a Bill with the view of taking a census, but that census will not be in the hands of Parliament, to be acted upon before this Parliament has ceased to exist, and unless prompt and decided action is taken by the Government, the people of the North-West will be without representation, not only during this Parliament, but during the whole or a portion of the next Parliament. Although the population in the North-West is not what we had a fair right to expect it would have been, still it is very considerable. In the district of Assiniboia there are very large centres of population, and it is supposed that there are somewhere between 50,000 and 100,000 people there. How far that is correct I do not know, but there are certainly considerable centres of population there, and I can see no reason why the Government should not give these people a representation of some kind, if not such as we have in this Parliament, at all events such as they have in the United States. I do not propose to discuss this motion at present. If there are any remonstrances or petitions of this kind, I desire to have them at as early a date as possible, as I wish to discuss them upon the Bill I have

introduced for the purpose of granting representation to the people of the North-West Territories; and I therefore hope that the First Minister will see that any papers in the Department which are called for by this motion are brought down as soon as possible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no objection to this motion going. Any correspondence which there may be will be brought down at once. I do not propose to enter into the discussion of the question now, as the hon. gentleman has a Bill on the subject, and the matter will be discussed on that measure.

Motion agreed to.

FOG-HORN ON DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE, LAKE ERIE.

Mr. JACKSON moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government and one Captain Conally, or any other person, in regard to placing a fog-horn or fog-whistle on what is called the dummy lighthouse, near the head of Lake Erie.

He said: I wish to call the attention of the Government to this matter, which is of very great importance to the marine interest navigating the waters of Lake Erie, that is, the placing of a fog-whistle on Dummy lighthouse. This lighthouse is placed opposite Point Pelee to show the channel between Point Pelee and Pelee Island. Point Pelee extends into Lake Erie ten or twelve miles, at a distance of about 30 miles from the mouth of the Detroit River. Pelee Island is some miles distant to the south-west, and all shipping entering Lake Erie from the west or from the Detroit River has to pass through this channel, with the exception of the shipping destined for points to the south, like Toledo, Sandusky and Cleveland, which passes to the westward of Pelee Island. During clear weather the light is sufficient, but, in foggy or heavy weather, they are not able to see or to distinguish where they are, and it is necessary in passing through that channel that they should know where they are. Vessels passing up the lake with a free wind, passing Point Pelee, have to change their course to get to the mouth of the Detroit River, and if there is a fog, so that they cannot discover the light, they are liable to strike the point on the north or the island on the south. As they have to change their course after passing the point, it is necessary that they should be able to see the light or to know where it is, and in consequence of there being no whistle there, there have been many disasters on that point. In fact, it is second in the number of disasters only to Long Point. I have had a number of communications from captains in reference to the matter, asking me to bring it up as one of great importance to the shipping interest. It will only require a small outlay of money—perhaps \$500 to \$1,000—and I hope the Minister will see his way clear to place a fog-whistle on this Dummy lighthouse, which will be a great advantage to those navigating this lake.

Motion agreed to.

SEIZURES AT THE PORT OF WINNIPEG.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) moved for:

A statement showing the seizures made at the port of Winnipeg by the Department of Customs or any of its officers or officials, between 1st January, 1883, and 1st January, 1885; giving the estimated value of each of such seizures, the amount of fine imposed in each case and the manner in which the said fines were disposed of, and stating in detail the amount paid to each officer or employé of the Government, the name of such officer or employé and when paid; also the salary paid to each such officer or employé; the disposal made of all such goods seized, and if sold, when, for how much, and how the proceeds were disposed of.

Mr. BOWELL. There can be no objection to giving all the information asked for in this motion, but if my hon. friend will look at the return moved for by the leader of the Opposition, and laid before the House, he will find that all

the information he asks for is contained in that, with the exception of the salaries paid to each of the officers and the sale of the goods. He will also find, if he looks at the Trade and Navigation returns, that the name of every officer in the employment of the Customs' outside service is placed under each port, with the salary paid to each one of them. This motion would only be duplicating the information which is already before the House, with the exception of the points to which I have called the hon. gentleman's attention. The information asked for in the six months prior to the 1st of July, or from July, 1883, to the 31st of December, 1884, is also contained in the information laid before the House last year. If, however, the hon. gentleman requires this synopsis, I have no objection to have it made out for him; but I would remind the hon. gentlemen opposite, who have such thirst for knowledge, that if it were possible it would be as well for them to place all the information they require in one return, so as not to necessitate the same return being made two or three times. The notice on the paper given by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) also ask for this information, and a little more, by adding the names of parties from whom the seizures were made in the Province of Nova Scotia, and if the motion had been made in the first place to cover the names of the parties from whom seizures were made, together with information as to the disposal of the property, when it was sold, and how much it realized, all this could have been put in one motion. I merely point out this to the House in order that they may not be at all surprised if, on account of the multiplicity of returns for which we are asked, they do not get them as rapidly as they would like.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I would just say for myself that whether the charge will lie against any member of the House, of moving unnecessary returns, it is not for me to say, but I think I may fairly claim that I am not liable to that charge. I make no motions for papers except I have a definite object in view. I have not forgotten, either, to look over the Order paper and to notice the fact that a general return had been moved for by the leader of the Opposition, but it would not give all the information that I sought for, nor in as definite a form as I desired, and it will not contain all the information I desire. I may just say to the Minister that representations have been made to me from that quarter, with reference to some of the seizures, and I suppose that it is the duty of a member of Parliament to pay attention to complaints. I am not going to found a charge against the Department without having the papers, and therefore I abstain from saying anything at present, but I can tell the hon. Minister that I am moving for cause. It is quite possible that when the papers come down they may do away with the necessity of any remarks whatever being made on the subject. But I just wish to remind him that I have not been so negligent as to overlook the general return that has been asked for. I had taken that trouble, and found it would not contain all I desired. I am sorry the hon. Minister is so overworked, but I do trust he will put forth this one extra exertion and give me this one little return, because I do not think it can amount to a great deal, unless his officers have been seizing very generally.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is only a little one.

Motion agreed to.

SUPREME COURT OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. FOSTER moved for :

The number and title of all causes entered for argument upon the docket of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick *in banco*, the date of each entry thereof, the date of the argument of each cause, and the date when judgment was given in each cause, the return to include all causes from 1st May, 1879, to 31st December, 1884, and to specify the causes in which questions arising under the provisions of the Canada Temperance

Mr. BOWELL.

Act of 1878, or of the Liquor License Act of 1883, were involved, and the cities or counties in which said actions were brought, or such questions were first raised.

He said: In moving for this return I beg leave to state my reasons therefor. For a number of years past there has been an impression, more or less general, in the Province of New Brunswick, that unnecessary and tedious delays take place between the arguing of causes in our Supreme Court and the giving of judgment upon the same. Within the last two years this impression has become even more prevalent, and has found expression in many quarters. It has found expression amongst the members of the bar, and although I am not a member of the bar I have conversed with a good many who are, and I find the impression quite general that these delays are unnecessarily frequent, and quite too tedious to be in the interest of justice. Within the last year several of the more prominent newspapers in the Province have called the attention of the public and of the Supreme Court to this matter; but what is more significant than all is, that the people generally are beginning to remark it. So long as these cases were individual cases, in which the general public were not much interested, the general public did not take it much to heart; but since cases concerning the Canada Temperance Act of 1878 and the Liquor License Act of 1883 have come up, the people generally are very much interested; and I think the House will agree with me that it is not in the interest of the Supreme Court or of the demands of justice that unnecessary delay should take place. I am not founding any charge, but I am simply saying that the impression exists, and I call for these returns so that the impression, if it is erroneous, may be removed. If the impression proves to be correct, something will need to be done to provide a remedy for the grievances alleged.

Mr. CARON. There is no objection to the information being brought down; but I must point out to the hon. gentleman that the information will have to be obtained through the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. FOSTER. I hope the hon. gentleman will expedite the matter as much as possible.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—VERNON SMITH'S REPORT.

Mr. LESAGE (Translation) moved for :

Copies of the report of survey by Vernon Smith, C.E., in relation to the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Canadian Ports on the Atlantic.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Is the hon. Minister of Public Works prepared to state when these reports will be ready?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I must say that the reports are now being prepared as speedily as possible. The Government desire to lay them before the House, together with the plans and profiles. It is impossible to name the day, but as soon as they are prepared they will be brought down without one day's delay.

Mr. LAURIER. (Translation.) Will it be to-morrow?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) No; not to-morrow; as soon as they are ready.

Mr. AMYOT. (Translation.) I suppose it is useless to ask for any one of these reports in particular, as they will all be brought down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) Yes; it is useless to ask for them separately, because they will all be laid before the House.

Motion agreed to.

FISH TAKEN IN THE MIRAMICHI.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex), for Mr. Mitchell, moved for :

A return of all fresh fish taken in the bay and river of Miramichi and its branches for the year ending 1st February instant, defining the separate quantities of each kind by weight—the places to which they were exported and the route of transport in each case and the average price received for each kind of fish ; together with an estimate, in detail, of the several kinds of fish taken in that time.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Minister says anything in regard to the motion, I wish to take this opportunity of calling his attention to a communication which I have received with reference to the hatchery on the Miramichi. My correspondent, who appears to be a respectable man and for many years a resident of that part of the country, declares that the hatchery is a slaughter house for the wholesale destruction of breeding salmon. He says further that he has been settled on his farm for 36 years, that he has always had something to do with the salmon fishing in that branch of the river, and that the number of salmon has steadily decreased until last year they would hardly pay for the time which was employed in the work. He states also the reasons which he supposes had produced this state of things, but in the absence of the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) I will not trouble the House with them.

Mr. McLELLAN. The return will be brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, instead of moving for a return of all fresh fish taken in this place, had better move for a return of the quantities of fish taken, or the fish will not be very fresh when they are returned.

Motion agreed to.

EXCHANGE BANK—GOVERNMENT ADVANCES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I wish to move the following resolution *pro forma*, so that the debate may be adjourned as understood :

That it appears by the Public Accounts that \$237,000 are due to the Government in respect of the advances made to the Exchange Bank in 1883.

That the said bank had already, within two years, suspended payment and reduced its capital by 50 per cent.

That the papers laid before this House—and the statement of the Minister—show that the bank was in difficulties when said advances were made, and that no proper enquiries were had or precautions taken in respect of the loan of the \$300,000 of public money put in jeopardy by such advance.

That the present condition of the loan is such that a serious loss may occur to the Treasury.

That the developments in connection with the Exchange Bank show that the institution was at the time of the loan insolvent, and under grossly careless and fraudulent management, and that the result of the action of the Government was to bolster up the bank by restoring in some measure public confidence, during an interval in which the said careless and fraudulent management was continued, enormous sums of money disappeared, the positions of shareholders, depositors and creditors of the bank, was changed, the liability of shareholders and creditors was lost, and the whole situation changed for the worse.

That this House regrets that the Government should have advanced the said sum of \$300,000 to the Exchange Bank.

He said : Of course it is understood that I speak on the resolution when it comes up on Thursday.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. O, yes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I move that the said resolution be the first order of the day on Thursday.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—PORT MOODY WHARF AND FREIGHT SHED.

Mr. BLAKE moved for :

Copies of all reports, plans, specifications, contracts, estimates, correspondence and other papers in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway wharf and freight shed at Port Moody, B.C., and relating to its deterioration and repairs or reconstruction. And like papers as to the bridge on the railway near Spuzzum, B.C.

He said : I make this motion partly in consequence of a statement made in the appendix to the Minister's report which reads as follows :—

"The two front rows of wooden piles in the wharf at Port Moody should be replaced by piles of iron or some other material equally proof against the ravages of the sea-worm, which is so destructive to timber on the British Columbia coast. This wharf can be approached by vessels of great draft, and is sufficiently spacious for the conduct of a very considerable ocean traffic."

Now the wharf is only just built, and the Minister having just managed to construct it brings down a report that he must put in iron instead of wood. I have a communication in my hand on the subject of the wharf, which reads thus :

"I will take as one sample, the terminal wharf or pier of this place—Port Moody. This structure was built in 1882. It is composed of wooden piles, with the ordinary superstructure. I learn from a perfectly reliable source, that it cost considerably over \$69,000. It may be stated in round numbers at \$70,000. This structure was to be a wooden pile wharf. It is obvious that those who planned it could have made no enquiry whatever as to the suitability of that material ; for almost everybody upon the coast is well aware of the speedy and enormous ravages of the teredo upon timber submerged in any British Columbia harbor.

It is, however, a fact, also well and widely known upon the coast, that, if pile timber is cut at the proper season, and care is taken not to remove the bark before diving into place, the presence of that bark will in itself protect the piles from the attacks of the teredo, for a space varying from three to five years. No provision was made as to the time of year when the trees to form these piles were to be cut ; in point of fact, they were cut at the wrong season ; and before the piles were driven home to form the wharf, they were almost carefully stripped of their bark. The result is, that so long ago as in the summer of 1883, when a number of rail-laden ships were discharging at this wharf, the latter was already obviously in an unsafe condition. Now, a large portion of it has already subsided to a depth of several feet ; so that, as to nearly the whole of its extent, it would be rash in the extreme, to attempt making any use of it as a wharf. We are now in daily expectation of the first of a squadron of ships—ten in all, I understand—loaded with railway for the completion of the Canada Pacific. There is barely one berth at this large wharf at which any of such ships can possibly be unloaded, and it is very problematical whether it can be safely attempted there or not. In fact, the whole structure is in such a flimsy condition that when once the squared face-piles—those which form the seaward face of the wharf—begin to sway from their position, which may now occur at any hour, the whole work must collapse, become a ruin and be carried off to sea—a speedy way of getting rid of \$70,000. We are told, indeed, that these squared face-piles are to be replaced by iron piles. This should have been done last year, when the weakness of the present structure became obvious to every observer. Indeed, it should have been done in the first instance. But no iron piles have made their appearance yet ; and when, if ever, they do come, it may be too late ; and the whole of this \$70,000 job may have to be done over again.

"I may add that the freight shed, built upon and simultaneously with this wharf, is of the same flimsy character. Last year, 1884, it already had to be roofed anew, and a large amount of patching done to make it serve any good purpose at all. Both it and the station house are miserably inefficient for the purposes which they were intended to serve, even if but temporarily. The designs and plans for these structures were all prepared at the office of the chief engineer at Ottawa, and obviously by those who were woefully ignorant of the requirements of the works which they were planning, of the materials to be used in them, and of the circumstances under which they were to be constructed. They have been, however, constructed under peremptory orders from the same head office."

Then, with reference to the bridge near Spuzzum, my correspondent says :

"From the same quarter have emanated all the plans and specifications for the very numerous truss bridges and trestle works between the terminus and Savona. It has been found that the specified dimensions of the timbers to be used in these works have, in all cases, proved too ridiculously slight to answer the purposes intended. The engineers upon the line, and who know the country, saw this from the beginning ; and I am credibly informed that some of them remonstrated accordingly ; but the remonstrances went for nothing, and the peremptory orders had to be obeyed. The result is, that these bridges, &c., have necessarily been constantly undergoing patching ever since they were built. In some cases it is much more than patching. I have evidence of one

bridge near Spuzum, which has been entirely built not less than three times; I do not know but oftener still. It is far from being the only one which has thus had to be rebuilt. As all this patching and rebuilding are, in no way that can be well seen, owing to any fault of the contractor, the Dominion will, of course, and in every such case, be called upon to pay him an enormous bill for extras."

I would like the hon. Minister—as no doubt his attention has been directed to the subject of the Port Moody wharf, as would appear from the report of the Department—to explain the condition of things which has resulted in the reconstruction, to a large extent, of this wharf, almost immediately after its completion. There must have been a lamentable amount of ignorance or carelessness on the part of the engineer as to the proper material to be used in its construction, and as to the management of that material, to produce this result. In fact, it almost reminds one of the experience of the great inventor, Lord Dundonald, who, a number of years before the use of copper-bottoms was discovered, invented a plan of covering the bottoms of ships with tar, in order to prevent the ravages of worms. He applied to the Home Government, and they would not do anything, and then he applied to a builder at Limehouse, who said to him: My good sir, we are living by repairing ships as well as by building them, and if you ask me, I would rather cover the ships with honey to attract the worms than with tar to keep them off. So, the hon. gentleman's engineer covered the wharf with wrong material, and that was stripped of its bark, so that the worms could get at it, so that it might go to pieces the sooner.

Mr. POPE. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's correspondent though I do not know him, has covered his paper with molasses.

Mr. BLAKE. No; vinegar.

Mr. POPE. It is true there was a bridge, which was carried off two or three times while it was being built; but there is no other bridge which has been built three times. With respect to this wharf, I do not want to say that the hon. gentleman does not understand these matters, because it annoys him.

Mr. BLAKE. Not at all.

Mr. POPE. But I want to say this—if he were to examine the building of railroads, he would find that it is necessary, and a great deal better, to put in timber work, although he knew it would not last for a year. Now, that is exactly what has taken place with respect to this wharf. Everybody knew when it was put there that it would not last long; but we were obliged to land our rails and other freight, and consequently we built this wharf with material that would have to be replaced with iron piles. But this correspondent, who says they cannot land their freight now, labors under a very great mistake. If the hon. gentleman will let me know the name of his correspondent—

Mr. BLAKE. No; I will not.

Mr. POPE. He will not. Very well; then I say this correspondent has misinformed the hon. gentleman. He is perhaps some disappointed engineer who could not find employment.

Mr. BLAKE. He is not an engineer at all.

Mr. POPE. If he is not, I venture to say he is a disappointed man, or else is an extreme Grit, which is the same thing. He is disappointed, whichever way you take him. Now, the hon. gentleman need not press for papers, because we have not got any, but I will read the information which the chief engineer has given. The wharf is built with wooden piles; the three outer rows are evidently eaten through by the sea-worms. This was not unlooked for, but the wharf has served a good purpose in connection with the landing of rails and other material, so that no loss has occurred. It is now proposed to replace three front rows of wooden piles with iron piles, which will probably cost

Mr. BLAKE.

\$100,000, because it is a large wharf. In every other respect the wharf is in good order, as is also the freight shed. The plans, specifications and estimates are now about ready for receiving offers to furnish the iron. If the hon. gentleman will take this paper, he will find in it all the information; there is no correspondence to bring down.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not think the hon. gentleman would so neglect my motion. There must have been a plan for this wharf.

Mr. POPE. There may be a plan; I said there was no correspondence.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman asked me to take his paper as an answer to this motion. My motion is for plans, specifications, estimates, contracts, correspondence and other papers in reference to this, and the hon. gentleman says that a memorandum by the chief engineer is all that there is.

Mr. POPE. If the hon. gentleman would be good-natured enough to wait and send me this paper back, he will get all the papers.

Mr. BLAKE. Take the paper away; I don't want it.

Mr. POPE. I will see that you don't get it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has just said, reading from his paper—for after all there is something in it—it is intended to replace the three front rows with iron piles. This shows how rapidly this wharf is deteriorating. Only a few weeks ago the hon. gentleman's officers reported that it was necessary to replace two front rows with iron piles. Now it turns out that half as much more has to be added to the expense, and the expense is to be \$100,000, so that we get a very enormous addition since the report was made, as to the expense involved in making this wharf permanent.

Mr. POPE. I did not say what it would cost.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman forgets what he has just read. He mentioned \$100,000 as the cost.

Mr. POPE. O, but that is the paper; I have locked it up.

Mr. BLAKE. Then it is not even to be treated as read.

Mr. POPE. You said you did not want it.

Mr. BLAKE. O, no; I do not want the paper. The paper is locked up, but the fact remains that \$100,000 is to be spent now to give us three rows of piles, when a little while ago it was to be two rows of piles. Now the hon. gentleman says it was expected the wharf would not last. I suppose it was intended to prepare for replacing it with iron, and the reason the bark was stripped off was to hasten the work and save the Government the expense of pulling out the outside piles. The hon. gentleman says that my correspondent must be a disappointed man, and that he must be a Grit. I do not know that he is either. He has not told me what his politics are, but living at the spot, he has given me these facts which appear to me, as far as I can judge, to be pretty correct, because after all it does appear that the hon. gentleman has not denied the statements made as to those circumstances which made the duration of the wharf less than it would have been if proper care had been taken; and it does appear that three instead of two rows have to be made of iron at an expense much larger than the whole cost of the original wharf. The hon. gentleman said it was quite true the same bridge was rebuilt two or three times.

Mr. POPE. No, not rebuilt; it was partly carried off, while being built, by the ice.

Mr. BLAKE. And what remained was rebuilt, I suppose; a part taken away and what remained was rebuilt; it was the only one. Well we have hit on the only one. I would

like to know the particulars of the only one. It may be that the hon. gentleman was so unfortunate as to have the bridge carried away three times in the course of construction, and that it was an inevitable misfortune and not the consequence of any fault. If he knows so much about it, he must know it, not from his having been there himself, for he was not there; and if his engineer knows so much about it, it was not for his being there either, for he was not there. The hon. gentleman must know it through correspondence, and I yet believe there is something in the Department with reference to this unfortunate bridge as well as to the wharf.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOR OF REFUGE AT PORT ROWAN.

Mr. JACKSON moved for :

A copy of any memorials that may have been addressed to the Government with respect to the construction of a harbor of refuge at Port Rowan, in the Province of Ontario. Also for a copy of Richard Stevens' report made to the Department of Public Works on the same subject.

It appears that the Government are desirous, or if not, they are willing to assist in the saving of life by constructing a harbor of refuge on the north shore of Lake Erie, if they could ascertain the point at which a harbor could be constructed, where it would be most advantageous to the marine interest. It would seem that the Government are willing to do this, inasmuch as I understand that during the recess of Parliament an engineer was sent out by the Government to inspect or survey certain localities, namely, Port Burwell and Port Stanley, but I have not been told that the said engineer was instructed to visit Port Rowan, which, I believe, is, in the opinion of mariners who have not private interest to serve, the proper place for the harbor of refuge. It is all-important, before the Government undertake operations which is of such great importance to the mariners navigating Lake Erie, that they should acquire all the knowledge possible with reference to those different points, and, if possible, decide upon some point where the harbor would be most advantageous to the mariners interest, which is the only interest that should be consulted in constructing said harbor of refuge. I propose to show to you that Port Rowan is, and Port Burwell or Port Stanley is not, the proper place at which to build a harbor of refuge. To do that I will have to show the location of the different points. Lake Erie, from the mouth of the Detroit River on the west, to Buffalo on the east, is about 245 miles in length. A vessel entering the lake from Detroit River on the west, takes a south-easterly course until they pass Point Pelee, a distance of about thirty miles from the mouth of Detroit River; she then has to change her course to about east-north-east, which is a direct course from there to Buffalo or the Welland canal. In passing down the lake from Point Pelee, she leaves the Eau harbor, which is forty miles distant from the Point of Pelee, a few miles to the north, when going on a direct course, and as you leave the Eau Point the main shore turns into the north. So that vessels on a direct course down the lake are, when opposite Port Stanley, fully twenty miles from the mainland. Port Burwell is still twenty miles to the east, and when opposite Port Burwell the vessel is some eighteen or twenty miles from the land. The shore, after you leave Port Burwell to the end of Long Point, takes a different direction, running east by south, or nearly that, so that when vessels arrive opposite Long Point on their direct course down the lake, which is about forty miles from Port Burwell, they barely escape the end of the point. That is the position of the three different places. Port Rowan is on the west side of Long Point, about midway between Long Point and Port Burwell. Prior to 1857, nature had provided this place with a magnificent harbor of refuge, which was utilised to a very large extent for a great number of years. I have a statement here signed by twelve of the oldest inhabitants living in that

section of the country, who state that they had lived there for over 40 years, wherein they state that this place afforded an excellent harbor of refuge, and that in severest storms a number of vessels came in there, as many as twenty-eight or thirty vessels lying at anchor at one time inside the cut. This natural harbor was formed by an opening from Lake Erie into Port Rowan Bay, which formed a basin of sufficiently large dimensions to allow all class of vessels navigating this lake to enter therein. In 1843 the Government placed there a floating lighthouse, which was a great benefit to the mariners, because, before that, they could only approach in daylight, while, after the light-ship was placed there, they could enter night and day. This harbor was kept up until 1857, at which time, on account of the natural harbor becoming filled up, it had to be abandoned. To show you the importance of this harbor, I may quote the statistics for ten years after the natural harbor was closed, which showed that during that time twenty-seven lives were lost in that vicinity and an amount of property of something like \$225,000, or more than double that at any other point on the whole coast of the lake. Where much is required, I believe much is given. At this place very much is required. There was, at the time of the closing of this cut, a small channel opened through the beach into Port Rowan Bay, about one and a-half miles further west, which still remains open, but it is not large enough to allow vessels to enter. But, just west of this, a marsh commences, which covers an area of several square miles, and a large stream of water flows through it which formerly entered Lake Erie direct, but now enters Port Rowan Bay through a channel formed there by the lumbermen some years ago, for the purpose of taking lumber and timber into the bay. I claim that this stream could be utilised in connection with the marsh surrounding it, to make one of the most magnificent harbors that a person could imagine, and just in the place where it is needed. In connection with this, I will show you how Port Burwell is located. It is twenty miles further west. The harbor is constructed at the mouth of a shallow, rapid stream, flowing from the interior through two high hills, and during the freshets at some periods of the year, a large amount of wash is brought down from the hills and the sediment is deposited in the basin or harbor. When this harbor was first constructed at Port Burwell, they placed the piers 175 feet apart. And on account of the amount of detrital matter or sediment which comes down with the current, and is deposited by the stream, they found it impossible to keep the harbor open, and in later years they contracted the width of the piers to 86 feet, which is now the width. At the present time, with that contracted width, it is very difficult to keep the harbor open, on account of the wash from the hills coming down and deposited in this stream. I will show you what Mr. Page, the chief engineer of this Department, says, in regard to this matter. He says:

"The entrance to Port Burwell harbor was originally formed of two lines of piers, placed 175 feet apart, each having a direction nearly due south. Great difficulty having been experienced in maintaining a sufficient depth of water between the piers, it was some years ago decided to contract the width of the entrance to 86 feet, and thus, by confining the current, endeavor to guard against deposit taking place in the channel. To accomplish this a close line of piling was driven from the docking in front of the warehouses for a distance of 700 feet outwards, beyond which 205 feet of cribwork was sunk, terminating about 140 feet within the head of the west pier. The eastern portion has been cut off altogether by a cross range of piles, and in it there was found 4 to 5 feet of water. This appears to have had, in a great measure, the desired effect, as less obstruction from deposit is experienced than heretofore. A bar is, however, formed immediately outside of the piers, which has to be dredged more or less every year, but it is said that some seasons, during heavy spring freshets, it is swept out *en masse* into the lake. There is also an outer bar, on which was found from 8 to 9 feet of water at a point about 225 feet south of the end of the west pier. This seems to be part of a continuous bridge that runs in the direction parallel to the shore for a considerable distance to the eastward and westward of this place. The position of the harbor is such that vessels failing to weather Long Point during south-westerly gales would gladly avail themselves of its shelter,

if it could be safely entered. But, from the limited width between the piers, and the bars which accumulate outside, this is attended with such risk as to be rarely attempted, except in cases of absolute necessity, as vessels endeavoring to make the harbor are liable to get stranded on the bar, or by missing the piers, go ashore alongside of them. A great improvement would doubtless be effected by extending the piers beyond the outer bar, but a work of this magnitude, it is to be feared, would exceed the means of the company, and even if carried out, the place, in heavy weather, would still be very difficult of access. From what has been said it will also be evident that the inside accommodation is confined to a width throughout of very little, if any, more than that between the piers; and were this increased by the formation of an inner basin it is quite probable that the space excavated, as well as the existing channel, would be more or less silted up by the detritus brought down by the stream."

Now, Sir, you see from Mr. Page's report that the construction of a harbor at this place is not at all practicable. To construct a harbor for the convenience of vessels navigating the lakes you must have a width between the piers of at least 300 feet, and you require a basin occupying an area of not less than fifteen acres, in order to accommodate the shipping interest. So, by his report, you see that Port Burwell is not the place to build a harbor, and if it was a place to build a harbor, the sediment coming down would prevent its being of any use. The same may be said of Port Stanley, which is twenty miles further west, and, like Port Burwell, is constructed at the mouth of a shallow, rapid stream. During the dry time in the summer this stream is very feeble, the bottoms are nearly dry, but in the spring and during the freshets there is a very large amount of water coming from the interior which drains a very large surface of territory, and brings down a very large sediment of earth. When this harbor was formed the stream came down very close to the lake and formed a short curve. In order to form this harbor and to make a basin, the idea struck him to take this ox bow off, which was done between 1852 and 1854, and a basin was formed there of about five acres. The harbor at Port Stanley is of about the same width as at Port Burwell—I think about 80 feet wide, and Mr. Page's report says, speaking of Port Stanley harbor :

"The harbor is situated at the mouth of Kettle Creek, 43 miles north-east half-east from Rondeau Point, and 57½ miles west-three-quarters-north from the lighthouse at Long Point. This creek is of considerable width, but although draining a large extent of country to the northward, is for the greater part of the year an ordinary feeble stream. For several miles before entering the lake it has a tortuous course through a deep clay valley, and is liable to heavy spring freshets, which bring down a large amount of the detritus and frequently causes considerable damage near the outlet."

Now, to show the amount of sediment and detritus that flows down this stream, Mr. Page's report states that between 1852 and 1856 :

"There had been removed by excavation and dredging 133,485 cubic yards. In 1857 a plan was prepared, showing the depth of water throughout the harbor. On comparing this with the soundings of 1868 it appears that the area of shoal water in the basin has considerably increased, although between the years 1859 and 1863 there were 107,000 cubic yards of material removed by dredging. From this, some idea may be formed of the large quantity of deposit which annually takes place in the harbor."

And he says again :

"It is said there is always a bar at the entrance, but that its position changes more or less every season. This, together with the narrow space between the piers, renders it extremely difficult to enter the harbor during stormy weather. Vessels attempting to make it at such times have frequently gone ashore to the eastward or the westward of the entrance. Still, when once fairly inside, they are safe, as the basin is fully protected by the high banks of the cliffs."

Now, these are the statements made by the chief engineer in regard to these two places, and I claim that neither of them are sufficient for a harbor of the requisite dimensions for the marine interests now navigating those lakes. I affirm that the vicinity of Port Rowan is the only place that affords large facilities for constructing a harbor of proper dimensions. There you have the stream, and by changing the current to its former course and compelling it to enter into the lake as it did formerly, you have a first-class stream to support the harbor, while you have no sediment from the interior, because this

Mr. JACKSON.

stream flows down through the marsh for a number of miles, whereas the water becomes pure before reaching the lake. Now, in Mr. Page's report in 1870, in regard to Port Rowan, he said that on account of the sand and bars changing so materially it was not practicable to construct a harbor at that point. Well, Sir, I have a statement here, signed by one of the oldest captains of that section, the present captain of the life-saving service there, wherein he states :

"That beach opposite Port Royal has not changed any since Mr. Munro made the survey. I have been acquainted with the beach for forty years, and it has not changed any worth mentioning in that time. I was with Mr. Munro all the time, and furnished the boat to do all the surveying with, so I am well acquainted with the beach all along."
" (Signed) WM. WOODWARD."

Now, that shows that Mr. Page's anticipations have not been realised, for the beach in that vicinity has remained as it was for a number of years. Again, Sir, the obstacles that appeared to be insurmountable fifteen years ago, when this survey was made, are now, on account of the advancement in science and engineering skill, comparatively of easy removal. I claim that even if there was some change in the sands and bar, the advancement of engineering skill could overcome that difficulty. These men state here that there has been no material change for the last twenty years or more. Now, I find that, in 1880, petitions were forwarded to this Government from all the municipalities bordering on the lake in the county of Norfolk, signed by the reeves of each municipality, also a petition from Simcoe, signed by the mayor, and also a petition from the inhabitants of the county of Norfolk, signed by 657 persons, all praying the Government to construct a harbor at the mouth of Big Creek, the point I have spoken of. Now, Sir, although these petitions are worthy of due consideration by the Government, I claim that they are of minor importance to the other petitions that were handed into the Government that same year. I find that, in the year 1880, there were petitions sent to the Government from the city of Hamilton, the city of St. Catharines, Bay City, Port Huron in Michigan, the town of Dunnville and Port Dover, containing the signatures of 623 mariners and owners of vessels navigating the lakes, praying that the Government would construct a harbor of refuge at the above named place. I say these men know where a harbor should be constructed to their advantage, and I claim it is the marine interest that should be consulted in constructing said harbor, and that alone. Now, here are 623 owners and mariners who have signed this petition which was forwarded to this Government in 1880, representing a capital of perhaps one million of dollars or more, all asking that a harbor should be constructed at this particular place, which shows conclusively to my mind that this is the proper place to construct said harbor. About that time I understand an engineer was sent out—Mr. Stephens, I think was his name; I have had no way of knowing what his report was, although I have heard it was favorable to building the harbor at this place. Now, Sir, I submit that in the opinion of mariners who have no private interests to serve, Port Rowan or its vicinity is the proper place to construct a harbor of the requisite dimensions such as the service requires, and that it can be built and maintained at that place at a much less cost than either at Port Burwell or Port Stanley, for the reason that there is no sediment coming down, no wash from the interior, and because the material that would have to be excavated is of so much softer a nature. As I said before, a harbor competent to maintain the shipping that navigates Lake Erie should contain an area of not less than fifteen acres, and at this particular point the width of the pier should be at least 300 feet. At this particular place you have plenty of room, and nature has provided there one of the nicest places for a harbor that could be desired. Another reason why a harbor should be constructed at this place is, because the captains coming down the lake often find themselves struck by gales that spring up on that lake

very quickly in the fall of the year. On some occasions, and under some circumstances, captains would be too far down the lake when a gale struck them to be able to make either Port Stanley or Port Burwell, if they saw fit to do so, and in other cases captains coming down the lake would rather take the chance of weathering Long Point than undertake to run twenty miles out of their course and attempt to make the harbor of either Port Stanley or Port Burwell. I therefore claim that Port Rowan or its vicinity is the only place where a harbor can be constructed which will be advantageous to the marine interest, and I claim that is the interest that should be consulted before any steps are taken in that respect, and that from a harbor constructed at either Port Burwell or Port Stanley mariners would receive no benefit. I hope the hon. Minister will give this matter his best consideration.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a memorial in the Department from shipowners, mariners, etc., of Buffalo, praying for the construction of a harbour at or near Long Point. We have also a report from Mr. Richard Stephens, in 1879. I think these are all the papers we have, and they will be brought down.

Motion agreed to.

IMMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION COMMITTEE.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I beg to move, with the consent of the House, that Messrs. Baker (Victoria), and Jackson, be added to the Standing Committee on Colonization and Immigration.

Motion agreed to.

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

After Recess.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—EASTERN SECTION.

Mr. EDGAR moved for :

Copies of the estimates in detail furnished to the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and by the Government engineers, upon which the estimated cost of \$23,000 per mile was based for the portion of the eastern section from the 100th mile to the 120th mile west of Callander, giving quantities, classification and prices; also, for a statement of the actual quantities, description and classification of the work from the 100th mile to the 120th mile west of Callander, on 12th August, 1884, when the subsidy and loan were paid by the Government as for a completed line.

He said: It will be observed that the resolution is limited to the section of twenty miles, from the one hundredth mile to the one hundred and twentieth mile west of Callander. The reason of that is, that this portion of the line is the first which was paid for under the Act of last Session, and also, it was estimated at \$23,000 per mile, which was a different and smaller estimate than that for any other portion of the eastern section. So that I desire, in drawing attention to this particular portion of the eastern section, to keep this portion separate from the rest. The House will recollect that last Session an Act was passed which related to the mode of payment of the subsidy of \$15,385 a mile, which had been apportioned to the eastern section as a cash payment, and also related to the distribution, advance and payment, over that same eastern section, of the proportion of the loan of \$22,500,000, which was by that Act made payable to this section. The way in which the Act provided that the subsidy should be paid and that portion of the loan should be paid, was the same. Both payments were governed by the second section of that Act. That section provided as follows:—"That the money subsidy hereafter payable to the company may be paid as the work on either section of the railway proceeds, in the proportion which the value of the work done on such

section, and for which payment is demanded, bears to the value of the whole work now remaining to be done under the contract upon such section." It cannot seriously be argued that it makes no difference what was the estimate of this particular portion, or what the payments on this particular portion were, so long as the entire sum made payable in respect of the eastern section should not be exceeded in the whole. I do not think that could possibly be fairly contended for, because while it is true that the proportion of money payable on this section must bear the same proportion as to the value of the work remaining to be done as the monies payable on the other section, and it is true that this section is a very cheap one, and there are other very dear sections, some as high as \$80,000 per mile, still it is perfectly clear that it is a very important and a material question for the House to ascertain whether the estimate for this section was not less than the actual value. If the estimates and payments on this particular portion of the work, or on any other particular portion, are less than the actual value, I admit that so long as the gross amount is not exceeded it made little or no difference. But if it should appear, as I think it will appear, that the estimate for the section is greater than the actual value, and that the payments made by the Government to the railway company are really largely in excess of the total value of the work done on this section, then it is most material that the House should know it, and by granting this return the House will be able to ascertain it. I do not ask in the return for statements of the payments made on this twenty mile section, because we have returns now before the House which show those payments. I do not ask for the profiles of this section to be laid before the House, because we have had them brought down, and I have had an opportunity of examining them very carefully, with such assistance as I could get, and I think, therefore, that the only quantities which it is necessary to ascertain are those I ask for in the resolution. We have seen the payments, and we have seen the profiles. Now, though I am only a lawyer, and not an engineer, I think I am able to form a very fair idea of the cost of this portion, by examining the profile, and I was assisted in investigating into it by a very able engineer. On these twenty miles I found only one mile of heavy rock work. I found four miles in which there was some light rock work, and fifteen miles in which there was no rock and no difficulty of any kind. It was merely levelling, or what engineers and contractors call "scraper work." The other day, in answer to a question, the Acting Minister of Railways gave me some information which will help us very materially to arrive at what was the actual cost, and what should have been the proper estimated value of these twenty miles. He informed me that the fixed sum which appeared in the progress estimates which are before me, of \$5,100 a mile, included the rails, the sleepers, the track-laying, the engineering, buildings, water service and ballasting. The estimate seems to be fair and I do not think anybody can find fault with it. Then, in those progress estimates which are before me, I find another fixed item, which enables us to get further at the value of the twenty miles—that is the item of bridging, which is put at \$1,500, whereas, as a matter of fact, on this particular portion the bridging is very light, and this estimate is a largely excessive one. We have, therefore, for these items, a total of \$6,600 per mile. Now, the only items, except excavations, which can be included in the work to complete that road, are clearing, close-cutting and grubbing, and it is perfectly easy to estimate what those are. In order that there may be no mistake as to the prices of that work and the excavation, I turned up a contract which had been entered into by the Government with Messrs. Parcell & Co., in 1879, for the construction of over 100 miles between English River and Eagle River, on the Port Arthur and Winnipeg section. There were two prices in that contract—one lower and the other higher. The latter was for the construction of a work at an

early period, so I take the schedule prices of quantities per acre in that contract, and I find, going into the minutest details, that it came to \$176 per mile for clearing, close-cutting and grubbing. That makes, therefore, except for excavation, the sum of \$6,776 per mile. Now, fortunately, in these profiles which I had the privilege of examining in the House, the actual quantities for a very great part of these twenty miles were given, and we can ascertain what the quantities were from that source. By calculating all these quantities, as if all the excavations in the cuts were wasted, and not used; and allowing in the same way for all the filling, there would be only in this light work, at the most, an excavation of 12,000 yards per mile. An engineer who looked at the matter very carefully and made the calculations, expressed his willingness to eat any earth which there was over that quantity, and it is quite apparent that it is a low estimate. Now there was only one mile in which there was any rock, and four with a trifling quantity of rock, and from the profiles there could not be over 30,000 yards altogether in that section. Take that figure and take in addition 12,000 yards per mile of earth, and we have an earth excavation of 240,000 yards, at the price in Messrs. Purcell & Co.'s contract, of 26 cents per yard, which is a good price, and we have \$62,400. Add the 30,000 yards of rock which we take also at Purcell & Co.'s highest contract rate, \$1.55 per yard, and we have \$46,500, making, for the excavation, \$108,900 on the twenty miles, or at the rate of \$5,445 a mile; and any one who examines the profiles and sees the quantities upon it will at once understand that that is a full estimate. Add that to the other fixed charges which we ascertained the other day from the Minister of Railways, and we have \$12,221 per mile as the entire cost without equipment. The Minister, perhaps, could tell me if he included the equipment or not. If he did, the estimates on that section will only be \$1,300 per mile more at any rate, which makes \$13,521 per mile for that section. Now that result is obtained from the examination of such information as has been laid before the House up to this time, as to that particular section. But we have some other evidence as to the cost of a line such as this is, from the engineers of the Canadian Pacific Railway themselves. Mr. S. B. Reed, engineer for the Canadian Pacific Railway, reported, only on the 9th of September last, to Mr. Van Horne, after a minute personal inspection of a large section of the country in British Columbia, on 113 miles there, in which he elaborately described the nature of the country, and in which he showed there is a great deal of rock, that there is very heavy work among the timber of the Pacific coast, which necessitates the expenditure of some thousand of dollars a mile for clearing and grubbing; and yet with all that, making a description of the country which is infinitely heavier work than this before us, he estimates that it can all be done, including station buildings and water service, for \$16,600 per mile. Therefore, I think anybody who looks at this section from the information which is before the House, must come to the conclusion that its cost, including equipment, could not be more than \$15,000 per mile. If it has cost more, the returns asked for in this motion will show it; and if it has not cost more, what has been the result? The result has been, that the moment the Act of last Session was passed—and the House will remember that the Royal assent was given to that Act in a great hurry on the 5th of March—and ever since then, monthly and semi-monthly, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has been drawing cash from the Government on account of subsidy and on account of loan. On the 12th of August last they had drawn, less 10 per cent., which is kept back until the whole section is finished, \$23,000 a mile in cash on this section as completed road. As I believe it did not cost them to build, even if they had paid their contractors, more than from \$13,000 to \$15,000 a mile, the country has been

Mr. EDGAR.

paying the company from \$8,000 to \$10,000 a mile more than it cost to build, besides giving them the road thus built and 9,000 acres a mile, in addition to other good things in the shape of guarantees of their stock and portions of the road handed over to them. So far, therefore, I think a very strong case has been made out for asking the Government to give this additional information.

M. POPE. There is not the slightest objection to bringing down all the information we have upon this in regard to these twenty miles; but I can say to the hon. gentleman that the rate of \$23,000 a mile was first established during last Session by a comparison of the profiles not of these twenty miles alone, but of 109 miles on the line from Sudbury Junction to twenty-seven miles east of Dog Lake. The twenty miles were included in the 109 miles. Of course, I cannot speak positively about these twenty miles, for I have not now the information, and I think it would have been just as well if the hon. gentleman had waited until he got the information, if it is information he wants, before discussing this matter. However, all the papers touching these twenty miles will be brought down, but I doubt if we can bring any down with respect to the twenty miles alone.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EDGAR. The motion I now desire to propose will meet entirely the objection of the hon. Minister of Railways, because it covers the eighty miles which, together with the twenty miles, make the 100 miles which the hon. gentleman says were taken into consideration when this estimate of \$23,000 a mile was made for the twenty miles. I am afraid my hon. friend is a little astray in his figures, for if he looks at the matter he will find that the whole of the rest of this 100 miles is estimated at \$27,000 a mile; so that it is impossible that it can be taken into consideration to estimate \$23,000 a mile for the twenty miles. I took the twenty miles up first, because the estimate for them was the lowest estimate. Now, the resolution which I propose, dealing with this further portion, is this:

Copies of the estimates in detail furnished to the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Government engineers, upon which the estimated cost of \$27,000 per mile was based for the portion of the eastern section from the 120th mile to the 200th mile west of Callander, giving quantities, classification and prices for each division of twenty miles; also, for a statement of the actual quantities, description and classification of the work, from the 120th mile to the 200th mile west of Callander, on the 30th November, 1884, when the subsidy and loan were paid as for a line completed, except station buildings and water service, for which \$6,000 in all was kept back.

Now, this will entirely meet the hon. gentleman's difficulty about the twenty miles, and I am glad he will be so thoroughly satisfied, because there is a great deal about these eighty miles which we would like to know. The profile of that portion of the road was also in my hands, and was very carefully examined by an expert. We found from it that more than half of that portion was absolutely without rock at all, and at least half of that is light scraper work, such as I have been describing most of the twenty miles to be; and it is to be observed that \$3,000 a mile more was estimated for that and paid for that. If we assume that the figures which I gave with reference to the twenty miles are correct—and they will be found to be absolutely correct by any one who examines them—the additional \$3,000 per mile which has been paid for these eighty miles would cover the cost of 3,000 extra yards of rock on the half where there is any rock, and would pay \$2 a yard for it—a great deal more rock, and a great deal bigger price than they need allow. That would still leave on this section of eighty miles an overpayment of about \$10,000 a mile. I am assuming that all that had to be filled was filled, not with temporary trestle work or trestle work of a cheap character, but honestly filled, as the profile says it ought to be filled. It is well known that about a week ago an unfortunate event occurred on this very portion of the line, this eighty

miles, which was paid for in cash by the Government as a completed line on the 30th November, 1884, according to the papers we have before us. Between 160 and 170 miles west of Callander there was an unfortunate accident, when a construction train broke down the trestle work and six cars fell through. I do not know whether that was on any of the trestle work called temporary. Certainly, judging from the result, it was exceedingly temporary; it did not last till any passenger traffic went on the road at all, but it lasted until the road was paid for at the rate of \$27,000 a mile, or \$10,000 a mile more than it cost. This subject is so important that we may as well discuss it thoroughly. All over the country it has been stated that the construction of this portion to which I refer has been exceedingly bad; that it was built in a wretched way; that it was rushed through, in many respects, in an unfinished manner. I think we should have the papers I have called for, in order to ascertain the value of these statements. And remember, I have based my calculations on a good road. I do not want to give currency to mere rumors about loose construction—

Mr. POPE. Hear, hear.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." I hope he will agree with me in the opinion that the proper way to proceed in this matter is, if there are people who say they have personal knowledge of the defects in that construction, these people should be asked to make their statements over their own signature. I have taken the liberty of doing that, and I have here a few documents which show these statements are not mere rumors. With the permission of the House I will read a few of these documents, which refer to the manner in which this part of the road has been constructed. I have in my hand now the statutory declaration of Hensley Reed Holinden, now of the city of Ottawa, county of Carleton, clerk, who solemnly declares:

"That I have been employed upon the construction of the eastern division of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the 6th day of September, 1884, to the 21st day of January, 1885; that I have travelled upon the train from Sudbury to Nemogossenda, a distance of about 163 miles west of Sudbury, and I have walked over nearly all the portions of the road extending from about eighty miles beyond Sudbury to Nemogossenda, a distance of upwards of eighty miles, while I was in the employment of the said railway company, as aforesaid; that there is a large quantity of trestle work used in the construction of the line all the way from Sudbury to Nemogossenda, a considerable portion of which will require to be filled in before the railway can be said to be permanently completed; that such trestle work is commonly used instead of filling, and a culvert wherever the road bed is built across streams or creeks. That some of the trestles so employed are very low, and one about ten or eleven miles above Negoyms not being more than 5 or 6 feet high and upwards of 30 feet long. That another well known trestle between Sudbury and Biscotching is constructed in the form of a letter "S," that is with reversed curves, and is commonly regarded by those using the road as dangerous and unsafe; that the amount of trestle work upon the whole of that part of the line above mentioned is very considerable, and the whole work has been pushed forward with great haste and with little regard to permanence or durability; that the common understanding among those engaged in the construction of the road is that the trestle work upon the line is only intended as a temporary work, and that it is intended to replace it by earth filling or other permanent work. And I make this solemn declaration, conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of the Act passed in the 37th year of Her Majesty's reign, entitled, 'An Act for the Suppression of Voluntary and Extra-Judicial Oaths.'"

This is a solemn declaration, made 13th February, 1885. It will be perhaps contended that the trestles above described were all for temporary works, only, unfortunately, this line has been paid for as a completed work. I have another document, the declaration of Alfred Norris, now of the city of Ottawa, laborer, who solemnly declares:

"That I was employed in the construction of part of the eastern division of the Canadian Pacific Railway from the 23rd day of November, 1884, to 18th January, 1885; that I started to work two miles east of Negoyms, and worked at the line both east and west of Negoyms, and also on each side of Nemogossenda; that I was engaged in working upon the grading of the line and also in getting the foundation ready for the trestle work; that the work of grading is very badly done in lots of places where the men could not get earth on account of water. The grade filled in with mud and ice. That at one place, two miles beyond

Nemogossenda, they had to make a cutting 3 feet 3 inches in depth, and although we were working in water up to our knees we could only get down 2 feet 3 inches, and could not get any lower on account of the water. The water filled this in at night after we had finished our work, and a few days after the ties and rails were laid over this part of the line on top of the ice. That in another place I was sent to prepare the foundation for some trestle work near Nemogossenda, and the foot of the trestles was laid upon a tie cut in two, which rested on ice and water, and a few stones thrown in on the surface of a soil of black muck or bog, in such a way that the trestle must settle down as soon as the ice thaws; that the work of repairing the foundation, for the trestle above described, was done under the direction of the company's foreman; that the grade for the greater part of the distance over which I worked is made up of black muck and moss, pieces of ice and stumps, frozen moss and some sand and clay; that the surface soil is generally composed of black muck, covered with moss, which was taken from the side and thrown on to the grade, but we were not able to get very far down, so as to get more solid material, on account of the water which flowed in and filled the hole while we were digging; that I have been employed upon railways for more than ten years in England and have seen a good deal of railway construction and repair; that in my opinion the portion of the road-bed of the Canadian Pacific Railway above described will have to be all rebuilt before it will be possible to run trains on it, and the present grade and road-bed will melt and be washed away when the ice and soil thaw in the spring."

There is another short affidavit, the declaration of John Reeves, of the city of Ottawa, who declares as follows:—

"That I was employed in the construction of part of the eastern division of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from the 23rd day of November, 1884, to the 18th day of January, 1885; that I was employed in the same gang with Alfred Norris, and worked with him during the said period. That I have heard his declaration, dated this 21st day of February, 1885, read, and that I believe that the said declaration is true in every respect. That I have worked upon the construction of the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa & Occidental Railway, between Ottawa and Montreal; that, in my opinion, a great part of the grade and the road-bed over which I have worked on the Canadian Pacific Railway will melt or wash away in the spring thaw as the foundation, for long distances together, is only black muck and swamp, and the grade is largely composed of frozen moss, frozen muck, and ice, some sand, and a little clay."

Now, these declarations are made by people who were on the premises and who were engaged in the work, and who have, as I am informed and believe, no interest one way or the other, for or against the company or the contractors, and, if the hon. gentlemen wants to satisfy the House and the country that they are not correct, the sooner they bring down the answer to this motion the better. The first thing I ask for is the estimates of the company themselves, upon which the \$27,000 a mile was based; then the estimates of the Government engineers, because they may not have been the same; they may or may not have agreed with the estimates of the company upon which that is based; and then I ask for that which is much more important than either, what has been obtained, or can be obtained, or ought to have been obtained long ago, when the Government was paying to the extent of \$27,000 a mile, I want to know what were the actual honest quantities in the road and what was the cost at a fair estimate. If the Government brings down the return, the whole question will be set at rest one way or the other.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman assumes that we are paying for a completed road all the time. Now, our payments are made for the work done per yard, whether the road is completed or not, but we do not base our payments on the statements of men who come down from that district and tell all kinds of stories, but upon the statements of the engineers of the Department. Let me tell my hon. friend that one of these engineers, and the engineer who made these estimates, is Mr. Ridout, whom he must be acquainted with, and it is upon his returns that every single dollar of this is paid. In no instance on any part of the road has a single dollar been paid, except upon the estimates of the engineers reported to us. It is true that Mr. Ridout has not gone all over the road, but he has gone all over this part of it, and we have paid exactly as we should have paid for every yard of earth or rock that has been moved upon this section. If we are to take the stories of everyone who comes down from there, if the hon. gentleman is going

to proceed to debate these questions upon the stories or affidavits of everyone who considers himself injured for this, that and the other, if we are to have that kind of debate before the hon. gentleman gets the information, we shall have plenty to do, and may keep on the debate all through the Session. We prefer to debate this upon the estimates of the engineers when they are brought down, upon the estimates of their engineers and ours, because they had to come to an understanding, and upon these there can be no mistake. I know something about this road. I travelled over a considerable part of the road the hon. gentleman spoke about, and it is a road fit to run sixty miles an hour upon. I know it can be run upon easily at the rate of sixty miles an hour, and I did not ask for letters from disappointed workmen, I did not go down picking up this information and getting them to make declarations. He makes a formal matter of bringing these statements, as if we were going to take these stories and affidavits in the place of the reports of our engineers and in the stead of what I have seen in travelling over the road. I do not say there is not some trestle work. There is not a great deal. I do not say it will not be filled some time or other; of course it will. All these things will go in time, but there are trestles, not very high, as he says, that in eight or ten years undoubtedly will have to be put in, as on the Thunder Bay branch, built by my hon. friend Mr. Mackenzie, we have already had to put in. But this is permanent trestle work. I have heard nothing about any accident, but the papers will be brought down, as far as they can be.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all Estimates, Reports and evidence, not already laid before the House, upon which the Government engineers made their progress estimates numbers 28 and 29, Eastern Section, Western Division Canadian Pacific Railway.

He said: I have here copies of the progress estimates which were brought down to the House, and I find that, on the 30th September, by progress estimate No. 28, relating to the western division of the eastern section, that means the portion from Nepigon this way, not counting from Callander—the estimate brought down, and signed by some gentlemen—Mr. Caddy, I think, signs this one, and also Mr. Chamberlain, and Mr. Lynch, and Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, the chief engineer himself—it is a very formal document, and I must attach some importance to this—the total amount of work done and materials delivered to that date was so much money, showing a balance to be paid, over and above what was paid before, of \$751,858. Now that is a very elaborately signed document, and purports to be, I suppose, a true statement of what it says, the total value of the work done and material delivered up to the 30th September, 1884, on the western portion of the eastern section. Now, remember, Sir, this is in detail—there is no lumping here—and it shows how much was on the thirty-four miles from Nepigon to Gravel Bay, how much on the ninety-five miles from Gravel Bay east, and how much on the 125 five mile section and on the twenty-seven mile section, and it shows the actual percentage of grading—96 per cent. of grading done at one place, 59 per cent. in another, so many sleepers, so much percentage of grading and bridging, so much for engineering on another section, etc.—all very carefully and elaborately done, showing the total amount done up to that date, and calling for the payment of \$751,858; that was very promptly attended to by the Governor in Council and paid on the 6th of October, and strange to say, the next estimate, No. 29, signed by the same gentlemen, Mr. Caddy, Mr. Chamberlain, Mr. Lynch and Mr. Schreiber, covering absolutely the same section—remember one was the 30th of September, giving the total amount done to that date, and the other the 1st of October, 1884—shows the strange result that there was \$1,078,171 worth of work

Mr. POPE.

done upon that section between the 30th of September and the 1st of October, this year. Now, Sir, I think that is what requires explanation, and I have no doubt whatever the hon. gentleman can explain it off hand. I can show from these papers how that million was made up exactly. It was made up by changing the 59 per cent. bridging to 68 per cent. on the thirty-four miles; by changing the 41 per cent. bridging, which was all that was done on the 30th September, to 69 per cent. on the ninety-five miles, as being done on the 1st of October, and changing the grading from 91 per cent. to 97 on the ninety-five miles; and then there were 12,400 additional ties, and the raising the percentage of grading and bridging, etc., on other parts. It was not a lump estimate, but a detail elaborately given. But the most striking and original item put in there that occurred on this line between the 30th September and 1st October, was \$100,000 for "tote roads," or service roads, added into that estimate. I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman will explain all that. This million dollars was added in and it was paid; it was not merely put in there for amusement, but actually paid, because the Order in Council was passed on the 9th October, and it was paid on the 10th, although on the 6th October \$750,000 had been paid on this very same piece of work. It was not because they had not got the money, because on the 1st September they had received \$1,220,000 on the same section. I have no doubt the hon. gentleman can explain it, but it does seem to me that when the engineers certified that the total work of one day is a million less than that certified to the next day, it is worth while that the House looked into it.

Mr. POPE. There is no trouble in bringing that down.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CHANGE IN ROLLING STOCK ON WEST DIVISION.

Mr. EDGAR moved for:

Copies of all applications, statements, estimates or letters sent from the Canadian Pacific Railway to the Government or any of its officials, in relation to the change made by the Government between 7th April, 1884, and 16th May 1884, in the dealing with rolling stock in progress estimates and payments in the eastern section, western division, and copies of all correspondence and papers upon the same subject.

He said: My reason for moving this return is this: In regard to the estimate No. 13, which is dated 7th April, 1884, Sir Charles Tupper, who was then Minister of Railways, held back on this western division of the eastern section \$450,700 for rolling stock. Now it is a curious circumstance that on the very next estimate of this western division, No. 15, (No. 14 relates to the other end), which is dated 1st of May last year, it appears that although not one mile of that portion of the road is finished, the whole \$450,000 that had been held back by Sir Charles Tupper for rolling stock was allowed for and paid out to the railway company by the hon. gentleman who is now Acting Minister of Railways, on the first certificate that he signed after Sir Charles Tupper left, and there is no evidence that any rolling stock was delivered. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should not say it was allowed for rolling stock; it was not really allowed for rolling stock, but it was put into the grading and paid for after that in the grading. The rough estimate for grading was increased by \$450,700 at one fell swoop by the present Acting Minister of Railways. Now the estimates either allowed for rolling stock or they did not; if they did—and Sir Charles Tupper, in this House, last year, as reported in the *Hansard*, stated that the estimate for finishing the road did allow for it—then this sum of \$450,700, and also another sum on the other end of this section, in the estimate No. 12, of \$68,000, altogether \$518,700, were paid over before one mile of the road was completed for rolling stock, by the Acting Minister. Now, if these estimates did not include the rolling

stock—I do not know, but my hon. friend will say, whether they did or did not—then the estimates I made before, on my former motions, are correct as to the cost of the twenty miles and of the eighty miles. But, as a matter of fact, it appears that while Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, rolling stock was included, and afterwards it was certainly paid for by grading—it was called grading, and was paid for as such. All the percentage calculations of grading are made on this sum of \$518,000, which Sir Charles Tupper said he was reserving for rolling stock, but which the Acting Minister of Railways puts into grading, and has been paid the company ever since on grading. I trust that the return called for and the explanation given by the Acting Minister, will enable the House to understand whether rolling stock was in it or not; and if it was in it, where the rolling stock is which was paid for before a mile of the railway was completed.

Mr. POPE. The papers will be brought down. I can say to the hon. gentleman, that there is no rolling stock paid for which was not put on the road; and when it was put on the road, it was paid for according to the understanding and agreement.

Mr. BLAKE. My hon. friend's difficulty is, that what had, before this last estimate, been reserved to pay for rolling stock, which is certainly included in the gross estimates made, was afterwards applied to grading, paid for as grading and not as rolling stock.

Mr. POPE. I know the hon. gentleman says so, but it is not the fact.

Mr. BLAKE. It is so in the progress estimates, because I saw it.

Mr. POPE. Because it had been kept out, and when it was put in it had been paid for.

Mr. BLAKE. The payment is not for rolling stock, but the sum which was formerly reserved for rolling stock is taken into grading. The sum reserved for rolling stock is absorbed in grading, according to the progress estimates.

CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

A statement showing the receipts and expenditure of the liquidators of the Canada Agricultural Insurance Company, from date of appointment up to this day, giving in detail the names of shareholders who have paid instalments, the dates and amounts of payments made, the balances due, the amount now owing by each shareholder, and the amounts for which they were liable when the company was put in liquidation; also a detailed statement of the sums paid by the said liquidators, the names of the persons to whom payments were made, the dates thereof, the objects for which such payments were made, and all other information necessary to show precisely the financial condition of the said insolvent company, including a statement of the affairs of the company when it was placed in liquidation."

He said: I move this motion in the interests of the stockholders of the company. Seven years ago this company was declared insolvent. In the beginning stock was taken under false pretences, if I am rightly informed, through the agency of the company. Those who were asked to take stock were told that they would never be called upon to pay more than a certain amount. The next thing they knew was that the company had become insolvent. As the insolvency of the company took place seven years ago, one would think that the risks would now be over; but, instead of such being the fact, the amount due by the company seems to increase every year. There is another peculiarity. The courts in Ontario have dismissed actions brought by the liquidators, asking that stockholders be compelled to pay amounts due. That caused the liquidators to incur costs. The courts in the Province of Quebec have, on the other hand, maintained the actions. So, while in one Province cases are dismissed with costs, in another Province the stockholders are compelled to pay the costs, together with the

amount of shares for which they were declared liable. Besides, in Quebec, I am told that a great deal of discrimination is exercised by the liquidators. They will ask payments from certain stockholders while they make no demands on others, who are quite able to pay. From these circumstances those people who were induced, by false pretences, to take stock in the company, find themselves in a very awkward position. They do not know when their liability will terminate. I hope that by having this return brought down a clue may be found which will place them in a position to seek the protection of the courts. Liquidators have been appointed by Parliament, and Parliament is in a position to ask them for an account. I hope the Government will do their best to have an account furnished as soon as possible.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether we will be able to give to the hon. member the information asked for, but we will do our best to meet his desires on that point. I thought that the Minister of Finance would be here to-night, and that he would be prepared to give the information sought for by the hon. member, but as he is absent, I make this reserve, because I am unable to answer in a precise manner.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVINCES.

Mr. AMYOT moved for:

Copies of all correspondence since 1st January last, between the Dominion Government and the Government of the Province of Quebec, in relation to an increase or readjustment of the Dominion subsidy to the several Provinces, including any letter written to that end by one of the said Governments to the other, or by any of the Ministers thereof in relation to the subject; also of any such correspondence with any of the other Provinces of the Dominion.

He said: This question is one very well known to the House and to the country. I do not belong to a Province which threatens secession, as another Province is now doing, but I belong to the Confederation which we seek to keep solid and make prosperous. It has been created by men of good will, by patriots. It was then understood that a certain share of work should be given to each Province, and to attain this end certain revenues were necessary. It was impossible to foresee, at the beginning, what monies should be apportioned and would derive to each Province. Now, we have the materials of eighteen years, and we see by the arrangements made that money enough is not left each Province to accomplish its share of Confederation. I think, therefore, that the time has come when we should give to each Province of the Confederation, the necessary strength and money to accomplish its end, putting each Province within the possibility of doing its share. I think the whole Dominion is strong and wealthy enough to bring in measures to attain that end, so that all parts of the Confederation will feel easy and their work will be better done in the future.

Motion agreed to.

BANKRUPT ESTATES.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex), for Mr. MITCHELL, moved for:

Return from all official assignees under the Bankrupt Act of 1859, and subsequent Acts in amendment thereof, for a list of all estates of which they were assignees. The estimated value of the several estates when taken possession of by the assignee. The amount realised from each estate. A list of creditors of each estate severally, and the amount of dividends severally paid to each of the said creditors. The several amounts in detail retained by the said assignees in each estate for their charges for management thereof. The amounts severally held by the several assignees which they have neglected or declined to pay over to such creditors as are entitled thereto, on each and every estate. Also a copy severally from each and every assignee on each estate, of the certificate of his discharge from the court, as laid down by said Act and the amendments thereof.

Mr. BLAKE. Surely, Sir, there must be some defect in this motion. I do not hear anything about the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MACMILLAN (Middlesex). It is not the same gentleman who moves in the Grand Trunk.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would be most happy to consent to the granting of this return, but I do not think that we really can supply the information. These returns have not been made, and a number of those who were official assignees throughout the country are dead. I think, therefore, that it would be better for the hon. gentleman to withdraw his motion, and perhaps my hon. friend, in whose name it stands (Mr. Mitchell), will at another period be able to limit himself to something we can give. Even if it were possible to supply this information, it would make an immense return and would take at least two years to bring it down.

Motion withdrawn.

INDIAN TROUBLES AT METLAKATLA.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of British Columbia or any other person, and the Dominion Government, in reference to the troubles at Metlakatla in the year 1834.

He said: I desire only to make a few remarks with reference to this matter. I regret much that there has been any trouble in this settlement of Metlakatla, which has been quiet for a number of years. I am informed that some twenty-five years ago the Rev. Mr. Duncan went to this place as a missionary, and on arriving in that settlement, he found that cannibalism and cruelty existed to a very large extent, but through his energetic and zealous labours he succeeded in winning those people over to a very high state of civilisation, and he has done, I can say, a great and a noble work. He succeeded, Sir, in inducing those people to do away with their wigwams and to build houses for themselves, as white people generally do. Not only that, but he started industries of various kinds, and induced the Indians in that locality to adopt habits of economy and industry. Through his instrumentality churches and school houses were established. Everything went on very prosperously in that little settlement, until some three years ago, when the bishop was sent there by the Church Missionary Society. On his arrival there, and before he had time to acquire an intelligent knowledge of the manners and customs of those Indians, he at once commenced to condemn the work of Mr. Duncan, who had been there for at least twenty-four or twenty-five years. This, of course, agitated the minds of the Indians, who were very much attached to Mr. Duncan. The bishop commenced to erect a building on the Indian reserve, to which the Indians in that locality objected. The result was that a difference occurred, the bishop wishing to step into the boots of Mr. Duncan and have Mr. Duncan retire from the work in which he had been engaged for a number of years. Of course Mr. Duncan declined. However, the bishop succeeded, I believe, in gaining over to his side something like a dozen of Indians, whilst Mr. Duncan had at least 1,000 who adhered to him, and who raised strong objections to this bishop erecting his buildings on the reserve. The result was that there was a little skirmish between them and the bishop, wishing to have the support of the Government at his back, I presume, sent word down to Victoria that there was a great riot at Metlakatla. The result was, that a gunboat was sent up north to protect the bishop and his half dozen Indian followers whom he had with him. When the gunboat arrived there, it found that the trouble was simply a tempest in a teapot—that there was no riot, except in the bishop's own mind. To send that gunboat there cost considerable money. I believe it has cost the Government \$6,000 or \$7,000 to send gun-

Mr. MACMILLAN.

boats there; and they have been sent there twice during the last three years. This is a matter which should be taken into the serious consideration of the Government, especially at this juncture of the affairs of British Columbia, when so many people are going there and settling on her lands and wishing to go into the interior. There is no doubt that any report of the troubles among the natives would greatly retard the settlement of the country, and hence the necessity of prompt action being taken to enquire into a matter of this kind. There is no doubt that great dissatisfaction is growing up among the Indians of that country. Apart from this little trouble which has occurred between the Indians and the bishop, the Indians have not the confidence in the officials to-day that they did have. I remember hearing of a council held at Metlakatla with the Indians. They complained of grievances, and they had the promise of the official that they would be attended to; but I am informed that no attention whatever was paid to that promise. The consequence was, that when the official returned to that locality a second time the Indians refused to take his word, unless he would put it in writing. This is a matter of very great importance, and I feel certain that having brought it to the notice of the Government they will look into the matter at once and do whatever is necessary under the circumstances.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In the absence of the First Minister, I may say to my hon. friend who moved this resolution, that the troubles mentioned as having taken place at Metlakatla were very much exaggerated. Of course, for obvious reasons, I do not wish to express an opinion about the dissensions between Mr. Duncan and the lord bishop who went up there; but, I think, these difficulties have disappeared, to a very great extent, and that so far as serious troubles amongst the Indians are concerned, there need not be any apprehension on the part of immigrants going to that country to settle. This matter has not failed to receive the attention of the Minister who presides over the Department of Indian Affairs, and I am sure that his attention will be still further directed to the matter, after the speech of the hon. gentleman. There is no objection to the production of the papers.

Mr. GORDON. From the appearance of affairs in British Columbia at the present time, I am under the impression that the troubles at Metlakatla are more serious than the hon. Minister of Public Works supposes. Only a few months ago a commission was sent by the Local Government to enquire into the matter, and so far as I can judge from the report of that commission, the Indians at Metlakatla have only insisted on what they think to be their rights. They have been taught under the Rev. Mr. Duncan for a number of years, who, as my hon. friend states, has brought these savages to a state of civilisation. They have their own councils, they have their own factories of various kinds, and they have been pursuing a life of sobriety and industry. They have their own schools and their own church, and they have established a council, which the authorities in the Province seem to complain is at variance with the Indian laws passed by this Parliament. Under the circumstances, I think it would be well for the Government to enquire very closely in what respect the Indian Act may conflict with the council established at Metlakatla. That council has grown up during the past twenty-five years, having existed long before the laws of Canada were applied to British Columbia. The Indians along the coast are, as a general rule, more or less under the influence of Mr. Duncan. He has educated them, they labor along the coast in various capacities, on the steamers and in fishing, and there is scarcely a place along the coast of British Columbia and Alaska where the influence of that gentleman among the Indians is not felt. Now, any carelessness or dereliction of duty on the part of the Government of this Dominion or

the officials in British Columbia will have a tendency to bring on an Indian war in that Province; and we know from the experience of our neighbors what it is to have an Indian war. White settlers are scattered at various points throughout the Province, in fishing, in mining, and in agriculture; and we know that when Indians declare war they take vengeance on all with whom they come in contact, whether innocent or guilty. I do think it is the duty of the Government to make serious enquiry and to take prompt measures whereby an Indian war may be averted. There is a class of men who would like to see an Indian war—the class who visit the coast of British Columbia to traffic in intoxicating liquors among the Indians, and who are prejudiced against Mr. Duncan and his teachings, on account of his successful repression of that traffic at Metlakatla. With regard to what has arisen in the church in that locality. I do not wish to express an opinion. From all that we can learn and from the reports of that commission, there does not seem to have been much christian charity shown, and the least said about the matter the sooner it will be ended. I desire simply to move in amendment to my hon. friends' motion that the following words be added:

Also all correspondence including the Order in Council recommending the commutation of the death sentence, passed by the court of British Columbia upon the murderer of Mr. Yeomans.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would ask my hon. friend to be kind enough to explain how his amendment agrees with the first motion—what relation there is between the two.

Mr. GORDON. My object is to ascertain all the facts in connection with the commutation of the sentence. It is essential that we should have them, in order to discuss the whole question on its merits.

Mr. MILLS. I think the murder of Mr. Yeomans took place at Stickeen River. He was in company with some Indians, one of whom, unfortunately, was drowned. Mr. Yeomans did not report the accident, as is required by the Indian custom, on his return to the village. He was then two or three days without reporting the matter, and the Indians looked upon him, therefore, as in some way privy to his death. The relatives of the drowned man took, according to the Indian custom, vengeance on Mr. Yeomans; one of them killed him. The Indian who committed the murder was arrested and taken to British Columbia to be tried. The correspondence of the Canadian Government with the Indian band shows what the custom is, and also refers to the fact that the Indian who murdered Mr. Yeomans, it was feared by the band, would not receive a fair trial. Of course, there has been a great deal of discontent among the Indians, not only in that particular locality but up the Stickeen River, and the representations from that district, which I have seen, go to show that there is a very serious prospect of disturbance between the Indians and the white population. It has also been represented in some of the British Columbia papers that the Government here have pressed upon the Local Government of British Columbia to make the bishop, or Missionary Society in his interest, a deed of two acres of land within the Metlakatla village. The Indians declare that if that be done they will burn their village and make war upon the white population. No doubt this matter is serious, and there are a number of things connected with the subject which it would be desirable to have.

Mr. BLAKE. From the correspondence it appears a man-of-war was necessary to settle the differences between these holy men. The Indians settled the Yeomans affair according to their notion, and the bishop and the other people appealed to the civil power. They want to settle the matter according to their notion, with vessels of war. Both sides seem to be equally Christian, as far as I can judge.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that one of the vessels of war sent there was an American vessel, employed to assist to keep the peace in the British territory.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. At all events, the papers will be brought down, as I understand the House wants complete information in regard to this matter.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

ANTWERP INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.

Mr. BERGERON moved for:

Copy of all correspondence between this Government and the High Commissioner in England, or the representatives of the Belgian Government in this country, or from the Belgian authorities at home, or any other correspondence and papers concerning the International Exhibition in Antwerp.

He said: We were told in the Speech from the Throne by His Excellency the Governor General that:

"An International Exhibition will be opened at Antwerp during the present year, and a Colonial and Indian exhibition is to be held in London in 1886. Canada should, I think, be represented in her various manufactures and natural productions on both occasions, and I invoke your consideration of the best means of aiding in these important objects."

I saw, the other day, in some of the newspapers, that the commissioners had already been appointed. This is a question of money, and a national question as well, and from such points of view this is the place where it should be discussed. We have had an example, in the Paris Exhibition of 1878, of what these exhibitions are for us. In what capacity are we invited to go to Antwerp? Are we going there as a nation, or only as a colony? Of course, any member can answer that without having the response from the Government. We are going there as a colony. We were there in that capacity in 1878. I read, the other day, in a paper, a long letter signed by Mr. Drolet, who was one of the commissioners in 1878, who knows what he is writing about, and who gives us a good deal of information, which may excuse my presenting this motion to-night. At that exhibition we had a little place in the great square which was allotted to England. Of course, this was quite natural. At that exhibition, Sir Cunliffe Owen, who was the English commissioner, was the man to whom everyone had to address himself for anything concerning Canada. If anything was wanted, we had to have recourse to Sir Cunliffe Owen. It even went so far that official invitations had to come through Sir Cunliffe Owen. In fact, every time that Canada, as a country, had to show herself, she was entirely erased and put aside by the British commissioner. That exposition of Canada's products at the Paris Exhibition of 1878, cost the Dominion Government over \$200,000. What were the benefits which we derived? I will not say it was money spent for nothing. I will not say it did not do good to Canada, to expose her products at the general exhibition in Paris; but I may say that, under other circumstances, we should have had perhaps, 200 per cent. more benefit than we derived from that exhibition. I may give, as an example, what happened to a merchant of Toronto at that Paris Exhibition of 1878, and perhaps that example will do more than a long speech, to explain what I want to arrive at. A gentleman from Toronto, named Malcolm, a dealer in leathers, had in Paris at that exhibition a splendid show of his goods. A gentleman visiting the part allotted to Canada was struck by the sight of a splendid lady's saddle. He wanted to buy it. Mr. Malcolm had no objection to sell it, but he asked him to wait a few weeks, and told him it would be better for him to have another saddle made, in Toronto and brought to Paris, than to take the one which was exposed. The gentleman consented to this, and Mr. Malcolm sent to Toronto. The saddle was made there and shipped over to France. Mr. Malcolm had a notice from the Customs authorities to go for that saddle. He went there,

and he was not asked 50 per cent. duty, to bring it to Paris, he was not asked 75 per cent. duty, but it was entirely prohibited; he could not bring his saddle to Paris and sell it, but he had to send it to England, and it had to pass as an English saddle at a duty of 5 per cent. If we are going to-day to Antwerp under the same conditions, if we have not the right to make our commercial treaties with the different nations we have to meet in the markets of Europe, I will not say it is money wasted, but I think we should either beg our Government to do it, or should find some way ourselves to do what we want, and to get some commercial relations with those we have to meet over there, and then these exhibitions of our goods may bring us a better result. I may say something further. My motion does not tend to that, but it is a case I may refer to *en passant*. Every nation exposing its goods in these great international exhibitions makes it a duty to send there as its representatives men who speak the language of the nation where the goods are exhibited. In France, in 1878, Germany was represented by a gentleman who spoke as good French as any Parisian in Paris. As to England, every one knows that the Prince of Wales speaks French as well as any Parisian, and every other nationality, without naming them all, had representatives who spoke the French language. But Canada alone, with 1,500,000 French Canadians, was represented by Mr. Keefer, who did not understand one word of French. When Marshall McMahon passed before the exposition of Canada, he thought it his duty to say something in French; he thought that, addressing the representative of a country in which at least a third of the people were French, he would be perfectly well understood in the language of France; and he took advantage of the opportunity to thank Canada for her generosity in sending money a few months before to the relief of those poor people, the *submergés* of La Loire; but, when he thought he might receive one word of acknowledgment from the commissioner of Canada, Mr. Keefer made a bow and did not say one word. After the President had gone away, Mr. Keefer turned to a gentleman beside him, and said, "It is a wonder, and I do not understand it, that the President of France should speak to us as if we came from the Department of La Loire," that was the only word which he had caught. This is not the way in which to arrange these things, now that we are sending commissioners to Belgium, where French is the official language. It is true that the Government may tell me that Mr. Desjardins or some other gentleman will be appointed. Some gentleman said that Mr. Drolet and Mr. Perreault were there in 1878, but they acted more as secretaries than as representatives of Canada, and probably the same thing will happen now. I do not make this motion for the sake of having a French Canadian appointed. I do not ask them to appoint a French Canadian or an English Canadian. Let them appoint a Russian, or a German, or any other man, but let him understand the language of the country in which Canada is exposing her goods. I am not speaking of the political side of this question, but only of the commercial side, and the two papers in which Mr. Drolet's letter appeared—*La Minerve* and *La Presse*—are read by thousands of readers in our Province, and when they see us voting money to send a representative of this country to that exhibition they will be perfectly in the right to ask us why we do not get some good results to Canada from this expenditure. What will be the effect of our exposing our goods in these international exhibitions? What would be the best outcome to Canada of these exhibitions? Would it not be to have commercial relations, commercial treaties directly, either with Belgium or Germany or France, or any other of these countries with whom we might be placed in commercial relations? I remember having spoken of this on the *hastings* one day, when my adversary said that England was opposed to our making treaties with any other nation.

Mr. BERGERON.

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, this is not true. I know, as a fact, that England is above these little annoyances. England is too great a nation to prevent 5,000,000 of her sons from dealing with other nations. And if we do so, will it not put us in a position to pay the immense debt that we owe to England? For these considerations, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the duty of the Government—whether it happens to be Conservative or Liberal—to treat this as a national and not as a party question. We have here the best interests of Canada at heart, and I ask the hon. members here assembled to say something or to propose something that may throw light on the question as to whether we may have commercial relations with the different countries that we shall be glad to meet when we go to the International Exhibition at Antwerp.

Mr. POPE. Of course I shall not undertake to discuss the question whether Canada ought to make her own treaties or not. I will say, however, that no commission has yet been appointed in this country. Some gentlemen are collecting information in Canada, and exhibits to be sent to Antwerp and London, but no commissioners have been appointed, and I do not think we shall appoint any commission for the Antwerp Exhibition. Sir Charles Tupper has that under his control. Mr. Law, who speaks English, French, and German, is there attending to it now. That is all I can say to my hon. friend.

Mr. MASSUE. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the remarks made by my hon. friend, the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), but I think his motion would be more complete if he would add to it that the Government should furnish us with copies of the existing tariff between Belgium and England, in order that the Canadian exhibitors in Antwerp should know what to do, and not be subjected to the same inconveniences that have attended them at former exhibitions.

Mr. AMYOT moved in amendment:

That the said motion be amended by adding the following words at the end thereof:—"And also copies of the existing tariff between Belgium and England."

Mr. BLAKE. Of course this is a very proper motion the hon. gentleman has made. I do not know what the various officers are that have been appointed by the Government with reference to this exhibition. We were requested by the Speech from the Throne to give our best consideration to the method by which Canada might be represented there, and I, at any rate, thought that though the invitation was couched in a very polite form of words, yet in fact and substance the Government had already arranged the whole business; that some time before we were called to meet here and in this very polite form of words to consider the matter, they had made arrangements, because we saw it announced in the papers that Mr. this, Mr. that, and Mr. the other, had been appointed to one office or the other to attend the Antwerp Exhibition, and were busy about the necessary preliminaries. I saw, for example, that one gentleman who, I may remind the hon. gentleman, up to that time had been secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Ontario, resigned his office as secretary and received a handsome testimonial avowedly on the score that he had received a Government appointment to go to Antwerp—I do not say as commissioner, but in one shape or the other. I was glad to hear the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) extend his observations beyond the somewhat narrow purview of his motion, and enter into a much larger discussion; and he requested us all to discuss this question, and throw some light upon it. I have no more light to throw upon it than I endeavored to throw upon it in the year 1882, when I presented to this House a motion which I believe afforded a practical solution of the question. I do not know whether I was honored by the support of the hon. member for Beauhar-

nois or not; I do not remember. There were six or seven hon. gentlemen from this Province who usually act with me, and who acted with me on that occasion. I think, Sir, that if the hon. gentleman will read that motion over again he will see that whether he agreed with me then or not, we acted pretty well. Now, it is not necessary to discuss the matter, for I am quite sure that when this House comes to a conclusion upon the lines of that motion, there will be no difficulty whatever in obtaining from the Imperial authorities power to do what is therein described.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

DOMINION LICENSE COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. BERGERON moved for :

Correspondence between this Government and the Local Government of the Province of Quebec, about the working of the License Act.

He said: This is another very important question. Two years ago the Government here thought it wise to pass a law which has been called the Federal License Act. It only worked one year, when the question of the constitutionality of the Act was raised, and I understood a few weeks before the Session commenced that the Supreme Court had declared the Act unconstitutional. Now, the Local Governments also are granting licenses, and so far as we have heard to the contrary, this Government continues, and will continue, to issue licenses. There is a conflict somewhere. The hotel keeper or other person who wants a license wishes to know to whom he shall apply. Should he apply to the local authority, or should he apply to the federal authority? As a rule the applicant for a license is not a lawyer, and is not an educated man. He is not bound to know all these things, and I think it is our duty here to advise him how to act. Now, a circumstance occurred the other day, in Montreal, which led me to move this motion. Last year Mr. Desnoyers, one of the magistrates in Montreal, was one of the federal commissioners to grant licenses. In that capacity he granted a license to Mr. Beliveau, an hotel keeper, who paid for that license \$200, besides the costs of the federal officer, \$15 or \$20, I believe. The hotel keeper was then perfectly sure he had acted according to law. This law had been put into force by the Governor General of this country, and it had been passed in this House by an overwhelming majority, and Mr. Beliveau naturally thought he was perfectly safe. But when the Supreme Court of Canada declared that the Dominion Act was unconstitutional, the Quebec commissioners sent an officer to arrest Beliveau for selling liquor without a license. He was brought before Mr. Desnoyers, acting magistrate of Montreal, on a charge of selling liquor without a license, and he was condemned to pay \$75, including costs. The defendant says that he has not been treated justly. I did not hear the evidence in the case. I was, however, under the impression, last year, that there was some understanding, at least between the Dominion Government and the Government of Quebec—I know there cannot be much understanding between this Government and the Ontario Government—under which men holding licenses from Ottawa should not be sued by the local authorities, and that persons holding licenses from the Quebec Government should not be sued by the Ottawa officers. I may have misunderstood the matter, and I desire this correspondence to be brought down, in order to ascertain whether there is any way of settling the claim of that poor man, Beliveau, or any other man who may be in a similar position.

Mr. BLAKE. Once again the hon. gentleman has opened a question very much larger than the comparatively innocent terms of his motion would seem to indicate. The hon. Minister of Public Works thinks that is so, as he wants the motion to be carried very speedily, but it cannot be carried for a moment or two yet. The hon. member wishes us to remedy the grievance of those unfortunate tavern keepers who have been ground between the greater and the lesser

power, between the upper and the nether millstone, and have suffered great hardship. He explains to us that it is our duty to set them right. As far as the Government are concerned, they deny the hon. gentleman's proposition, for I see that a respectable person of that class, at Halifax, telegraphed to the appropriate Minister, the Minister of Inland Revenue, to know whether they, the tavern keepers, would be held safe if they took out licenses under the Government commissioners, and the Minister of Inland Revenue told them to act on their own responsibility and at their own risk; they would not be defended by this Government in case anything went wrong. The hon. gentleman has also pointed out to us that he thought this law was surely right, because it was passed in this House by an overwhelming majority, of which he was one. I may assure him that not only this law which was passed by an overwhelming majority or any other law is either good in point of policy or in point of law because a majority passed it, although the hon. member was one of them. No, Mr. Speaker, the question is, as I have said, one of wider and of pressing importance. The hon. gentleman has indicated to us that he thought there was an understanding between, at all events, the Quebec and the federal authorities, that neither should hurt the other's licensees. No such understanding has been made public at least, and I have not that means of information which the hon. gentleman should possess as to the existence of such an understanding, and I am sure every one will be much interested to hear of it. However that may be as regards Quebec, the opinion of Ontario, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Manitoba and British Columbia, with respect to this license question, is sufficiently pronounced; because these have all officially declared themselves to be hostile to the encroachments, as they believed them to be, and as the courts have decided them to be up to this point, on the part of the Federal Parliament. A little while ago an hon. gentleman, I think the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot) or the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) enquired of the Government whether it was their intention to order the commissioners under the Dominion license law to act this year. The First Minister, with a very grave face and diplomatic air, said that this subject was receiving the anxious consideration of the Government, and we certainly expected that so soon as that anxious consideration had borne fruit and a decision had been arrived at, this House would have been told what the Government intended to do. But instead of that being done, the very next thing we find, the anxious consideration having terminated, but without any communication having been made to this House of the Government's intention, is from the ordinary sources of information, that all through the country, from Vancouver to Halifax, the Government commissioners have been ordered to act. This Act was passed in 1883, contrary to our protests. We declared that it was upon a mistaken notion of the law that it was proposed. It was passed then as an Act of necessity. Last year it had been proved not to be necessary, and we called for its repeal. Its repeal was refused. I am afraid the hon. member (Mr. Bergeron) was amongst those who refused it. We then called for its suspension, and the Government in the end so far yielded that they agreed, not that the Act should be suspended, but that the penalties should be suspended, until a certain time. They also arranged to obtain a decision of the Supreme Court, and that has been given unanimously against the Act; and now we find, that without submitting the matter further to Parliament, without even as yet communicating—for they have not communicated, though they have been called on to do so—the decision of the Supreme Court, without having come to a decision, or at all events without having announced their conclusion to Parliament and stated what they were about to do further, the Government have taken this other executive step and

have called on their commissioners to act. It is very clear what should be done: It is, to repeal the Act in so far as it has been declared unconstitutional, and so desist from this effort to encroach upon that which the judicial committee of the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of Canada have agreed to be within provincial jurisdiction. If that is not done, at all events we should suspend the operation of the Act altogether, while the Government are making further efforts to save their reputation, somewhat battered in this matter, and acquire, if they can, a justification for encroachment on provincial rights. What have the Government done? Last year they compelled the license victualers, from one end of the country to the other, to pay \$15 for a license. For what good? The Dominion Government were not going to exact any penalties if the people failed to take out their licenses. It turned out that the Government could give those people nothing in return for their money. Besides all the trouble, annoyance and difficulty connected with the matter, the dealers were money out of pocket. And what is to be done this year? We had a difficulty created by a decision of the Supreme Court. You go on, Sir, in the same direction, calling on them to make a double set of applications and pay a double set of fees. Is it to pay these cormorants, the commissioners whom you have established all over the country, or if not, for what reason do you insist in keeping this Act in operation? I say if you insist on further trying this question, at any rate if you do not repeal the Act, suspend its operation; or if you will not do that, at any rate suspend the operation of the penalties, so that even without a decision of the Privy Council, and until Parliament meets again, that part of the Act may be inoperative. There are three things open to us. I am in favor of the first; failing that, I am in favor of the second; and failing that, I am in favor of the third; but I say it is intolerable to leave matters as they are to-day and allow these applications to be made all over the country, allow this class of the community to be harassed, allow the community itself, which is interested in limiting the licenses, to be harassed by a double set of applications, and all these transactions which were so regretted last year to be repeated this year, simply in order that the Government may not be humbled by an acknowledgment that they made a great misstep? The question raised by the hon. member is an important one, and though I cannot acquit him of his share in the responsibility of passing this Act, I hope that he sees it in a different light from what he saw it in 1883 and 1884. I have no doubt that in a few days he will be called on to vote on this question, and I hope that this time he will vote with me.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. chief of the Opposition is quite right in saying that this is an unpopular measure. Two years ago, in 1883, when we were called upon to pass a license law by the federal Parliament, I, as every man here, thought I had good reasons for the course I took on that occasion. It was thought proper then to make the license law a Federal one instead of a provincial one, as it had been before. I had no doubt, because I have confidence in the Government, that when the Government proposed such a law to Parliament, they were in earnest; they based their judgment then, as I understood, on a report of the courts, which declared the provincial law to be unconstitutional. The new law was only put in operation in 1884; it was the first year it was put in operation, and like any new law, it did not work immediately as well as it should have worked. It was, I may say, unpopular, and one reason was that it cost a little more than the provincial Act. Tavern keepers and hotel keepers paid a few dollars more license than formerly. But another reason, and a great deal more important one, in my mind, than the question of money, was this: That formerly the people of the parishes, the municipal officers, those who

Mr. BLAKE.

knew the good and the honest from the bad, and the dishonest tavern keepers, were the parties called upon to give or to refuse licenses. I am not saying anything new either to the Government or to the hon. gentlemen opposite, when I say that our people were surprised to see strangers coming in and saying: You shall have a license, or you shall not. But when that law was made we were, and I was, under the impression—and I say it sincerely—that it had to be made by this Parliament, that the local laws on this question were unconstitutional. It is true that the hon. leader of the Opposition last year proposed a repeal of this law. He says, and I hope he did not say it in any sneering way, that I did not vote for the repeal of this law which to-day I do not look upon as being as good as the local laws. I did not vote with him, Sir, and I will tell you why. It has been said before, and I repeat that every man voting in this House has not to rise up and give his reasons for or against any measure that may come before the House. One or two can do it, and when we follow them, people are supposed to believe that we agree with them. We, members of this House, made a law in 1883, and that law was just one year in operation. It is true that a judgment had been rendered in the courts against it, or rather that a judgment was rendered which showed that a previous judgment on which the law was framed was not a proper one. We had two judgments, and we were in a state of uncertainty; and I ask any reasonable man, either here or outside of this House, could we, as sensible men, say immediately, without being sure, that the law we had made the previous year was not a good one? We were not fools, and we did not do that. I believed like the majority, and like sensible, earnest men we voted against the repeal of the law. Since then that question has been brought before the courts. The Supreme Court of Canada, in which I have not the greatest confidence in the world, has declared it unconstitutional. I believe that was a good point for the court; I believe they were right; I wish the law to be unconstitutional; I wish the licenses to be issued by the local authorities. If I voted for that law it was not because I was in favor of it, but because I thought the local laws were unconstitutional. The leader of the Opposition says we put ourselves in a bad place, but I do not agree with him in that point of view. Whenever we are making laws here we are doing it seriously; it is important work, and I am sure every hon. member here understands the responsibility resting on him. We are not here for pleasure or amusement, and when that law was made, it was done, as I heard people on this side say, because we thought we could not help it; we had to do it. The question is, how to get right to-day? I agree with the hon. gentleman that the Government should come down and say what they intend to do—whether they intend to uphold the law or to appeal from the judgment of the Supreme Court. That is not my business, and when they do something I will judge it for myself. I may say, however, that I have advised the hotel keepers and the tavern keepers in my county to take the licenses from the local authorities, from whom they used to take them before.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). The leader of the Opposition appears to be anxious for provincial rights, but would it not be well for him to take into consideration the municipal rights in this matter. He thinks this Government took from the Local Government rights belonging to them, but I ask him, as a lawyer, did not the Provincial Governments take from the municipalities rights which belonged to them? Of course the hon. gentleman sneers, as he always does at every person who speaks on this side; he is welcome to sneer—he knows that. But were not the licenses granted by the municipal councils? Will the hon. gentleman deny that? And did not the Local Government take away from

the municipal councils rights which belonged to them for political purposes? Does the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. BLAKE. I do.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). You do! When Mr. Mowat passed a license law he said he would appoint one Conservative and two Reformers. This he did do the first year, but refused to do it a second time, and has not done it since. It is a well known fact that through Ontario certain men, for political purposes, get licenses on buildings that are merely little huts, while men who have good, decent hotels are refused. What does this law do? It gives back a portion of the power and license fees to the municipalities of which they had been robbed by the Mowat Government; and the warden, the judge and one man appointed by the Federal Government, are to give the licenses. Is that not better than to have three men appointed, as they were under the Crooks' Act, to give licenses for political purposes and no other. The licenses given by the municipal councils, I contend, were better given, and the hotel keepers were better looked after and lived within the law better than at the present time. And what do we find? Under the old municipal law, when they granted the licenses, they were only \$30, while under the new law they are \$60. Mowat and his Government were not satisfied with a portion of the \$30—they had to get \$60 without any increase to the municipalities. This is not denied; and I contend that the McCarthy Act is the best License Act ever placed on the Statute Book. If Mr. Mowat had left the authority as it was with the municipal councils, we would not have asked for an Act from the Federal Government; but the people do not want to lose every right they have. If this Government is guilty of centralising everything in the city of Ottawa, Mr. Mowat is guilty of centralising everything in the city of Toronto. Hon. gentlemen need not sneer; they know it is true. Let a man enter a suit in court, and it is not ended until it is decided in Toronto. At one time the judges had the right to appoint clerks and bailiffs, but that has been taken away. Day after day the municipalities have been losing rights they had, and I wish, for my part, there was not any such a thing as a Local Government in the country, for I believe we should be better off to-day without them, as they are ruining the country with their extravagance and expense.

Mr. GIROUARD. This question is not a question of feeling or sentiment. It is not whether we were asked to prevent the municipal or provincial authorities from granting licenses. The question is a legal one, and so it has been considered in the past. In 1881, in the case of *Russell vs. The Queen*, a decision was given by the Privy Council to the effect, as we understood it then, that the Provincial Parliaments had no right to grant licenses. A year later, in *Hodge vs. The Queen*, a somewhat contradictory decision was given by the same authority. The Supreme Court, in its last decision, when the constitutionality of the Act was before it, admitted that the two decisions were contradictory. Under these circumstances we were right in referring the question to the Supreme Court. Now, what have we to do? The decision of the Supreme Court is not final upon any constitutional question; the hon. leader of the Opposition, who is an able lawyer, knows that much better than any member of this House. In order to have a final decision, you must resort to the Privy Council of England, and therefore on this question there is nothing decided finally to-day. If this Government does not go to the Privy Council, any individual in the country will have a right to carry a case there after beginning it at the court of lowest jurisdiction, and then taking it to the Court of Appeal, then to the Supreme Court, and then to the Privy Council. There is always an appeal from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council on constitutional questions; therefore, I contend, that it is the duty of the Government to appeal this case to the Privy

Council, unless, on reasons of public policy, it chooses to petition the Imperial Parliament to pass a statute declaring that the constitution of 1867 is in the sense of the decision of the Supreme Court. There are only the two steps to be taken, and I defy the leader of the Opposition to contradict my statement—either to appeal to the Privy Council, or to ask the Imperial Parliament to define the constitution of 1867, as it is defined by the Supreme Court of Canada. Until that is done, I agree with the leader of the Opposition, that the Act should be suspended. Last year it was partly suspended, and I was, I may say, in favor of its total suspension, until the decision of the proper authorities should be obtained. The leader of the Opposition says, that at least the penalties should be suspended. That is already the law. The statute of last year, as I read it, says the penalties shall be suspended until the decision of the Supreme Court and the Privy Council shall be obtained. I am decidedly in favor of the penalties being suspended, but I would go farther, seeing that there is a decision of the Supreme Court against the law. There is a strong presumption that it is unconstitutional; my own opinion as a lawyer is, that it is constitutional, but we know that lawyers do not always agree. However, I think it is the duty of the Government, not only to suspend the penalties, but to suspend the Act entirely, until the decision of the Privy Council is obtained.

Mr. LISTER. As this is a matter which the leader of the Opposition said a few moments ago would probably come before the House in a few days, I think it is premature to discuss it now. However, I wish to say a word or two with reference to the speech made by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. White). I think he was not very long on his feet before he convinced the House that he knew nothing at all of the subject under discussion. He talked about the Parliament of Ontario taking from municipalities rights which they had before. The Parliament of Ontario had a perfect right to do that, as it was a matter over which that Parliament had jurisdiction. He seemed to blame the Parliament of Ontario for taking away from the municipalities the right to issue licenses. Sir, at the last Session of this Parliament, when the Bill now under discussion was being passed, a clause was incorporated in it, expressly reserving to the Province of Quebec the rights which existed previous to Confederation. My hon. leader proposed an amendment, giving the same rights to the Province of Ontario, and the hon. gentleman who gets up to-night and is so loud in his protests against the Local Government, was found voting against the resolutions for giving back the rights of the municipalities which were taken from the Province of Ontario, and which he voted to give to the Province of Quebec. That is the consistency of the hon. gentleman, so far as I have been able to see, since I have had the honor of a seat in this House. So far as this question is concerned, the leader of the Government represented to the House that he did not want to interfere with the rights of the Provinces, or to take from them the right which they supposed they had, in fact, exercised for fifteen or sixteen years, and he caused the Government to make the statement that the interference was an imperative necessity and not a matter of policy. He caused the Governor General to make that statement as an excuse for introducing legislation into this House, which took from the Province of Ontario the undoubted right to issue licenses; and upon that statement a Bill was passed, against the wishes of the temperance people of this country and without being asked for by the liquor dealers. Nobody asked for it; but the hon. gentleman passed it in pursuance of a promise made in the elections of 1882, that if he got into power he would show that little man Mowat—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Tyrant.

Mr. LISTER—that little tyrant, Mowat, what he would do. It was in pursuance of that threat, and not because it

was a necessity, that that legislation was passed in his House. In the course of twelve months the courts decided that it was in the power of the Local Legislatures to issue licenses and to regulate the sale of liquors. That decision did not go so far as to say that this Parliament had not a concurrent power, but it decided that it was not an imperative necessity on the part of this Parliament to pass that law. Whatever were the reasons which prompted the gentlemen on the other side of the House to support that law, the first duty of the Government, after that decision, was to repeal it. But instead of doing that they harassed the liquor men of this country; they doubled the number of licenses; and instead of protecting the people and restraining the evil which they said existed, they doubly increased it at the expense of the liquor men, and against the wish of those in favor of temperance. They appointed their boards of license commissioners, and they took a tax from the people of this country, for the purpose of maintaining licence inspectors, who were of no use whatever. There was not one prosecution under that Act, but every prosecution that took place, every enforcement of the law that was attempted, was on the part of inspectors appointed by the Local Government. It is the duty of the Government to return those men the money which they have illegally taken from them under that Act, and the hon. gentleman who introduced this motion said properly that people did not know what they were giving their money for. I say here, and I believe I am giving utterance to the feeling of the people through the whole country, that it is the duty of this Government, instead of trying to wrest from the Provinces the rights they claim, and which the courts have decided are theirs, to give them the benefit of the doubt and return them their rights. They are able to exercise them better than we can, as they have proved in the past. There is not one Province in this Dominion that can be found acquiescing, confirming, or in any way recognising the law this Parliament enacted. They are satisfied that things should be as they were, and all they ask of us is to give them back the powers which they had previous to the passing of this Act. That Act having failed, it is the duty of Parliament to repeal it. If we should not repeal it, it is our duty to suspend its action altogether, and not go through the legal farce of calling upon people to take out a license which can give them no protection whatever. So far as the Province of Ontario is concerned, every man who sells under Dominion license and without a provincial license will be prosecuted as far as the Province can prosecute him. There is not a tavern keeper in Ontario, be he a Conservative or Reformer, who will be found taking a license from this Government. This Government having no right to issue licenses, they cannot enforce the collection of fees; they cannot prosecute successfully one man in the whole Province of Ontario. I believe there can be no doubt whatever, notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has said, about the constitutionality of the law, that the highest court of the realm will hold that that law is unconstitutional, that this Parliament has no power whatever to deal with the question. It is so held by the Supreme Court, and I believe that decision will be confirmed by the Privy Council. But why go to the Privy Council, why seek to deprive the Provinces of the rights our courts decide that they possess? There has been and there is in this Parliament a tendency to encroach on the rights of the Provinces, and if we go on as we are doing we will have a legislative instead of a federal union. There will then be no protection for a certain Province in this Dominion. It is of the most vital importance that they stand by the Liberals of the Province of Ontario in asserting the provincial rights whenever and wherever they come up.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, has already announced that we are going

Mr. LISTER.

to have an opportunity of voting on this question before the Session is through, and I presume, therefore, there will be abundant opportunity of discussing it at greater length before that time. But in the meantime, I desire to call attention to an error into which the hon. gentleman who has just sat down has fallen, in relation to the action of this House when the McCarthy Bill, as it is called, was before us. The hon. gentleman says, by the amendment put into that Act by the majority of this House, it was resolved to reserve to the Province of Quebec certain rights which she enjoyed before Confederation, with reference to the issuing of licenses, and that when it was attempted to pass a similar motion in the other Provinces the same majority voted that down. It is as well to point out that these hon. gentlemen who talk so loudly of provincial rights and of the importance of leaving to the different Provinces freedom of action in relation to this question of licenses, ought, at least, to remember that the motion that they made with regard to the other Provinces was a motion to destroy the action of the Provincial Legislatures in relation to this very question. The difference between the Province of Quebec and the other Provinces was this, that before Confederation in Quebec, the municipal councils had the power of their own individual action, without the intervention of the ratepayers in any way whatever, to refuse licenses. The people of the Province of Quebec, as represented in their Legislature, had never repealed that, had never modified it or altered it in any way whatever. They were satisfied with the law as it existed before Confederation, and the amendment that was made by Parliament when the McCarthy Act was brought in was simply that, inasmuch as the Provincial Legislature of the Province of Quebec had in no way signified by its own action a disposition to change the law as it existed prior to Confederation, we ought not to interfere and override that law. But in the Province of Ontario particularly, and I believe I am right in saying in the other Provinces as well—certainly in Ontario—and the hon. gentleman's amendment having relation to all the Provinces has therefore relation to Ontario among the others—the Local Legislature had, by its Act, signified its disapproval of the law as it existed before Confederation. The Province of Ontario had adopted a new law, and what these hon. gentlemen wanted us to do was this, that we should, by our Act, set up our judgment as against the modifications of that law adopted by the Province of Ontario, and that we should go back to the law which that Province, by its own Legislature, having, as it supposed, the power to legislate for itself, had set aside. I can understand the hon. gentleman saying that we were doing that under the McCarthy Act, that we were changing the law under the McCarthy Act; but if we were, there was no proposal by those hon. gentlemen that we should include the provisions of the Crooks' Act, the provisions of an Act which Ontario had itself adopted, but there was a proposal that we should set aside the decision which Ontario, in its Legislature, had adopted as applicable to the Province itself, and substitute a different state of things—a state of things they had voluntarily set aside. That was the distinction between the two cases, a distinction every hon. gentleman who looks fairly at it will realise, and which justified the action of this Parliament, even from the highest standpoint of provincial rights, in taking the action it did take, in confirming ante-Confederation laws which had never been interfered with in the Province of Quebec, and at the same time in refusing to set aside the action of the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, in modifying and changing the law as it prevailed before that time. Then the hon. gentleman has told us that the Privy Council have declared that the Crooks' Act is absolutely legal, and that the Supreme Court have practically confirmed that decision. The Supreme Court have done nothing of the kind. They have confirmed,

to some extent, that decision; but they have declared that there are portions of the McCarthy Act which are legal and constitutional. They have declared, for instance, that the right to issue and control wholesale licenses belongs to this Parliament, leaving us to determine what are wholesale licenses. We know that at this moment that in the different Provinces the term "wholesale licenses" has an entirely different signification. In some places a pint is considered a sale by wholesale. Do hon. gentlemen admit that we have the right to deal with the selling of liquor by the pint? That is not what is meant by the people of the Province of Ontario when they talk of wholesale licenses. There, a wholesale license is a wholly different thing, and therefore we are left, by the decision of the Supreme Court, with the whole question worse confounded than when it went to the Supreme Court. One cannot read the reports of the discussion which took place before that body, and the remarks of the learned judge when the argument was had before them, without realising that they felt that they were embarrassed by the two decisions, which some of the learned judges did not hesitate to declare were entirely contradictory—that in the case of Russell against the Queen, and that in the case of Hodge against the Queen. And, in neither of these cases, as far as a layman can read them—and I profess to discuss them only from a layman's standpoint—did the question arise on the point of trade and commerce. In the Russell case we were told that it was a matter of peace, order, and good government, and that it therefore belonged to the Dominion as far as that was concerned. In the Hodge case, we were told that it was a matter of peace, order, and good government, and that therefore it belonged to the Province. Precisely on the same ground, the regulation of the sale of intoxicating liquors was declared to belong to the Provinces and to the Dominion as well. I see the hon. the leader of the Opposition laughing. The hon. gentleman, in his mightiness, may laugh, but this House will recollect that, from the time this question was first discussed in this Parliament, the hon. gentleman has not had the courage to express his own individual opinion upon it. He has told us what were the opinions of the courts; he has told us what this court has said and what that court has said; he referred us, in former debates, to the decisions of Mr. Justice Ramsay, if I rightly remember, and to the decisions of other learned judges on the subject. But his own opinion we remain as ignorant of to-day as we were the first day he rose up to speak on the subject. We know, however, that this very question of the constitutionality of provincial license laws, of the place where the authority rested to deal with this question of the regulation of the liquor traffic, has been a subject of discussion and controversy almost ever since Confederation. Before the Conservative party went out of power it was a subject of discussion. After that Government went out, and, if I mistake not, when the hon. gentleman himself was the Minister of Justice, his Deputy Minister, a man of eminent ability, a man whom we could not retain in the public service of this country, because we could not pay him enough—and everyone will regret that we could not retain him, because he was a man of eminent ability—I refer to Mr. Lash—in a report he made to Council in relation to an Act of the Provincial Legislature of Ontario, expressed grave doubts—that hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) being his chief at that time—as to the powers of that Legislature to pass a law conferring upon a municipality in the Muskoka district, I think it was, or in some of the unorganised territories, the power to deal with these licenses. We know that the late Mr. Bethune, a man of great parts, a man whose eulogy, if I mistake not, was pronounced as a lawyer and as a Christian gentleman by the leader of the Opposition, when sitting in the Local Legislature of Ontario, and speaking on this question even from the Ministerial side of the House, in relation to a measure introduced

by his own leaders in that House, expressed the gravest doubts whether they had the power to deal with this question. This is not, and this ought not to be, a question to be bandied about simply for party purposes, as a political shuttlecock in the game of party conflict, but is a question of serious political import in regard to which gentlemen as eminent as any on the other side of the House who have expressed their opinion—and that, of course, excludes the leader of the Opposition—have expressed their grave doubts, and, in the case of Mr. Bethune, more than a grave doubt, an absolute certainty of conviction, that the Local Legislatures could not deal with the matter. What is the position in which we stand to-day? Everyone admits that the decision of the Supreme Court is not a satisfactory decision, that it does not fairly settle this question, that it does not really determine the position which the Local Legislatures and this Parliament stand in to-day. I may say here that, for my part, I do not believe a legislative union possible in this country, and that I would not desire to see it attempted. I believe we have the very best system of government, by which the Local Legislatures have full control over local affairs. But we are acting under a constitution which leaves, as the constitution of the United States has done, some of its clauses subject to controversy before the courts, for years after its adoption. We are under a constitution which ensures those rights to the Provinces. When the court of final resort decides upon them, and they become a settled part of the constitution, those rights are confirmed to the Provinces, and they can exercise them without the possibility of this Parliament interfering with them. And the one feature, it seems to me, which is in favor of Provincial rights—not, as I say, as a matter of party shibboleth or party clap-trap, but having regard to the well-being of this constitution and its proper observance—is the consolation and surety they have, and the confidence they may feel, in the fact that the courts can interpret the constitution above the action of this Parliament or of the Provincial Legislatures; that we are, in fact, subject to that interpretation, and are ready to bow to it when the interpretation is finally given. Hon. gentlemen speak of provincial rights. Do they remember that when they were in office Acts were disallowed; that more were disallowed—if you leave out the repetition of disallowance by the Conservative Government in connection with Manitoba and the Streams Bill, while they were in office—than during the whole time the Conservatives have been in power? Do they recollect that an Act which has since been declared to be within the competency of the Legislature of Ontario—I mean the Escheats Bill—was disallowed by a Minister of Justice of their own, who is to-day, I believe, a judge of the Supreme Court? No, Sir; this question of provincial rights, which is raised now for mere party purposes, will settle itself, as many other questions have settled themselves. We will find our constitution settled by continued—and in the nature of things they must be continued—interpretations and decisions of the highest courts upon it; and, when these decisions are given—and in this question in its present position it is most desirable that the highest decision should be given—then we can go on, this Parliament and the Provincial Legislatures respectively, each confident in their own ability and power to legislate within their own sphere, and for the benefit of the constituencies which elect them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). The hon. gentleman has stated that the question of provincial rights will settle itself. I can only allude to the fact that it will take a long time to settle itself if the course pursued by the House is to be that pursued on the occasion to which reference has been made. At the time when the amendment was moved by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet), when the

McCarthy Act was passing through this House, to exempt the municipalities of the Province of Quebec from the operations of that Act, so far as they were in possession of power, that received the unanimous support of the House, receiving the unanimous support of the Liberal party, because they considered it was the affirmation of the principle of provincial rights; but when a few moments after, a resolution was moved, couched in the same language as the resolution of the hon. member for Laval, it was voted down by the gentlemen, many of whom had a few moments before voted to reserve that right to the Province of Quebec. To do our French Conservative friends justice, they do stand up for provincial rights when they are standing up for the rights of the Province of Quebec; but, if provincial rights are to be asserted and maintained in their integrity, I would ask them if they do not think duty requires them to go a little further than to see the rights of their own Province maintained; do they not think they should find it their duty also to see the rights of every other Province maintained? They cannot expect to occupy a peculiar position in this respect. It is a grand principle, and all the Provinces are equally affected by it. Striking at the rights that are enjoyed by any one Province in the Dominion is in effect striking at the rights enjoyed by all the Provinces; and that there may be no mistake about how we voted, just let me read again to the House the two resolutions that were before it at that time. The hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) moved:

"That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, in order to amend the same by adding thereto the following clause:—'Section 44. No provision in this Act contained shall affect the powers conferred on municipal councils in the Province of Quebec, on each county, city, town, village, parish and township, by the laws in force in the said Province on the 1st of July, 1867, to restrict or prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the limits of their respective territorial jurisdiction; and the powers and the by-laws now in force passed under the authority of the said laws are hereby confirmed.'"

For that every Liberal member of the House voted. I believe every Conservative member here, whatever Province he came from, with the exception, I think, of one hon. gentleman from the Province of Quebec, voted for it. In a very few moments after that had been declared carried, Mr. Blake moved in amendment thereto:

"That the Bill be recommitted to a Committee of the Whole, to amend the same by adding to clause 46 the words following:—'And nothing in this Act contained shall affect the powers conferred on the municipal authorities of any Province by the laws in force in such Province at the time of its Confederation with Canada, to restrict or prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors within the municipality; and these powers are hereby confirmed and continued.'"

And the mover added: "I have paid my hon. friend the compliment to adopt his language." And what was the result of the vote, Sir? Every Liberal in the House, I believe, voted, as it was his bounden duty to vote, in favor of provincial rights and in favor of giving to the other Provinces in the Confederation just exactly the same rights and powers that a few moments before we had given to one Province; and, Sir, the Conservative members of this House from the other Provinces stood up and voted down the proposition to give to the other Provinces that which a few moments before they had given to one. Sir, I cannot excuse our French Conservative friends for their action on that occasion. Having got what they wanted for their own Province, was it the way to maintain the rights of their own Province by voting down the rights of the other Provinces? That, Sir, I believe, is the record of that question. It stands upon our journals for hon. members to examine for themselves, and in the light of that action by this House, and if that same course is to be pursued, the question I desire to ask the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) is, how long he thinks it will be before provincial rights will take care of themselves.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) undertook to defend the difference in the treatment of the Mr. PATTERSON (Brant.)

Province of Quebec and the other Provinces of the Dominion, in reference to this question two years ago, by stating that the law with regard to the issuing of licenses in the Province of Quebec remained precisely the same as it did at the period of Confederation. This was not the case in the Province of Ontario, for the law there had been changed. But, Mr. Speaker, the whole proceeding of this House on that question was based upon the theory that the Provinces had not the power to legislate, that the power to deal with this question of licenses was a power vested in the Parliament of Canada, and not in the Provinces, and every Act passed by the Province of Ontario, if the hon. gentleman and those who are associated with him in this warlike enterprise, are correct, was *ultra vires* the powers granted to them by the constitution. Now, Sir, if these Acts of legislation on the part of the Provinces were mere waste paper—if the hon. gentleman and his leader were right as to the law enacted by the Parliament of Canada before the Union of 1867, then every Act passed by the Legislature of the Province of Ontario after the Union was an Act *ultra vires* the power conferred upon them by the constitution. If that, Sir, were the case, then there was no reason whatever for dealing with the question upon a different basis from the manner in which the other Provinces were dealt with by this House. Sir, that excuse or defence put forward by them will not bear a moment's examination. It is perfectly obvious that the hon. gentlemen from the Province of Quebec who support the Government, entertain upon the subject of the constitution the same views that we do upon this side of the House, and while they were ready to protect the interest of their own Province they had not the generosity to deal with us of the other Provinces in the same way. But, Sir, I am convinced myself we will have an opportunity for discussing this question at a very early period. I am convinced that the only way of defending the provincial rights of the Province of Quebec is to defend the rights of all the Provinces under the constitution. With the exception of those special privileges or special instances that are provided for in the British North America Act, the Province of Quebec stands exactly upon the same footing as the other Provinces of the Dominion, and it is impossible to draw the line separating the provincial from federal rights at one point with regard to the Province of Quebec, and draw it at another point with regard to the other Provinces. Sir, I congratulate the hon. gentleman who brought this motion forward, and several of his political friends who have supported it, on the new light that they have had. I congratulate them on the fact that they are entertaining more correct views with regard to the rights of the Provinces under the British North America Act this Session than they did last Session or the Session before.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return of any papers or letters in the hands of the Government signed by Deputy Minister Smith, bearing on the subject of dispute or irregularity between Deputy Minister Tilton and Staff Commander Boulton, or in any way relating thereto; also copies of any letters addressed to Mr. Tilton by Mr. Smith as Deputy Minister on the subject.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return of the names of the president, vice-president, directors (or provisional directors as the case may be) and shareholders of the various railway companies for whose lines subsidies have been granted by the Parliament of Canada, and the amount of the stock held by each individual.—(Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, Orders in Council, statements of accounts and other documents in the possession of the Government relating to the claim of the Government against the Allan Steamship Company for services rendered by the steamer *Newfield* in 1881, with a statement of the Government claim and the amount received in liquidation thereof.—(Mr. Forbes.)

Copies of the petition praying for the deepening Bras St. Nicholas, in the county of Montmagny; statement of the amount expended in the said work, the names of the persons to whom the same was paid, the

work for which such sum was paid, the date of payment, and the report, estimate or account upon which each payment was made; statement of the amount paid to Jules Bélanger in connection with the said works.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Copies of all advertisements for tenders, of all specifications, and of all tenders received, for fog-horns and letter box fronts, from 1st January, 1884, to 31st January, 1885; also, of all correspondence, contracts, accounts, receipts and documents relating to the furnishing of such fog-horns and letter box fronts.—(Mr. Langelier.)

Statement of the quantity and value of coal purchased in 1882 and 1884, for the use of the public buildings at Ottawa, including Rideau Hall, showing from whom purchased, the price paid per ton, the kind of coal and where produced.—(Mr. Kirk.)

Return to show the number of officers, non-commissioned officers and men comprising "A," "B," "C" batteries, the cavalry and infantry schools; also the pay and allowances of the commissioned officers of said batteries and schools, with their rank and names, and distinguishing such of said commissioned officers as are graduates of the Royal Military College, the date of appointment of all said Officers to the Schools and of their commissions in the militia, as well as showing their qualifications and the Provinces from which they come; also, Return showing the expenditure on account of "A," "B," "C" batteries, the cavalry and infantry schools, from the 1st July, 1884, to 1st January, 1885, distinguishing the disbursements on account of pay and allowances, and the names of the parties to whom payments were made.—(Mr. Cameron, Middlesex.)

Return showing:—1. The amount of revenue derived from the importation of wines, spirits, ale, beer, porter, cordials and other liquors during the last fiscal year. 2. The amount of revenue derived from the manufacture of the same for the same period.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Statement showing the earnings and working expenses of the Eastern Extension Railway, from New Glasgow to Port Mulgrave, Nova Scotia, for each month of the calendar year, 1884, respectively.—(Mr. Cameron, Inverness.)

Return showing:—1st. Number and names of the students having passed or graduated from the Royal Military College, Kingston, in each year to date. 2nd. Total number of marks received by each, together with the total number possible to be obtained in each year respectively, and the percentage of such total obtained by each pupil. 3rd. Number and names of those cadets who after passing through said college are now employed in the service of the Dominion, together with statement of the positions occupied by each. 4th. Number and names of cadets who have been offered employment in the service of the Dominion, and have declined the offer, together with statement of the position offered and declined by each respectively.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:10 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 3rd March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Calgary, Edmonton and Athabasca Landing Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Royal.)

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Canadian Pacific Employés Relief Association.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 76) to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex.)

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Truro Bank.—(Mr. Tupper.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE BUDGET.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Mr. Speaker, in rising to move that you leave the Chair and that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means, I desire, as is the custom, to ask

the attention of the House not only to the consideration of the Estimates for the next year and the changes that the Government propose in the tariff, but to review, as briefly as possible, the financial condition of the country and the results that have followed the adoption of the policy accepted by Parliament in 1879. We have had laid upon the Table of the House since 1879 the Departmental reports, including the Trade Returns and the Public Accounts, which put Parliament in possession of all the information connected with the administration of the Government, with its expenditures, with its policy, and with its acts. I desire, Mr. Speaker, on this occasion, as the House is in possession of these reports, to call the attention of Parliament to their contents, and I trust that before I close I shall be able to satisfy the supporters of the Government as to the economical administration of the affairs of this country during the five years, as well as the success that has attended the policy called the National Policy, adopted in 1879. I say I hope to have the assent of the supporters of the Government to the facts and statements that I propose to submit; and as we also have before Parliament the returns from 1874 until 1879 containing the results of the administration of our predecessors, I hope that by the contrast we will be able to make, we will also have the assent of hon. gentlemen opposite to the declarations that I am about to make in favor of this policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Your faith is great.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. My faith is great—yes, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to know that it is greater than that of the hon. gentleman opposite, and I trust that before we close this discussion—because I have no doubt that, as in Sessions past, it will take a wide range, and that a good deal of time will be occupied in it—we will have reason to feel that I am nearer right than my hon. friend opposite, who takes a more gloomy view than we do on this side of the House with reference to the circumstances to which I refer. It has been the custom, during the last three Sessions of Parliament, and it has been the custom of hon. members opposite out of Parliament, to endeavor to show that the Government of the day has been extravagant because we have added largely to the expenditure of the country, and they claim that it must necessarily, therefore, add to the taxation of the country in proportion to the increased expenditure. Now, Sir, one of the objects that I have in view in addressing this House on the present occasion is to show that while we have increased the expenditure largely, we have not increased the taxation of the country beyond the increase of the population. It is a very easy thing for hon. members to say here or elsewhere that the expenditure of the country has increased from \$24,000,000 to \$30,000,000 or \$31,000,000, and to state that that is ample and sufficient evidence to prove the extravagance of the Government. I find on looking over the expenditure of the late Government that from 1874 to 1879 the average expenditure was nearly \$24,000,000, I think \$23,900,000. The smallest expenditure, I believe, was in 1877-78. It was remarkable that the expenditure that year was less than usual—I will not say what object hon. gentlemen had in reducing it then and increasing it the following year—but I will take for the purposes of comparison, and in order that hon. gentlemen opposite may have the full benefit of 1877-78, the expenditure for that year, and compare it with the expenditure in 1874, and I will call the attention of the House to each of the items to show that many of those expenditures on which there were increases did not add one dollar to the taxation, and were necessary and justifiable in the public interest. The difference between the expenditure for 1877-78 and 1884 was something like \$7,500,000, and I can quite understand that that statement, made in Parliament and out of it, is calculated, without explanation, to mislead the public with regard to

the expenditures of the Government. The first item I will consider is the expenditure under the head of railways and canals. The expenditure in 1884 was \$1,035,443.81 more than that of 1877-78. Well, Sir, did that cost the country anything? On the contrary, it was a saving to the country. Let me give you, Mr. Speaker, the receipts and expenditure from 1874 to 1879, for railways and public works, and the receipts and expenditure from 1879 to 1884, as an evidence that that increased expenditure did not cost the country anything, but that it was in the interest of the country and of the revenue. Here are the figures :

Receipts from July 1st, 1874, to July 1st, 1879	\$ 8,616,298
Expenditures from July 1st, 1874, to July 1st, 1879	11,688,318
Deficit.....	\$ 3,072,020

or \$614,405 per annum—

Receipts from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884	\$13,718,389
Expenditure from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884	14,476,470
Deficit.....	\$ 758,081

or \$151,616 per annum. It must be borne in mind that between 1877-78 and 1884 there was an increased railway mileage worked by the Government, that there was increased business transacted, and that, of course, must necessarily increase the expenditure, especially when by the additional mileage worked we had additional business, for every person understands that you cannot carry 100,000 tons over a railway at the same expenditure that you could carry 70,000. There must necessarily be an increased expenditure; and, therefore, so far from this \$1,030,000 odd representing increased taxation to the country the deficit was reduced from \$600,000 to \$100,000, making half a million dollars, as the benefit in a financial sense received by the Dominion. The next item of expenditure to which I desire to call the attention of the House is that of the Postal Service. The expenditure for 1884 was \$588,026 more than it was in 1877-78. That added so much to the expenditure of the year. But did it add to the taxation? No, it did not. I heard an hon. member opposite—I do not see him in his place now—complain because the Government, and especially the Postmaster General, had not provided additional postal accommodation in a certain district. We know that since 1877-78 there has been an enormous increase in the accommodation given. We know that the number of offices established, the increased mileage of road over which the mails are conveyed, and the number of letters, papers and postal cards have respectively increased, and I can appeal to hon. members on both sides of the House, who will agree with me that the increased facilities provided during the last five or six years have been very great indeed, to say nothing of the increased expenditure to establish postal service in Manitoba and the North-West Territories, where the expense would naturally be far in excess of the receipts from the service rendered there for a number of years. In view of all those increased facilities, all the increased accommodation, the opening of 4,000 or 5,000 miles of railway since 1874-75, the railways receiving subsidies for the mail service they perform, so soon as the mails were sent over them, it was but natural that there should have been a very large and considerable increase. Has it added anything to the taxation of the country? Nothing whatever. Let us see what are the facts with respect to that service. Here is a statement of the receipts and expenditure :

Receipts, 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879....	\$ 5,753,025
Expenditure, 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879	8,358,360
Deficit	\$ 2,605,335

or \$521,067 per annum—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Receipts, 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884...\$ 7,748,560
Expenditure, 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884 10,064,549

\$ 2,315,989

or \$463,196, against \$521,067 for the first five years. It is all very well to point to increased expenditure, but so long as there is an increased return equal to, or in excess of, that expenditure, and so long as we are giving additional accommodation to the country, I am sure this House and the people will never object to any such increased expenditure made under those circumstances. The next item to which I desire to call the attention of the House by way of comparison is the Dominion Lands expenditure. That expenditure was in 1877-78, \$87,628; 1884, \$166,898, an increase of \$79,270. Now, Sir, when we consider the vast territory which has been transferred to the control and management of the Department of the Interior, when we consider the large sales that have been made in the last three or four years, when we consider the number of settlers who have gone upon the lands of that country—and from which lands we have received no money return—when we consider that the receipts for lands from Manitoba and the North-West from 1874 to 1878 were \$89,392.61, while the receipts from 1879 to 1884 were \$4,070,543.67, I think it will be understood by this House why the management of so large an estate as that, the sale of such a large portion of that country, and the settlement of tens of thousands of people upon its lands, justified the increased expenditure of something like \$60,000 or \$70,000 last year, as compared with the expenditure of 1878.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Is that exclusive of the capital expenditure?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, I will come to that by-and-bye—the hon. gentleman will find that I have not forgotten it. The next item of expenditure is public works and buildings. The expenditure under that head in 1877-78 was \$998,594.70. In 1884 it was \$2,908,851.65, or an increase of expenditure amounting to \$1,910,256.95. The expenditures last year on public buildings and harbors, and all other works under the management of the Public Works Department, were nearly treble what they were in 1877-78. Now, Sir, so far as this expenditure is concerned, I admit that it is a charge on the country—I admit that there is no direct return given. But who will say that if the Government or the country has a surplus sufficient to induce Parliament to vote sums of money for the construction of public buildings, for the improvement of harbors, and the navigation of our rivers—that the Government is not justified in spending it in that way? These works and buildings are part of the assets of the Government. If we do not erect these buildings we would have to pay rents for inferior ones, and we know perfectly well that it has been, and necessarily will be, the policy of the Government of Canada, that whenever the funds of the Government admit it, these buildings shall be erected in every important town and city throughout the Dominion of Canada. The only question is whether the treasury will admit it, and how rapidly these works are to be undertaken. We know perfectly well that the trade and commerce of the country must largely depend on the facilities that are given to it. We have since 1867 expended a large sum of money in improving the navigation of our rivers, in improving our harbors, in establishing harbors of refuge throughout the country, and I do not hesitate to say that in my judgment, whenever the funds of the country will admit it, Parliament will justify the erection of these buildings for the public service throughout the Dominion just as rapidly as the work can be done. The next item is Interest, and under the head of increased expenditure for that item is the sum of \$651,297.06, paid in interest over and above the interest which was paid in 1877-78. Now, Mr. Speaker, a large portion of that interest is met by the increased

receipts of interest, perhaps reducing it by \$300,000. But I am in a position to state here that, though that sum is nominally \$651,297 more than was paid in 1877-78, the net interest paid by the people of Canada during 1884, in proportion to its population, was less per head by 8½ cents than it was in 1877-78. The next item that swells up the expenditure is the excess of \$337,746.65 paid into the Sinking Fund more than was paid in the year 1877-78. It is only necessary for me to remind the House that the sinking fund is a sum laid aside towards the redemption of the debt, and that it is practically a reduction of the debt to that amount, instead of an increased tax, though it appears on the expenditure side of the account. The next item is Immigration and Quarantine. In the year 1877-78, the expenditure under that head was reduced very materially from what it had been the previous three years. It was \$180,691.44, while in 1883-84 the expenditure was \$575,326.72, an increase of \$394,635.28. I may state to the hon. gentlemen opposite that the average expenditure during their Administration for immigration and quarantine was \$300,000 a year, and for the five years from 1879 to 1884 it was \$340,000 a year, with results which, I need hardly say, were three-fold greater than the results of the expenditure during the five years from 1874 to 1879. Sir, I think it is not necessary for me to say anything more than to make that statement with reference to that branch of the expenditure. The next item is Militia and Defence, the expenditure upon which in 1877-78 was \$618,136.58, while in 1884 it was \$989,498.22, or an increase of \$371,364.64. But if we go back and take the five years from 1874 to 1879, we find that the expenditure for militia was about the same as it has been from 1879 to 1884—that is for the five years from 1874 to 1879. The whole expenditure for militia and defence varied very little from the expenditure that took place for the five years 1879 to 1884, though there is a considerable difference in the expenditure of 1877-78 and that of 1883-84. But we know perfectly well that notwithstanding that over the five years there has been an average about the same, yet in 1884, we had four new organisations, consisting of three infantry schools and one cavalry school—one in the Maritime Provinces, one in the Province of Quebec, one in Ontario, one in British Columbia and a troop, I think, in the Province of Quebec. These additional organisations were established last year. I think, Mr. Speaker, that on this question, perhaps, there may naturally be in the House some little difference of opinion with reference to the expenditure under the head of militia. But I recollect perfectly, though then not a member of the Parliament of Canada, that engagements were entered into by gentlemen belonging to both parties, with the Imperial Government, when in England, for an expenditure of \$1,000,000 a year for the defence of the country. I think such an arrangement was entered into before the Union took place. At all events, I think under existing circumstances, there will be very little objection to this increase. When the establishment of those four organisations is considered, this expenditure is not in excess of the five years previous; and I think it will not be considered a useless expenditure, but by a large portion of the members of this House and the people of Canada will be regarded as a wise and judicious protection of the country. The next item of expenditure is under the head of Fisheries. In 1877-78 \$93,262.28 were expended, and in 1883-84 \$286,700.14, making an increase of \$193,437.86. I need not explain to the House that this increase is the result of its action in giving the fishermen of Canada a bounty, which has had the most beneficial results, so far as the production of our fisheries is concerned. I think there were no objections offered to that proposition even on the opposite side of the House. The only anxiety hon. gentlemen opposite manifested, if my memory serves me, was that it should be simply a vote of Parliament for \$150,000

a year, but that it should be embodied in a Bill so that it might be made permanent. Therefore, under these circumstances, I think no hon. gentleman on the other side will raise any objection to this increase of expenditure. Then we come to the expenditure on account of Indians. In 1877-78 it was \$421,503.66, and in 1883-84, it was \$1,116,153.87, an increase of \$694,650.21. I may remark that in 1877-78 all the Indian treaties that had been entered into just before were not so far completed that all the Indians received in that year the sum provided for them under the treaty arrangements; and therefore a considerable proportion of the \$694,000 is the result of treaties that were entered into previous to 1878. We had hoped in the present year to have had a decrease in that expenditure; but, unfortunately, owing to circumstances over which neither this Parliament nor the Government have any control—owing to the fact that the buffalo has ceased to make its appearance in the North-West Territories—it has been found expedient, in the interests of the country, during the last two or three years that these unfortunate Indians, instead of being left to starve or to imperil the property or the lives of the white men in that country, should, at all events for a time, until educated to farm or to provide for themselves, be maintained at the public expense rather than bring upon that country any such disaster as would follow from their being allowed to fall into a starving condition. Therefore, much as the Government and the House may regret that we have not been able yet to bring about a decrease of that expenditure, it is hoped ere long that that amount will be reduced. The next item, Sir, is the mounted police. The expenditure has increased from \$345,958.68 in 1877-78 to \$485,983.66 in 1883-84, or an increase of \$140,024.98. This increase is due to the necessity of an increase of the force. I may say here that, taking the force that was in Manitoba from 1874 to 1878, and the mounted police together, the expenditure during the last five years on the mounted police has been equivalent to the expenditure for the force that was in Manitoba and for the Mounted Police. But this increase of \$140,000 was considered necessary by the House. Last year Parliament voted the sum of money for this increase, for various reasons which were then presented by the First Minister. The next item is Subsidies to Provinces, which have increased \$130,906.51. This has been caused mainly by the concessions that were made to Manitoba from time to time from 1879 down to 1884. The next item is Legislation, in which there is an increase of \$44,731.85. This is the result of increased cost of the publication of *Hansard* and of the increased number of members of Parliament under the census of 1881. Then the Lighthouse and Coast Service has increased from \$461,967.71 to \$520,524.38; an increase of \$58,556.67. Now, Sir, I think there is perhaps scarcely any expenditure made by the Dominion of Canada from year to year, of something like \$40,000 a year in the first place for the construction of lighthouses, then perhaps \$10,000 a year or nearly that for their maintenance, that is more in the interest of the country than that expenditure. We know that in 1867, when this Dominion was organised, the lighthouse service was very inferior to what it is to-day, and we know perfectly well that during the early administration of the Department that had charge of this expenditure, very large appropriations were made, and the result has been, as every man connected with trade and commerce knows, to cheapen the rate of insurance on vessels coming into the country, to diminish the risk of the life of the mariner, and to reduce the rate of freights on imports coming into the country, as well as the rate of freights and expenditure on products going out of the country, and this has been a direct benefit to the whole country much greater indeed than any additional expenditure that it was found necessary to make for that great and important interest. The expenditure for the

maintenance of the lights—because the increase is largely due to that—is one which I am satisfied will be justified by Parliament and by the people of Canada. The next item is Civil Government, and I take the expenditure of 1877-78, because it was lowest in that year; I take the most favorable year for hon. gentlemen opposite, because I do not wish them to say during this discussion: You have selected the highest year of our expenditure. I desire to stand upon firmer ground than that, and am willing to give them the benefit of the lowest expenditure for the purpose of making the comparison to which I now call the attention of the House. While the expenditure of civil government for 1877-78 was \$223,869, last year it was \$1,084,417, or an increase of \$261,047—

Mr. CASGRAIN. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman says, hear, hear. I do not wonder at it, because hon. gentlemen opposite have made this one of the great charges against the Administration throughout the length and breadth of the country, to prove the extravagance of this Administration. Now I desire to call the attention of the House to the circumstances that have led to this increase of \$261,000 in six years. One of the difficulties that every Government must experience in preparing the Civil Service estimate, is the increase that is inevitable under the provision of the Civil Service Act, by which a very large proportion of the employés receive each a yearly increase of \$50. This increase for the last six years is estimated as follows: It is estimated that 420 of the Civil Service employés have received an increase of \$50 a year, and each year since 1877-78, that is during six years, or a total increase of salary to each employé of \$300. That amount for 420 civil servants gives \$127,000 of an increase. Then we have had transferred to the Civil Service account the expenditure on the Geological Survey, the cost of the employés in that branch of the public service. These officers were formerly paid by a vote of the House, which did not appear under the head of Civil Service appropriation, but last year and the year before this vote was transferred to the Civil Service, and the amount of their salaries, \$36,000, is added to the expenditure, making, not an increased expenditure, but a simple transfer from one account to another. As it appears now under the head of Civil Service expenditure, it increases that vote to the extent of \$36,000. Then, there is the High Commissioner's salary and contingencies \$14,000. Well, our friends opposite had not a High Commissioner, but they had a gentleman for a time in London, an Agent-General with a liberal salary; and I may say with reference to the services rendered by the High Commissioner that the very fact of sending him to London, apart from the other services he has rendered, has placed the Government in a better position towards their financial agents. It was intended at the time that he should be our financial agent, but it was found impracticable to carry that intention out. The very fact, however, of such intention being made known, led to a reduction in the charges of our financial agents and the saving of a sum of money annually greater than that which the High Commissioner's office has cost us. I venture to say that hon. gentlemen opposite, should they, at a future day, have the responsibility of office thrown upon them, will find that the services of this gentleman, or if not of the present incumbent, the services of one of their own friends acting in a similar capacity, would be found of so much value to them and so much in the public interest of the Dominion that, object as they may to the expenditure now, I doubt if they will ever repeal that arrangement or discontinue the office. At all events, that adds \$14,000 to the civil list. Then there is the Board of Examiners who last year were paid \$4,661, another addition to the Civil Service vote. This leaves about \$80,000 to be accounted for, and it may be accounted

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

for in this way: \$80,000 is the increase from 1877-78 to 1884, on new employés. I heard the other night the remark made that the number of employés in the Civil Service had been about doubled. Well, Sir, that is not the case. If we take the number of permanent employés of 1877-78 and the extra men paid by the day, and the number of employés in the Civil Service in 1884, and the extra men, we will find that the increase is just 119, or twenty men a year, on an average, added to the service during the last six years. Now, I desire to lay before the House the circumstances which, in my judgment, warrant that increase. Take, in the first place, the Department of Public Works. The expenditure under that Department last year, as I have said, was three times as great as it was in 1877-78. This House will quite understand that it is impossible to carry out an expenditure of \$3,000,000 at the same cost as you would an expenditure of a million dollars. That is quite clear. Then we come to railways and canals. The expenditure in that branch has increased. It will be quite understood by this House, when we take into consideration the increased mileage of railways that are being worked by the Government, when we take into account the large expenditure since 1879 on contracts from the head of Lake Superior to Winnipeg and in British Columbia, when we take into account the supervision which is necessary to be exercised in the construction of the easterly portion under contract by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, when we consider the increase of business as compared with 1877-78, this House will agree with me that these circumstances warrant the increase in cost of this Department during the last five years. Then we come to the Department of the Interior. I called attention a few moments ago to the fact that the Department of the Interior had to deal with a territory nearly as large as the whole of Europe; three-fourths as large at all events; that in the last four years the Minister of that Department has sold and received money for sales made to the amount of \$4,000,000, that he has had necessarily to superintend the surveying and all the arrangements necessary for the settlement and selling of this enormous territory, so that it cannot be expected that the expenditure would be anything like what it was five years ago, when only \$90,000 was received for sales of land, when that country was not penetrated by railways, and there was little or no expenditure necessary. Then we come to the Post Office Department. There has been a very large additional number of employés engaged in the Post Office Department. When we look at the facts, I think it will be admitted that the increased number of employés is warranted. What were the duties performed in 1884 as compared with 1878? In 1878 we had arrangements made for the sale of money orders only with Great Britain, the United States, and Newfoundland. Since that period that privilege has been extended to sixty countries in addition to these—extended, I may say, to the whole civilised world. Money orders can now be had from the Postal Department to almost any part of the civilised world. That could not be done without increasing the expenditure; but, on the other hand, let me say to this House that the increased expenditure has been largely met by the charges made for these money orders. Therefore, if while this extension has increased the expenditure of the Department and the number of employés, it has given in return to the revenue, no doubt, a sum quite equal to the expenditure for those additional employés. In addition to that, we find that the number of open accounts in the Post Office Savings Banks in July, 1878, was 25,535, and in 1884, 66,682, showing an increase during the five years of 41,147. We know perfectly well that this increase in the number of accounts involved an enormous amount of labor. If any one goes to the Post Office here and deposits \$10 or \$20, under the provisions in regard to the postal savings banks, that money is transmitted to the general office, and the general office has to send to the man who makes the

deposit an acknowledgment of the receipt in each case. That is the protection of the Department and depositor, as the depositor is told that, unless he receives a notice from the Department that the money is to his credit he must at once make enquiry with regard to it. But every one of these deposits, even if it be only of \$1, requires an acknowledgment, and entered by a person in the Department here; so that, when that is extended to 41,147 additional accounts all over the Dominion of Canada, you will see how great must be the increase of work in the Department under such circumstances. And that is apart from the general extension of the business of the Department outside of these two particular accounts to which I have referred, and warrants us in coming to the conclusion that, with an increase of sixty-three countries outside of those named in 1878-79, there must necessarily be an increased expenditure in the Department, but for that expenditure there is an equivalent return. The next Department is the Finance Department. The additional work that is thrown upon that Department is mainly through the Savings' Banks. The deposits, as the House is aware, have largely increased. The number of open accounts in 1878 was 19,922, and, in 1884, 43,406, making an increase of open accounts of 23,484. These accounts all require to be checked here, the parties having deposits are notified by the Department, and a large amount of increased work is involved, though, perhaps, the increases are not so great as in some other Department.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not want to interrupt you unnecessarily, but are these separate accounts, separate depositors?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, they are separate accounts.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I beg pardon, but I dare say it will not embarrass you. Does each separate account mean a separate depositor?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, not in the Savings Banks, but it does in the Post Office. In the Post Office, notice is given of each deposit, it is not so with the Government Savings Bank. It is an increase in the number of accounts, but does not involve the same amount of increased work as in the Postal Department. The next is the Militia Department. As I stated before, the establishment of the additional schools must necessarily lead to some extent to an increase of expenditure, but the increase of expenditure in that Department is not larger than would reasonably be expected from the increased force and the additional schools and organisations that have been established. The Audit Department, as hon. gentlemen know, is a separate and distinct department, which is now necessarily more expensive than before, because it is much more efficient in its operation, and, although it requires a certain additional number of clerks, not much increase has been made in the last four or five years. Still, as the business of the country increases, some increase has been necessary there. In the Customs Department, the increased revenue collected, the increased number of ports, the extension of the Customs Department to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, the increased vigilance required under the Act of 1879, which has thrown very considerable additional work upon that Department, would naturally lead to some increase in the expenditure there. In the Indian Department, there is the Mounted Police, and there is an increased expenditure for the Indians, which would account for the increased expenditure there. In the Inland Revenue Department, an additional expenditure has been necessary owing to the passage of the License Act, which threw upon that Department some additional expenditure last year. In the Department of Agriculture, I desire to call the attention of the House to the increase of that Department since 1878,

and I think the hon. members will be fully satisfied that that Department is justified in asking the additional expenditure which is proposed.

Mr. POPE. It is a model Department.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is a model Department I know. When we consider the additional work that has been performed in that Department in the last three or four years in connection with immigration, we can see that it would warrant some increase in the expenditure; but there is a portion of its business to which I wish particularly to call the attention of the House, which would warrant to the fullest extent the additional amount expended in that Department since 1878. In 1878, the number of patents issued was 1,172, and the revenue received from the Patent Office was \$33,663. In 1884, 2,456 patents were issued, with a revenue of \$69,530. This gives some idea of the increased work thrown upon that Department in that particular branch, and it must be borne in mind that the salaries of the increased number of employés there have been paid fourfold by the additional fees received from the increased number of patents granted, an increase of \$36,000 since 1877-78. Then there is the Department of Justice, in which there is, necessarily, an increased amount of work, from the increased population of the country, which leads to an increased number of convicts. The Departments of the Secretary of State and the Privy Council depend, as far as their work is concerned, largely upon the development of the country from the increase of the population, from the settlement of the North-West, and from the various questions and orders that reach the Council, and the correspondence that passes through the Secretary of State. Every hon. member will understand that an increased population means, to these Departments, an increased business, an increased number of documents which pass through them and which must necessarily increase the expenditure. Taking these facts into account, the increase of \$80,000, or of twenty men per year from 1878 to 1884, is, I think, sufficiently justified, and so there is a justification for the employment of these 119 men in addition to those employed either temporarily or permanently in 1877-78. Now, Sir, I have gone over the items of the increases to make up the expenditure of \$7,500,000 in 1884 over the expenditure of 1877-78. Many of these, as I have shown, do not cause an increase of taxation, but, on the contrary, have caused increased revenue, and, therefore, we should confine our consideration to these expenditures for which there is no money return; they are limited in character, and if they are limited in character it is found that the advantages the country derived from these expenditures is an equivalent, and more than an equivalent, for the expenditures that have been made. Under these circumstances I wish it to be understood that when hon. members opposite make the statement that the extravagance of the Government must be judged by its increased expenditure of \$7,500,000 in six years, we have a good and sufficient answer to give, and that is that that sum, during those five years, has not necessarily resulted in increased taxation to the people. Now I proceed to establish that fact. From 1874 to 1879 the necessary taxation of the people of Canada, based upon the average population between those periods, had the Government of the day collected the money necessary to pay the expenditure, would have been, as I have stated before, \$4.88 per head of the population. When I state here—and I have the data to prove it—that from 1879 to 1884 the necessary taxation per head of the population to meet the expenditure, was less than \$4.88 per head, by 10 cents per head—when I make that statement, it is, if I can prove it, the answer to the assertion I have just made that this expenditure of \$7,500,000 does not and has not led necessarily to the increased taxation. I have made this statement before, and I think it is necessary to give the data upon

which it is made, because an hon. member of this House has, within the last two or three months, made an alarming statement that has gone, not alone through Canada, but the world over, I may say, to show that the taxation of the people of Canada is now nearly double that of the United States, and that it is increasing at such a ratio that before long it will be equal to that of the most highly taxed nations of the world. Now, Sir, I think it is necessary, under these circumstances, that we should here, rather than in any other place, give the answer to that statement and relieve the anxieties of the people which must naturally result from such a statement as this going over the length and breadth of the country. Sir, I am about to establish the statement I made as to the necessary taxation from 1874 to 1879, and the necessary taxation from 1879 to 1884. The Customs, Excise, and stamp dues collected from the 1st July, 1874, to the 1st July, 1879, were \$93,295,770.34. The deficit during that period was \$4,818,789, making a taxation necessary, if the revenue had been collected sufficient to pay that expenditure of \$98,114,559.34, or on an estimated average population during that period of 4,021,000, or \$4.88 per head. I may state that the deficit was caused in this way: The total receipts during those five years were \$114,860,495; the total expenditure during that period was \$119,679,284, which represents the deficit I have named. Now, then, we come to the years from 1879 to 1884. Received from Customs, Excise and Stamps, from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884, \$124,723,659.84. The surplus during those five years was \$20,429,725, made up in this way: Total receipts during the period named, \$157,687,879; total expenditure during the same period, \$137,258,154. If you deduct the \$20,000,000 surplus from the receipts, the necessary taxation—the hon. member (Sir Richard Cartwright) laughs, I will give him a statement that will require more than a laugh to answer. The necessary taxation for that period was \$104,293,934.84, on an average population of 4,364,800, or \$4.78½ per head, against \$4.88 per head.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. member laughs. What was done with that \$20,000,000?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Wasted on the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No, Mr. Speaker, not wasted on the Canadian Pacific Railway, or on any other railway. I will tell you what effect that surplus of \$20,000,000 had. Let us see what the net interest of the Dominion of Canada was in 1874 when these gentlemen came into power. The net interest paid in 1873-74 was \$5,113,573.31, on an estimated population of 3,873,920, or \$1.32 per head. The net interest paid in 1878-79 was \$6,456,383.51, an increase in the net interest of \$1,342,810.20 in five years, or \$1.54½ per head, or an increase of 22½ cents per head in five years, on an estimated population of 4,178,890. Then, as the result of that surplus, as the result of the improved credit of the country, as the result of the redemption of maturing liabilities bearing 5 and 6 per cent., the net interest paid in 1883-84 was \$6,713,482.24 on an estimated population of 4,600,000, or \$1.46 per head, or 8½ cents per head less than was paid in 1878-79. That is one of the effects of the surplus of \$20,000,000, and that, Sir, while they expended \$33,000,000 or \$34,000,000 during the five years that they were in office, chargeable to capital. These are the results so far as the taxation per head is concerned, after we have spent in the five years to which I refer \$65,000,000 in the construction of the Pacific Railway, in the completion of the Intercolonial Railway, in the deepening and enlarging of our canals. The result is that the interest paid during the last year was 8½ cents per head less than it was when we came into power in 1878-79.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

I think I hear the hon. gentleman opposite saying, as was said by the hon. gentleman who sits on his right: What about the capital account? You have not taken into account \$1,800,000 that is charged to capital for surveys of the lands, which outlay hon. gentlemen opposite charged to capital when they were in office. I think I hear the hon. gentleman say that in answer to my declaration. I admit that I have not in this statement taken that into account, but if that had been taken into the calculation the taxation per head of the population would have been still less than \$4.88. I, therefore, think that so far as the past five years are concerned, though we expended in 1883-84 \$7,500,000 more in the development of the country and in the carrying out of great public works than hon. gentlemen opposite did, yet the necessary taxation of the people has been less during those five years than during the time hon. gentlemen opposite were in office. That is a sufficient answer to the country as to the increased taxation and as to the alleged extravagance of this Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is feeble, but I am glad to have it from the hon. gentleman. I wish it were stronger for his sake and for mine also.

Mr. MILLS. Especially for your sake.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I must say that I have always found the hon. member (Mr. Mackenzie) an opponent just as difficult to meet as could be found on that side of the House. I appreciate his ability, and I regret that the state of his health is such as prevents the hon. member taking as active and vigorous a part in the discussions of Parliament as he did formerly. I would now like, as we have had experience of the National Policy developed outside of Parliament and in Parliament by the trade returns, to discuss that question from a five years' standpoint. We have for years taken up the results of the policy, its effect upon trade, the development of our manufactures, and we have compared the results year by year; but it will be profitable, I think now, having before us the returns of the five years with respect to its known effects upon trade, and with respect to its general influence on the country, to spend a little time in taking a review of its operations for that period. We know that in 1879 various objections were urged by hon. gentlemen opposite to the resolutions that were submitted to Parliament defining and declaring the policy of the Government on the trade question. One of the objections that was raised—I think it was put forward by the hon. member who passed a word across the House a few moments ago—was that the imposition of a duty on breadstuffs would interfere materially with the foreign export trade we had enjoyed down to that time. He went into a very elaborate calculation, as to what would be the direct results under the operation of this tariff, consequent upon forcing the trade through the United States ports instead of bringing it through our canals or over our railways, as heretofore, giving employment to the people of Canada. No doubt there were grave doubts at that time as to the effect that would be produced by the imposition of a duty upon foreign breadstuffs, because it would subject exporters to transmit their goods in bond at some little trouble, and perhaps at some expense; and it was contended by hon. gentlemen opposite, that these circumstances would drive the trade into channels other than the St. Lawrence. I have, from year to year, been able to make a statement, showing that the fears expressed by hon. gentlemen at that time were, so far as our experience then went, without foundation, and I think the experience of the last five years goes to show that their fears were groundless. For instance, I find as follows:—

Value of exports foreign goods from 1st July, 1878, to 1st July, 1884.....	\$53,384,455
Value of exports foreign goods from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879.....	41,003,910
Increase.....	\$12,380,545

That will be a sufficient answer to hon. gentlemen who entertained fears upon this subject at that time for shipment, instead of sending them by the St. Lawrence and by the winter ports of the Maritime Provinces. Again, it was said when those resolutions were introduced that they were unpatriotic, that their effect would be to diminish trade with the mother country and increase our trade with the United States. That was the statement made by hon. gentlemen opposite, and we were told we were unpatriotic, that we were really assisting our American neighbors rather than the country to which we owe allegiance, and the country to which our sympathies naturally lean. Here are the facts with respect to that matter :

Value of goods imported from Great Britain for five years, from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884.....	\$224,112,853
Value of goods imported from Great Britain for five years, from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879.....	209,077,876
Increase.....	\$ 15,034,977
Value of goods imported from the United States for five years, from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884.....	\$220,865,271
Value of goods imported from the United States for five years, from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879.....	240,559,480
Decrease.....	\$ 19,694,209

I think that may be considered as a sufficient answer to the fears expressed as to the effect of that policy on trade between Canada and Great Britain, and trade between Canada and the United States. Then it was asserted that under the policy of 1879 the duties would be increased on British goods to a greater extent than on United States products. Let us see what the results are for the five years to which I refer, as shown in the Trade and Navigation Returns :

Percentage paid on imports from Great Britain from 1874 to 1879.....	16	per cent.
Percentage paid on imports from Great Britain from 1879 to July 1st, 1884....	19 ³⁷ / ₁₀₀	"
Increase.....	3 ³⁷ / ₁₀₀	"
Percentage paid on goods imported for consumption from the United States, from 1874 to 1879.....	9 ⁴⁵ / ₁₀₀	"
Percentage on goods imported for consumption from the United States, from 1879 to 1884.....	14 ⁸⁶ / ₁₀₀	"
Increase.....	5 ⁴¹ / ₁₀₀	"

That is the answer to the fears expressed by the hon. gentlemen opposite, that the tariff then about to go into operation would work adversely to Great Britain and in favor of the United States. The question of the balance of trade has been referred to frequently, and on several occasions by the leader of the Opposition, who has quoted statements made by me, I think in 1879 or 1880, when the imports and exports had approached an equality, and in one year, I think, the exports were a little in excess. For the subsequent years the imports were in excess, and I expressed at that time my satisfaction that the imports and the exports assimilated more nearly than they had done for many years previous. The leader of the Opposition said that it was my desire that the imports should go on decreasing until we would have a perfect balance of trade, as we had in 1879-80 or 1880-81. Now what are the facts? The facts are that during the last two years the importation has been exceptionally large. First, the imports for the Canadian Pacific Railway—imports of rails, rolling stock, and other articles brought into the country, added to the imports of the last year, and to a

considerable extent to those of the previous year. Then the general prosperity led to larger imports and larger consumption. But I give the following facts to show that the National Policy has had the practical effect of keeping the difference between imports and exports in a much more favorable condition than it would have been but for the National Policy :

The imports from July 1st, 1874, to July 1st, 1879, were.....	\$490,654,805
Exports for same period.....	386,543,729
Excess of imports over exports.....	\$105,111,076
The imports from July 1st, 1879, to July 1st, 1884, were.....	\$559,891,152
Exports for same period.....	477,831,784
Excess of imports over exports.....	\$82,059,368

In addition I may state that there was a large increase in the trade of the Dominion in the last five years. The increased production of our manufactures, as shown by the returns submitted to the Government, and laid on the Table of the House—and I am sorry they are not printed, but hon. gentlemen will have ample time to examine them before this discussion closes—must have diminished the value of the imports of manufactured goods for the five years to the extent of \$100,000,000. When I say that the increased labor paid during the last year to the men and women employed in the manufactures of the country was \$15,000,000 alone, you may fairly infer that for interest, on the outlay on buildings and the profits to the manufacturers it would reach an average of \$20,000,000, or for the five years \$100,000,000. The imports have been necessarily decreased by the operation of this policy, and the balance of trade would have been that much larger against us had not these factories been built and these industries established in the country; and the consequences would have been, I think, unfortunate if such had been the condition of things. So much for the question of the balance of trade. I do not desire to see the consumption of the people diminished; but what the Government prefer is that while they desire to see the consumption of the people increased, they prefer rather to see them consuming articles produced and manufactured in the country, by the labor of the country, than that they should be imported from outside and involve the necessity of sending the money out of the country to pay for them. Now I desire to give some further evidence with reference to the success of this policy in increasing the industries of this country. There is nothing, perhaps, that can mark more clearly the increase of these industries than the increased demand for machinery. It is known perfectly well by every man who is engaged in the manufacture of machinery, that the orders he has received and executed since 1879 have been largely in excess of his orders from 1874 to 1879. You will find, perhaps, that leading men who are not members of Parliament, who are advocating this policy, and are the most effective speakers in its favor, are the men who speak of their own industry, who go to the country and tell the people what benefits they have received from this policy, in the increased demand for their machinery. I may, perhaps, point to a man whom my hon. predecessor met recently, and who, speaking from his own experience, spoke so effectively that he carried the people with him, because he was able to show that the increased demand for his products and the increased employment given to mechanics were the result of the National Policy. In addition to the increased demand at home, we find that the machinery imported from 1874 to 1879 was \$3,100,018 in value, while the value of that imported from 1879 to 1884 was \$8,597,300. I think this is an indication that some new life or vitality was given to industries requiring this increased amount of machinery. Then take the article of raw hides in order to show the development of leather manufacture. We find

that the raw hides imported from 1874 to 1879 were valued at \$6,419,294, and from 1879 to 1884, \$9,517,744. This is some evidence of the increased demand for hides for the manufacture of leather, and the manufacture of boots and shoes and other articles made from leather. We come next to coal. The amount of coal entered for consumption from 1874 to 1879 was 4,230,984 tons, and from 1879 to 1884, 7,085,985 tons. The output of coal in 1878 was 650,000 tons; the output in 1884 was 1,550,500 tons, or 900,000 tons more than it was in 1878. Hon. members who were here in 1879 will recollect that I estimated—and I thought it was a liberal estimate—that in four years the output of coal in the Dominion of Canada would be increased 400,000 tons, and now, in a little over five years the increase has reached 900,000 tons, or 3,000 tons for every working day of the year 1884. I think some hon. gentlemen opposite will say: Well, if you have increased the imports of coal 3,000,000 tons, you have taxed the people 50 or 60 cents a ton on that increased import of coal. Well, I admit it. I will not undertake to prove—though it might be proved to some extent—that in some cases the duty is paid by the party selling the coal; I am not going to take any doubtful ground. I will admit for argument's sake, that the people pay every cent of that duty. But what does it enable us to do? It has enabled us—because the duty is just about the same—to take the duty off tea and coffee and place it on coal, which gives us an industry that has increased its output 900,000 tons in 1884 over 1878. Were that duty taken off coal to-morrow, the Government would have to come to Parliament and ask them to impose a duty on tea and coffee instead. Now, Sir, the next question is the question of sugar. That is a question which was pretty fully debated here. Very strong language was used by hon. gentlemen opposite with reference to the effect of our policy upon sugar. It was stated that we were enriching the sugar refiner and taxing the consumer. I should not at all wonder if we should now have from the same gentlemen the declaration that our policy has ruined the refiner, while, perhaps, they may not admit that it has benefited the consumer. The change in the duty on sugar has had this effect: It has restored to Canada an industry she had lost; it has led to the erection of two or three new refineries in addition to the old, giving employment to a large number of hands. I am not quite sure we have not one refinery too many; but if they are not making as much money at present as they did in former years will it not be right for hon. gentlemen opposite to take into account the large profits said to have been made in 1879 and 1880, to counterbalance the small profits at the present time, and average the return which the investor had from this industry? I think that would be reasonable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Only the men who made the money then won't divide with the others now.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not at all. But, Mr. Speaker, I am now combatting the argument that may be raised by-and-by, and I am calling the attention of the House to the fact that when this question of sugar was under discussion, it was charged that our policy was to enrich the rich and to impoverish the poor; and now we are to hear that these gentlemen are engaged in an enterprise in which they lost money last year, not from the effect of the policy, but from the downward tendency of the price of sugar during the last twelve months. Hon. gentlemen say, hear, hear, to my statement; but let me call their attention to the fact that the argument that applies to sugar will apply to cotton and other industries. If, as hon. gentlemen said, these industries were yielding large profits then, and if they are making small profits now, if the inference from their statement is that we have induced men to engage in enterprises that have not paid, they should take into account the profits

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

they had in the first years, and make an average by a comparison with the less profits that they have had since. That is my answer to that line of argument. With regard to sugar, the question is, has it cost the people any more than it did before? Never before in the history of the country was the price of sugar so low as it is to-day; and I will say, never before was sugar so good either. I admit that that is not a sufficient answer to the statement of hon. gentlemen opposite, that the cost was increased to the consumer, because the price of raw sugar has been lower than it was; but when we take into account the cost of yellow and refined sugar during the past five years, I believe you will find that the consumer has had his sugar as cheap as he would have had if he had imported it from the United States and England, under the tariff which prevailed in 1877 and 1878. What has our policy done more than that? In 1878 only 6 per cent. of the sugar consumed in the Dominion of Canada came direct from the country of its production; last year 89 per cent. came from the country of its production, and only 11 per cent. from Great Britain and the United States. That is my answer to the statement of the hon. gentleman who said that the duty on sugar meant a great loss of revenue, and an increased cost to the consumer. The revenue received during the last year on account of the increased quantity of raw sugar imported, although the value was low, was greater than the revenue of years previous. All this shows that we have not only obtained the usual revenue from sugar, but that we have given employment to a large number of people. We have restored to Canada an important industry. Our trade with the West Indies has increased by 40 or 50 per cent., and our policy with regard to sugar has been eminently beneficial to the whole Dominion of Canada. Well, Sir, the next industry I come to is the cotton industry. We recollect the statements made by hon. gentlemen opposite about the cotton lords. The sugar refiners, the cotton lords and the woollen manufacturers were the favorites; and their industries were the three pet industries of the Government.

Mr. BLAKE. Do not leave out the iron.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We did not do much for the iron industry until 1881.

Mr. BLAKE. You gave it a bounty.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I am now referring to the statements made in 1879. I admit that we did do something for the iron industry; and if \$1.50 a ton, to be, after a certain period, reduced to \$1 a ton, should be found necessary to more fully develop this industry, I have no doubt that the protection of \$1.50 will be extended to it. Coming back to the cotton industry. Hon. gentlemen opposite objected to this policy on the ground that the men engaged in that industry would make fortunes out of it, while the poor man would be forced to pay higher prices. I should not wonder if we were to hear the same hon. gentlemen now say that the poor unfortunate men who invested money in the cotton mills of the country are suffering badly. Well, I can say, so far as the consumer is concerned, that he is not suffering. There was great solicitude felt by hon. gentlemen opposite for the poor man and I remember that that solicitude extended to the leader of the Opposition. In his speeches here and elsewhere he dwelt upon the great tax the poor man would be subjected to by requiring seven yards for a certain garment.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, nine yards, perhaps. Whether it was seven or nine, I know he was extremely solicitous about the consumer of cotton. I have had placed in my hands the prices current on the 31st of January, 1885, taken from the New York *Economist*, giving

a comparison of the prices of cotton at New York and in Canada:

	American.		Canadian.
	in., 6 cts. per yd.		in., 5½ cts. per yd.
Whitemisville.....	33	“	33
Pelham	35½	“	36
Heron	35½	“	36
Whitemisville.....	35½	“	36
Dwight Anch'r.....	36	“	36
Langdon, G. B.....	36	“	36

If these figures are reliable, and they have been given to me by a gentleman upon whose veracity I can rely—they are copied them from the *Economist*—they show clearly, as far as the consumer is concerned, that he is having his cotton at less or about the price at which the consumer in the United States can purchase similar goods. I refer, of course, to the retail purchaser. With reference to the manufacturers, it will be said that under this policy, capitalists were induced to extend this industry far beyond what circumstances have shown was justifiable; but the difficulty that has arisen is due to a very great extent to the fact that the manufacturers confined themselves, for a year or two, to one or two classes of goods. The result has been they overstocked the market, and for the last six months or so, they have been quietly discussing what arrangements they can make, by varying the character of their manufactures, which will enable them to obtain a living profit on their investments. I recollect hon. gentlemen opposite rising, three or four years ago, and stating that the dividend declared by one of these companies was something like 40 per cent. If statements of that kind were correct, the manufacturers probably invested those large profits and incurred far greater liabilities in extending their operations, with the result that, owing to those operations being exceedingly limited as regards variety in the goods manufactured, they created so sharp a competition among themselves that they are compelled to reduce the prices to the consumer to a figure as low or lower than the prices in the United States. Hon. gentlemen opposite will say: "Oh, very soon they will remedy that," for they are meeting together and are endeavoring to make such arrangements as will enable them to increase the price and have a living profit. I doubt if there is a single gentleman in the House, at all events a single member who believes in the National Policy, who desires that the men who have invested their capital in that industry should not receive a fair return, for the capital they have invested. And this the manufacturers can do because the number of spindles in operation in Canada is not equal considering population, to the number in operation in the United States; and the fair inference is that the moment the Canadian manufacturers have so arranged as to increase the variety of their goods, they will obtain a fair profit on them and the consumers will not have to pay an additional sum for the goods, not as much as they would pay on imported goods under the tariff of 1878. To show what an impetus has been given to this trade since 1879, I will quote from the Trade Returns giving, the imports of raw cotton for the five years from 1874 to 1879, and compare them with the imports during the five years from 1879 to 1884. From 1874 to 1879, the imports of raw cotton amounted to 31,847,880 lbs.; from 1879 to 1884 they amounted to 94,038,219 lbs., and their value increased from \$3,563,185 to \$10,531,532. This, I think, will show that an impetus has been given to this industry, that there has been a large amount of cotton manufactured in the Dominion, that it has been purchased by the Canadian consumer at a very low rate, and that, considering the number of spindles that are now in Canada and the demand that must exist for these goods, the day is not far distant when all these manufactories will be profitably employed. Subsequent to 1879, the Government came down and asked for an increased duty upon agricultural implements, and that was one of the grievances that has been magnified. It has been for a

year or so presented, especially to the people of Manitoba and the North-West, by our opponents and used by them to create a feeling averse to the National Policy and the action of the Government in that matter. I may state now what I stated. When, on behalf of the Government, I asked that the duty should be increased to 35 per cent., that I had the assurance of the manufacturers of the Dominion that the increased duty would not increase the cost to the consumer. If that assurance had not been carried out, the Government would have felt themselves perfectly free to say to these manufacturers: your assurance has not been carried out, the cost has not been kept where it was, but has been increased to the people of Canada, or to that portion of Canada specially affected, and we will repeal that resolution increasing the duty from 25 to 35 per cent. I think that I am in a position to say that the manufacturers of Canada have carried out their engagement, that the various articles of agricultural implements will be sold this year in Manitoba and the North-West as low, many of them, as they can be purchased in Dakota.

An hon. MEMBER. Lower.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. All of them as low as, and some lower, than the prices at which they can be bought in Dakota or Minneapolis, including the expenses of carrying them from those places. I have here the comparative prices of agricultural implements at Winnipeg, for several years past:

	1881-2	1883	1884	1885
Self-binders.....	\$340	\$330	\$300 to \$275	\$225 to \$249
Mowing machines....	95	90	85	72 to 77
Seeders	90	85	80	72
Sulky ploughs.....	...	80	75	65
Gang ploughs.....	...	130	110	100
Farm waggons.....	95	85	65 to 75	76

Let us compare these prices with the prices in Dakota and Minnesota:

	Larimore, D.T.	Fargo, D.T.	Minneapolis, D.T.	Columbus, D.T.	Winnipeg, D.T.
Self-binder, 6 ft cut.	\$225 to \$250	\$210	*\$210	\$250	\$225 to \$240
Mowing machine.....	75 to 80	70	75	80	72 to 77
Farm waggon.....	65 to 75	75	65 to 70	...	70 to 76
Breaking plough, 12 inches.....	22 to 24	26.50	22	24	20 to 21
Sulky plough.....	65 to 75	65	50	55	65
Gang plough.....	110 to 120	100	85	95	100
Seeder.....	55 to 65	75	55 to 60	65	72
Hay rake.....	30 to 35	30	35	35	36

* Retail price to consumer in Minneapolis, \$250.

Now, Sir, as far as the prices of these articles are concerned, the policy resulted in the reduction to the consumer; and I think I may venture to say, with reference to every leading industry in the country, that the productions, whether of agricultural implements, or sugar, or leather manufactures, or cottons, or woollen goods, or the articles which enter into the consumption of everyday life, and especially among the masses of the people, that it cannot be shown that in any case, except perhaps that of coal, where a duty of 60 cents a ton is imposed, there has been an increased cost to the consumer; and in consequence of the competition of the manufacturers, which is very sharp at present, the prices have been in favor of the consumer. And, though the manufacturers are at present under very great disadvantages in consequence of the competition from outside, and are compelled to sell with a very small margin of profit, still this policy has given employment to a vast number of people in the country and has been in the public interest. Before I refer further to that, let me call attention to a few other facts. Take, for instance, the value and the products of fish and their exports. I think I hear hon. gentlemen opposite say: What have you done for the fishing interest? Whether it be the effect of the bounty which has been paid during the last two years or not, we find that there is a considerable increase in the catch of fish, as shown by the following statement:—

Value.		Value.	
1874.....	\$11,681,886	1879.....	\$13,529,254
1875.....	10,447,886	1880.....	14,499,979
1876.....	11,116,999	1881.....	15,817,163
1877.....	12,005,934	1882.....	16,824,692
1878.....	13,215,678	1883.....	16,958,192
Total.....	\$58,468,383	Total.....	\$77,628,679

Then, as far as the exports are concerned, we find the following:—

Fish and Products of Fish Exported.				Fish and Products of Fish Exported.			
Produce of Canada.		Not Produce of Canada.		Produce of Canada.		Not Produce of Canada.	
1874...	\$5,292,368	\$104,359	1879...	\$6,928,871	\$143,332		
1875...	5,380,527	5,232	1880...	6,579,656	73,691		
1876...	5,500,989	232	1881...	6,867,715	31,169		
1877...	5,874,360	1882...	7,682,079	15,529		
1878...	6,853,975	75,391	1883...	8,809,118	47,808		
Total...	\$28,902,219	\$185,214	Total...	\$36,867,439	\$311,529		

With reference to our cattle exports, which, thanks to the great tact and energy of our High Commissioner in England and the policy pursued by the Government, have been secured from the great loss to which the shippers of cattle in the United States have been subjected, we find that the products of that industry sent out of the country from 1874 to 1879 amounted to \$11,417,642, and from 1879 to 1884 to \$41,062,474. Then there is the question of the effect of the general policy upon the development of the industries of the country. I have given some evidence, I think, of the progress of these industries, by the increased demand for machinery in the country, by the greatly increased import of cotton, by the import of hides, by the consumption of coal to drive the machinery of the country, and by various other facts which have been presented here; but there has been laid on the Table of the House, and will be placed in the hands of every member shortly, the result of the enquiries of two gentlemen, who were appointed by the Government, to examine the leading factories of the Dominion of Canada, in order to show their development since 1878. As these papers are not yet in the hands of members, I shall only, at present, just quote generally the results, because, when the discussion goes on further and hon. members have those papers to refer to, it may be interesting and valuable to go more into detail. I will simply give the results of their enquiries for six months in the prominent towns and cities of the Dominion. It is estimated by them that they have visited factories employing about two-thirds of the people who are engaged in the various manufacturing industries, and these are the results:

	No. of Factories.	No. hands employed.	Yearly wages paid.	Products.	Capital invested.
1884.....	2,096	77,346	\$24,398,165	\$102,870,166	\$67,293,373
1878.....	1,501	42,794	13,833,733	49,963,282	37,819,931
Increase in five years....	595	34,552	\$10,564,432	\$52,906,884	\$29,473,442

If we add 50 per cent. to that, supposing their calculation is correct and the results should be found to be the same, it will appear that the adoption of this policy in 1879 has increased the number of factories in Canada by 892, the number hands by 51,828, the yearly wages paid to the people employed by \$15,843,648, the products by \$79,360,126, and the capital invested by \$44,210,163. It does appear to me that, under these circumstances, we have reason to be satisfied with the results of this policy during the first five years of its existence. I have not said anything up to the present moment as to the effect this policy has had upon the credit of the country. I have been in the habit of referring to that in the past, and I desire here, though I shall touch upon that further on, to say that the credit of the country stands better to-day at home and abroad, than it ever did before; and money can be obtained on more favorable terms

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

than ever before. Before I refer to the last loan which was made, and to which the late Finance Minister will probably refer, let me say that I have had a table prepared of the price of 4 per cent. securities for various countries in order to compare them with the rates obtainable for Canadian 4 per cents. It is as follows:—

	5 per cent.		4 per cent.	
	When Due.	Rate.	When Due.	Rate.
Canada.....	1904-1908	105-107
Cape.....	1900	104-106	1922	89½
Jamaica.....	1927	99-100
Mauritius.....	1922	100
Natal.....	1926	87-88
New South Wales.....	1903-1910	104½-105½
New Zealand.....	1929	98-100
South Australia.....	1929	102-102½
Queensland.....	1915-1924	100-102½
Tasmania.....	1908	99½-101½
Victoria.....	1907	103½
Western Australia.....	1927	99-101
Austrian.....	86-87
Belgian.....	10½
Danish.....	100
Dutch.....	100-102
French Treasury Bonds.....	101
Indian.....	101½-102½
Italian.....	96½-96¾
Sardinian.....	98-100
Norwegian.....	1934	101-102
Prussian.....	After 1885	101½-102½
Russian.....	1922	78

Thus it appears that Canadian 4 per cents stand higher to-day than any of the countries that I have named. With reference to the last loan placed upon the English market, at 3½ per cent. interest, the House will remember authority was given to the Government to loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company \$22,500,000 towards the construction of that railway, and it became necessary that we should obtain, on the best terms possible, money to meet our engagements in that direction. A £5,000,000 sterling loan was offered at 3½ per cent, and the minimum named was 91. That loan produced £91 1s. 8d. It was a 50 years loan, and the sum realised is equal to 2 per cent. premium on a 50 years' loan at 4 per cent., as will be shown by a book I have in my hand, and which any hon. member can see, there he will ascertain the value of securities at various rates, with the number of years to run. Perhaps the late Minister of Finance has seen it.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I have the book.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When that loan was placed upon the market it brought equal to 2 per cent. premium on 4 per cent. loan for fifty years. That, Sir, was the highest rate ever obtained for any Canadian loan that had been placed on that market. The loans placed by my hon. predecessor from 1874 to 1876, and the loan placed upon the English market by myself, in 1878, realised about the same sum at 4 per cent. The fact is, Sir, we did not realise as good a rate even at 4 per cent. as the 3½ per cent. loan of 1884. The 4 per cent. debentures placed at 30 as appears by this table. The loan effected by my predecessor in 1874, at the price it realised, yielded to the purchaser £4 12s. 6d. for every £100 bought. The 30 year 4 per cent. debentures placed in 1875, cost Canada, in interest, £4 11s. 2d. per annum on every £100 that was realised. The 50 years 3½ per cent. debenture at 91—which was the minimum placed, though it brought a little more, gave a rate of interest of £3 18s. 3d. That is what we are paying on that loan. A 50 year 4 per cent. debenture, selling at 102, would yield an interest to the holder of £3 18s. 2d., so that I may fairly say we realised what was equal to 102 per cent. on a 50 year 4 per cent. loan. Now, Sir, the difference between the rates at which the hon. gentleman opposite, and I myself in 1878, obtained for the 4 per cent. at that time, is about ½ per cent. and that ½ per cent., were it used as a sinking fund, would pay off the principal in between 40 and 50 years, and that shows the nature and extent of the

value to Canada of the different loans that were floated. My hon. predecessor asked for the names of the persons who tendered, and what they tendered for. We had not the names in our possession to give him, but I may say that when I placed the minimum at 91, almost everybody who was in the habit of dealing in securities of this kind thought the minimum high, and I had a conversation with the manager of the Bank of Montreal on this subject, and he declined to tender, as many others also did, because the minimum rate was considered too high. Now, Sir, there has been a good deal said with reference to ample notice not having been given of this loan, that the number of papers it was advertised in was too limited in circulation, and therefore the interests of the country were sacrificed. The hon. gentleman moved, if you will recollect, for the names of the papers in which that loan was advertised, and you will also remember that I asked him to amend that request and go back to 1874. I had a reason for doing so, because I was satisfied there was no difference in the papers that were used as the advertising medium of his loan and those used for the loan of 1884. The result showed that, with the exception of 1876, when he floated his loan and the loan I floated in 1878, the papers were the same, that there was not one paper which he used in 1876 that I did not use in 1884, and I imagine only from the name of that paper that it has gone out of existence. There is nothing to be gained by the Opposition by an investigation into the number of papers in which tenders were asked, for the loan of 1884, as compared with the papers in which tenders were asked for the previous loans. Now, with reference to the time that was given for the parties to tender. If you will compare the prospectuses that were issued by the hon. gentleman opposite, and by myself, it will be found there is very little difference. But I will tell you what the Finance Minister of Canada has to encounter. There is in London an organisation of men who are opposed to the Pacific Railway, and who are opposed to the Government of Canada, because they have given facilities to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the construction of that great work. There are men connected with the Northern Pacific Railway whose interests lead them to oppose that road and to destroy the company if possible, and you will find that, whenever an opportunity arises, the Northern Pacific Railway Company very naturally seeks to defeat the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, because when completed it will be one of its great competitors. Then, I think I may fairly say that the stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway are not peculiarly demonstrative in their regard for the Canadian Pacific Railway. And what do we find when we go into that market to float a loan? Just what I found last summer, and that was a most determined hostility to the successful placing of that loan. The morning that tenders were asked for to be deposited at Messrs. Baring Bros., the parties opposed to the Canadian Pacific Railway had a most violent article in one of their papers against the Government of Canada and the Canadian Pacific Railway, and from 10 o'clock in the morning until 3 o'clock in the afternoon, while the tenders were being deposited at Messrs. Baring for this loan, a man stood there with a placard advertising this paper, and calling the attention of everybody who came along to the article in the paper. But, notwithstanding that fact, when the tenders were opened, I do not hesitate to say that on no occasion have we had so many offers of sums varying from £100 sterling to £10,000. Had the matter rested there, we could have made out a case to which there could have been no reply from hon. gentlemen opposite. But I think I hear the late Finance Minister saying: Oh, but New South Wales has floated a 3½ per cent. loan since then, and that loan brought a higher price than you received for our 3½ per cent. loan. There are reasons why the New

South Wales 3½ per cents should have sold for a higher price than our securities. Ours were for 50 years, theirs for 40 years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Ours are for 50 years.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, ours are for 50 years, and theirs are for 40 years; and therefore if the purchaser of a £100 bond pays £92 for it, he gets back into his coffers £8 in 40 years; while the purchaser of one of our bonds does not get it back for 50 years. So the purchaser of the former has the use of his money for 10 years longer than the purchaser of the latter. According to the table in my hands, it makes a difference of nearly 1 per cent. to the purchaser. The purchaser can give 1 per cent. more for a 40 years bond than for a 50 years bond when it is sold for 8 per cent. discount. It is just the opposite when you buy at a premium. In addition to that, the payments which were to be made on the New South Wales bonds were distributed over a longer period than the payments on the Canadian bonds. The buyer had, therefore, the use of the money for a longer time, and the difference between the payments on the Canadian and the New South Wales bonds was about one-half per cent., which gave 1½ per cent. advantage to the purchaser of the New South Wales loan. It is true that shortly afterwards, owing to circumstances of an exceptional character, both our bonds advanced. The Chancellor of the Exchequer of England was about converting 3 per cents into 2½ per cents, and the rate was favorable to our colonial securities, and ours advanced rapidly for a month or so, and the New South Wales bonds also advanced in about the same ratio. That led to comments in the Opposition press attempting to show that I had sacrificed the interests of Canada in placing the loan at 91 when the securities subsequently advanced to a higher rate. What I cannot understand is why our 3½ per cents are selling comparatively lower than New South Wales' 3½ per cents, and our 4 per cents having the same period as theirs to run are higher than theirs. What is our position? While Canada has comparatively few friends in the money market of London, and many opponents when we are placing our loans on the market, whenever an Australian colony places a loan the twelve Australian banks take hold of it, and there is a different feeling manifested as compared with that displayed towards a Canadian loan, and a deep interest is felt on the part of the Australian bankers for the success of an Australian loan.

Mr. MITCHELL. There is no Grand Trunk against them.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is a hearty and commendable desire manifested by Australian capitalists to keep the credit of the Australian colonies at the highest possible point; and although we cannot get at the facts, I believe there must have been some arrangement made between the New South Wales Government and the syndicate of Australian banks as purchasers of the loan, that as the proceeds are not required for a long time a moderate rate of interest should be paid until called for. That loan should have brought 1½ per cent. more than ours; it brought over £93, or practically £1 more than our loan brought. I do not hesitate to say that the rates at which our 4's are quoted, and they form the larger part of our indebtedness as compared with the 3½'s, show that the price of the latter may be influenced at present by the fact that we have five million pounds maturing in June next. To-day our credit at home and abroad stands higher than ever before, and I believe it is to a very considerable extent the result of the adoption of a policy which has enabled us to have a surplus, after making the expenditures necessary to carry on public affairs, and without increasing the taxation of the people

per head, or increasing the burdens they have to bear in the shape of interest.

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

After Recess.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. When we separated, Mr. Speaker, I was discussing the general effect of what is termed the National Policy on the general industries, and especially the manufacturing industries, of the Dominion of Canada. I now propose briefly to call the attention of the House to the amended estimates for the current year, both of income and expenditure, and I will then proceed to submit an estimate of income for the next fiscal year, the estimate of expenditure being on the Table of the House. Then I shall ask the indulgence of the House for a short time while I submit evidences of the prosperity of the country as proved by the facts which I desire to submit for their consideration. But before doing so I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter of which I intended to speak earlier in the evening, and that is a statement that has been made relative to the taxation of Canada as compared with that of the United States, in which it has been represented that the taxes of Canada at the present time are nearly double those of the United States, and that we are fast becoming the most heavily taxed country in the world. I desire to give some facts to the House on this point. The most of them are taken from the Finance Report of the United States of 1884, recently published in Washington, dealing with the expenditure of 1883-84. The expenditure for the first quarter of 1884-85, an estimate of the expenditure for the remaining nine months of the current year, and the estimate of the income and expenditure of 1885-86 as contained in the volume before me. I find from this document for 1883-84, page 4, the following figures:—

Receipts from Customs.....	\$195,067,489 76
" Inland Revenue.....	121,586,072 51
National Bank Tax.....	3,108,730 13
Fees, &c.....	4,323,603 03
	<hr/>
	\$324,085,895 43
Less surplus.....	57,603,296 09
	<hr/>
	\$266,482,499 34

Estimating the population for that year at 54,000,000, the necessary taxation per head to meet the expenses and sinking fund was \$1.93½ cents per head. The taxation necessary in Canada to meet the expenses, out of consolidated revenue including sinking fund for the five years from 1879 to 1884 was \$4.78½ per head against \$4.93½ in the United States for 1883-84. I would call the attention of the House to the fact, that of the necessary Dominion taxation \$1.75 per head of the sum received into the Dominion Treasury goes towards the relief of the Provinces, either in the interest of their debt assumed by the Dominion of Canada, amounting at the close of the last fiscal year to nearly one hundred millions of dollars, and \$3,600,000 paid annually in subsidies to the Provinces; whereas, in the United States, no portion of the revenue collected by the general Government goes to the relief of the States. The State taxation as shown by return laid before Congress is 32 cents on every \$100 of taxable property in the United States, or \$1.20 per head of the population, in addition to that collected by the general Government. So when we are considering this question as to the taxation of the United States, we must remember that we collected for the Provinces \$1.75, last year, while the inhabitants of the United States, in addition to the sum which is collected and paid into the general treasury, pay \$1.20 state taxation per head. Now, Sir, this makes the necessary taxation in the United States, including sinking fund, \$6.13½ per head, against an average necessary taxation in Canada for five years of \$4.78½ per head, or for

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Dominion purposes alone, \$3.03½. And as to this amount which we contribute for the Provinces, it is not now a question of whether the policy is wise or unwise; the only condition on which the various Provinces would enter this union was that the Dominion should assume their debt and pay the interest, and give what would be considered sufficient to maintain and pay the working expenses of the different Local Governments. The facts of the case nevertheless are these: That if we had been in the position of the United States, leaving the Provinces to collect by provincial taxation such as is collected by the States of the Union, we would have only required, in order to pay the necessary expenses for 1883-84, to have collected \$3.03 per head. I may here state that I desire to put this case in as fair and as accurate a position as it can possibly be presented. The sinking fund of the United States is larger in proportion of the population than that of Canada, and therefore it may be said that the fair way to test this question is to look at it without reference to the sinking fund at all, and to say what the necessary taxation would be not taking into account the sinking fund. The necessary taxation to meet the expense of the Dominion for the fiscal year 1883-84, less sinking fund, was \$4.84 per head. The necessary taxation to meet the expenditure of the United States for the same period, less the sinking fund, was \$4.07 per head, and if you add State taxation \$1.20 we have as the necessary taxation of the United States for that year \$5.27, as against \$4.84 in Canada. Now, Sir, I take from this document before me—the Estimates of the United States for 1885-86—I will refer presently to the Estimates for the Dominion of Canada for the same year—and with this result: The estimated revenue for the United States from Customs, internal revenue, bank tax and other fees, is \$307,000,000. Deduct estimated surplus and sinking fund \$54,656,000, and you have left \$252,344,000 the amount necessary to assess and tax the people of the United States to pay the expenses of 1885-86, or \$4.58 per head of a population of 55,000,000; add State taxation, \$1.20, making a total of \$5.78 as the estimated taxation of the United States; while the estimated taxation of Canada for the fiscal year 1885-86, less sinking fund, based upon a population of 4,800,000, is \$4.75 per head. Now, Sir, with reference to the statement that we are fast approaching in taxation to the condition of the most heavily taxed nation in the world, I have here a statement of the revenue and expenditure per head of the population of various countries, which I desire to submit to this House to show whether that statement, is reliable or not. This statement refers to the year 1881-82:

Country.	Revenue per head.	Expenditure per head.
Queenland	\$43 44	\$42 51
New South Wales.....	42 90	36 75
West Australia	40 34	23 10
New Zealand	34 83	35 30
South Australia	31 76	37 46
Victoria.....	30 99	30 22
Tasmania.....	21 67	20 55
France.....	15 43	15 24
Great Britain.....	12 62	12 61
Germany.....	12 33	9 15
Netherlands.....	10 98	12 73
Italy.....	10 85	10 80
Belgium.....	10 74	10 99
Spain.....	9 48	9 43
Chili.....	8 43	8 87
Russian Empire.....	6 33	6 44
Brazil.....	6 32	8 00
Denmark.....	6 26	7 02
Norway.....	6 15	5 88
Greece.....	6 08	7 25
United States.....	7 94	5 29
Canada.....	7 30	5 48

In the case of Canada the revenue received from railways is deducted, and adding to the United States taxation the taxation of States, it is below all the countries that I have

named, and the countries in Europe whose taxation is below that of Canada are:

Countries.	Revenue per head.	Expenditure per head.
Sweden	\$4 79	\$4 73
Turkey	3 22	3 82
Switzerland.....	3 07	3 03

And then we come to China, British India and Japan. If we take into account the value of a day's labor in these countries as compared with the value of a day's labor in Canada, the taxation at their figures is greater than that of Canada, without any of the compensating advantages that our people enjoy. Sir, I fail to see in these statements any warrant whatever for the statement made by a member of this House in another place that the taxation of Canada was nearly double that of the United States, and that our taxation was fast approaching that of the most heavily taxed country in the world. Our taxation is not one-fourth of the average taxation of the Australian colonies, when we contrast our condition with that of the countries to which I refer. In our case the expenditure is not on war or on standing armies, but for the development of a great country, and to secure for Canada the most magnificent canal system in the world, and railway facilities such as are scarcely to be found in any other part of the world. Sir, if I am right in these statements, how deeply is it to be regretted that any gentleman occupying the prominent position of the gentleman to whom I refer, should have put into the hands of American land and steamboat agents who are striving to divert immigration from Canada to the United States—should have put into the hands of the people of Ireland to deter them from emigrating to this country—should have put into the hands of the people of England and the people of Scotland statements such as these, calculated to damage our credit and prevent immigration to the country—should have put into the hands of the people of Germany a statement made on high authority that if they come to Canada to settle, they will come to a land which is or soon will be more heavily taxed than any other country in the world; and these statements made at variance with the facts and without warrant or justification. I now pass to another subject. I desire to consider the Estimates for the current year, with the view of making an amended statement relative to the income and expenditure. The estimate made of Customs receipts last Session was \$20,000,000. The amended estimate is \$19,500,000. There will evidently be a falling off in the receipts from Customs, arising mainly from the decreased value of the imports. Every person knows that during the last year there has been a large reduction in the values of goods imported into Canada; and I may mention as an illustration of that the article of sugar. The revenue derivable from sugar entered this year, and upon which an *ad valorem* duty of 22½ per cent. is collected, has been materially affected by the reduced value of the sugar. We know that the depression that exists in England, in France and in the United States, is such that the products of these various countries are sent into Canada at lower rates, and sold in those themselves at lower rates than the rates that prevailed a year ago. Therefore, the articles imported into Canada paying *ad valorem* duty, supposing the volume was the same, would necessarily show a reduction in Customs duties; but in addition to that there is no doubt that the energy which our own manufacturers have displayed in developing their industries has had the effect of reducing to some extent the imports. I may say, however, that in the current year the reduction in the Customs revenue will arise very largely from the decreased cost of the goods imported. It is quite true that the falling off in Customs for the first six months of the year amounted to over half a million, but I wish to call the attention of the House to one or two facts which will justify me, I think, in

estimating that at the close of the year the reduction will not be more than half a million. For instance, on the 1st of January, 1884, we increased the duty on printed cotton goods from 20 to 27½ per cent., and there was at the close of 1883, in the months of November and December, a large amount of revenue collected on these goods that did not legitimately belong to that year. The result is that in comparing the first six months of the present year with the first six months of last year, the latter will show an increased amount of revenue on that account. The return placed in my predecessor's hands (Sir Richard Cartwright) shows that for January and February there is nearly \$200,000 increase in revenue which indicates very fairly, I think, that the diminution of imports in September, October, November and December, was the result, not only of depreciation of value but of the low price of our wheat which remained in the country and was not sold or exported, causing a depression in trade that made every man in business feel it was wise to import only what he absolutely wanted during that period. But since then, a considerable portion of the wheat having gone into the market and having been sent forward, things are improving, and we may fairly consider that while the deficit for the first six months was over \$500,000 in Customs duties, the imports of the second half of the year, taking into account the increase of duty on printed goods, will be such that we may fairly estimate that the revenue will be from Customs duties \$19,500,000 or only half a million dollars less than the estimate of last year. The next item is that of Excise. It is estimated the revenue from Excise will be \$5,400,000. There has been some falling off in that direction which may be attributed in part to the action of a good many of the constituencies in Ontario of late, by which the amount of duty collected on spirits and malt liquors will be reduced; but it will be found before the Session closes, that the Government propose to make it up to some extent in another way, in Excise duties, a portion at least, of the money we are likely to lose this year and likely to lose to a greater extent next year on malt and spirits. It is estimated that this year, the revenue from Excise will amount to \$5,400,000. The postal service we expect to yield \$1,900,000, railways and canals \$3,000,000. The interest which last year was put down at \$750,000, will amount to \$1,900,000, with however more than an equivalent increase on the other side, because, under the authority of this House, the Government floated a loan by which money was raised to be advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This increased, of course, the amount of interest payable by us, to a very considerable extent, but it increased on the credit side, the receipts from the estimate of \$750,000 to \$1,900,000. From the miscellaneous items we expect to obtain \$800,000, as estimated last Session; and the lands in the North-West, from which I estimate we would obtain nearly a million dollars, I now have to estimate at \$500,000, making altogether \$33,000,000 revenue, with an estimated expenditure of \$32,850,000. The receipts from interest for the present year will be less than the charge for interest, because there will be, between March and the first of July, a portion of the debt of the Canadian Pacific Railway bearing interest, but the interest, however, is not payable until September. Consequently the surplus is reduced to the extent of \$300,000 from that fact. The estimated expenditure is \$32,850,000, leaving \$150,000 surplus for the present year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Including Dominion lands.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; including receipts from Dominion lands. I trust that hon. gentlemen who complained that we were unnecessarily collecting taxes from the people, two or three years ago, will be satisfied now, as as the receipts and expenditure are very close for the

current year. The increases in our expenditure are the following: The interest will be increased about \$550,000, but practically about \$250,000; the expenses on account of Indians \$250,000; subsidies to Provinces in excess of what was paid last year and under the Act of last Session, \$425,000. Then there will probably be a decrease in the immigration expenses of this year of \$100,000, but at all events the estimate now is that the revenue will be \$33,000,000 and the expenditure \$32,850,000. Before I pass to the next year I think it but right that I should state to the House something with reference to the loan issued last summer and the temporary loans made since then. The loan made last summer netted to the Government \$22,500,000 or thereabouts. The temporary loans made since that time amount to \$12,500,000, making altogether \$35,000,000. I think it right to state to the House how this money has been used and for what purposes it has been expended. Since the 1st of March last we have paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway, under contracts of Mr. Onderdonk, \$3,379,873, on account of the Canadian Pacific Railway subsidy, \$8,386,418; to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, on loan account, \$19,459,000; redemption of debt \$3,991,056; total \$35,216,347. The members of the House may wish to know the course the Government are likely to pursue with reference to the maturing liabilities bearing 5 per cent. interest, as well as with reference to the floating debt. There are \$25,000,000 of the present 5 per cent. loan in the hands of the public. The balance of about \$7,000,000 is held by the Government in the sinking fund, and therefore, of the loan which matures in June next, \$25,000,000 must be provided for either by the payment to the holders direct or by some other arrangement by which other bonds will be exchanged. I am not in a position to state definitely which course the Government will take, but it has been suggested that the Government should offer to the holders of 5 per cent. bonds, debentures payable in 7 or 10 years, in exchange for the 5 per cent. debentures that they hold. The Government look upon this proposition somewhat favorably because, in 1891, the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway will be payable. When the Canadian Pacific Railway has been completed and its value fully established, arrangements will, no doubt, be made by which the mortgage which we hold upon it will be paid. If we issue debentures payable in 30 or 50 years, the Government would have to go into the market and buy back debentures at an advanced rate. At any rate, it would put the Government in a position, with a very short time intervening, to make arrangements for these \$25,000,000; and then it is suggested that by the issue of Treasury bills we could provide for the temporary loans made in Canada and in England, so that in fact the Government may not be required to place on the London market any debentures during the present calendar year, except for the redemption of the \$25,000,000, due on the 1st July next. At all events we will be in a position to provide for our maturing liabilities without materially depressing the value and character of our securities. Now, I will pass from the amended estimate for the current year to the estimate of income and expenditure for the next year. The Government estimate that the receipts from Customs will be what we have estimated for the present year, \$19,500,000. We expect that Excise will not yield quite as much as in the present year from the fact that, on the 1st May next, several districts will come under the operation of the Scott Act, and it is natural to expect that the consumption of spirits and malt liquors will diminish and that there will be a decrease of revenue on that account. The receipts from Post Office we estimate at \$1,950,000; from Railways and Canals, \$3,000,000. It is true that we are running seventy or eighty miles more of railway than we were last year, that is, the road which was purchased from the Government of Nova Scotia; but we have not estimated any increase of revenue, because the Minister of Railways

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

puts down the receipts for the Intercolonial Railway at \$100,000 less than for the current year. For interest, we estimate \$1,950,000. I may say here that the interest will not be as large as in the present year, because we are receiving interest this year on \$7,000,000 of sinking fund debentures, which will be cancelled on the 1st July next, and therefore, while we shall receive the whole of the interest from the Canadian Pacific Railway next year, it will only increase the receipts \$50,000, but the payments on the other side will be diminished in the like proportion. We estimate miscellaneous receipts at \$700,000; and lands, &c., North-West, at \$700,000, instead of \$500,000 for this year. The estimate for the current year and next year of the proceeds from lands in the North-West is only one-third of the amount which will fall due on the pre-emption lands within that period. The expenditure is estimated at \$31,757,032, leaving an estimated surplus of \$1,242,968. The supplementary estimates may reduce this surplus to \$700,000, and, if that should be the case, the taxation necessary for the next year will be \$24,000,000, and that, on a population of 4,800,000, is just \$5 per head, which is 12 cents more per head than the sum required during 1874 to 1879, but we, during the next year, will give to the different Provinces of the Dominion more than the 12 cents per head, under the action of last Session, for local expenditure and local benefit. Then the net interest which we will have to provide during the next year will be \$7,500,000, and that, divided by 4,800,000, is \$1.56½ per head of the population, or 1½ cents more, after the Canadian Pacific Railway is completed, after all the money is paid that we are bound to contribute for the construction of that work, after many millions of dollars have been expended in the enlargement of our canals, after six or seven millions of dollars have been expended in the completion and extension of the Intercolonial Railway, than was paid in 1878-79. It strikes me this should be considered a somewhat satisfactory condition of affairs. Many of us, when we agreed to contribute \$25,000,000 for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to spend \$38,000,000 more for the construction and completion of sections to be handed over to that company, were somewhat alarmed at the responsibility that we assumed. In the financial statements that have been made from time to time with reference to the completion of that work, we have all been basing those estimates upon the completion of that work in 1891; and it can quite well be understood why, in the current year, we have found it necessary to borrow more money than was anticipated and to increase the interest on the net debt of the country, from the fact that that work has been carried on with such wonderful rapidity towards completion. Many argue that it was unwise to press on this work so rapidly, and that it would have been better to spread the expenditure over a greater number of years. But when we consider, Mr. Speaker, that with 1½ cents per head of increased taxation in the shape of interest upon the debt; when we consider that with 12 cents per head of increased taxation next year, and that for the relief of the Provincial Treasuries, we will be able to complete this work—and the taxation necessary for the payment of interest is practically but a cent or two in excess of what it was in 1879-80; when we consider that the 150,000,000 acres of land that we have opened up for settlement in that country—which was comparatively worthless without the railway, and which will probably give us a return equal to our contribution to its construction, I think that with such a showing every man will feel that it was in the interests of this country that the work should be completed rapidly and expeditiously, in order that we may enjoy the advantages to be derived from the completion of that road, and that some of us who are now growing grey may yet live to enjoy its benefits. But before dealing with the evidences to which I refer

of the prosperity of this country—"evidences of prosperity!" I hear an hon. member say. Yes, the evidences of prosperity, not perhaps as great in every respect as we could desire, but evidence of prosperity in advance of that which is enjoyed by any other country in the world. Before I proceed to give the evidence on which I base that opinion, I desire to submit to the House the resolutions with reference to changes in the Tariff that the Government have thought desirable to submit for your consideration. I may say that the first sheet or two of these resolutions are confined to articles that are placed upon the free list or to articles that have been made free by Order in Council, and it was thought better by the Government that Parliament should be asked to assent to them rather than allow them to remain as Orders in Council, and therefore we propose that they shall become part of the statutes of the Dominion of Canada by which the concessions will become more generally known. Therefore I am in the first place, simply giving a list of articles that are at present free, but which we desire to be placed on the free list under statute.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Have you that paper ready for distribution?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I have not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It has been the custom to distribute them when you move resolutions.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will lay it on the Table. There are reasons why it was not desirable to distribute it this afternoon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Usually when we have introduced these changes—of course I did not expect the hon. gentleman would present them to the House until he had them in his hands—but usually speaking, those sheets have been sent all around the House just as you explained them to the House. You are not prepared to do that, I suppose?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If that has been usual, then my memory is at fault.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I did it two or three times.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not know what course the hon. gentleman may have pursued, but since I have had the honor of occupying this position I do not recollect of having done so, although it may be an omission on my part.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am not blaming the hon. gentleman.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. These are the resolutions:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the tariff of Customs duties and schedule of free goods as follows: By adding to the free list, Schedule B, the following articles now admitted free by Orders in Council under authority of sub-section 12, of section 230 of the Customs Act, 1883, as coke, when used in Canadian manufactures only; woollen rags; steel, imported for use in the manufacture of skates, musk, in pods or in grains; white shellac, for manufacturing purposes; jute cloth, as taken from the loom, neither pressed, mangled, calendered, nor in any way finished, and not less than 42 inches wide when imported to be manufactured into bags only; salt cake, being a sulphate of soda, when imported by manufacturers of glass and soap for their own use in their own works; "foot grease" the refuse of the cotton seed after the oil is pressed out; tagging metal, plain, japanned or coated, in coils not over 1½ inches in width, when imported by manufacturers of shoes and corset laces for use in their factories; locust beans, for the manufacture of horse and cattle food; hoop iron, not exceeding ¾ of an inch in width, and being No. 25 gauge, or thinner, used for the manufacture of tubular rivets; buckram, for the manufacture of hat and bonnet shapes; recovered rubber and rubber substitute; silver and German silver, in sheets, for manufacturing purposes; steel of No. 20 gauge and thinner, but not thinner than No. 20 gauge, to be used in the manufacture of corset steels, clock springs, and shoe shanks, when imported by the manufacturers of such articles for use in their factories; cotton finer than No. 40, unbleached, bleached or dyed, and not finer than No. 60, for the manufacture of Italian cloths and worsted fabrics; steel, in sheets of not less than 11 or over 18 wire gauge, and costing not less than \$75 per ton of 2,240 pounds, when imported by manufac-

turers of shovels and spades for use exclusively in such manufacture in their own factories; red liquor, a crude acetate of alumina, prepared from pyroligneous acid for dyeing and calico printing; iron liquor, solution of acetate of iron, for dyeing and calico printing.

Also, by adding the following unenumerated articles to the free list. Precious stones, viz.:

Agate, amethyst, aqua marine, blood stone, carbuncle, cats eyes, cameo, coral, cornelian, crystal, crysolite, crocodolite, emerald, garnet, intaglio, inlaid or incrustated stones, onyx, opal, pearl, ruby, sardonyx, sapphire, topaz and turquoise, not polished nor otherwise manufactured.

Some of these precious stones are named in the present tariff, but there are others not named, and a question has arisen with regard to them. Therefore, agates, amethysts, etc., are all named when not dressed or polished, as free, in order to prevent difficulties in working out the Tariff.

Bichromate of soda, sulphate of iron (copperas), indigo auxiliary, fancy grasses, dried but not colored or otherwise; oil cake meal, paintings in oil or water colors, the production of Canadian artists, under regulations to be made by the Minister of Customs.

Now, Canadian artists go to Paris or Rome, and execute paintings while there, and we thought it right, that when they brought them home to Canada, they should be admitted free. At present they are subject to a duty. By adding to the following articles now on the free list, the explanations and additions attached to each respectively: Bolting cloths, of silk or worsted, not made up. At present the question arises as to whether brass bolting cloth should not be admitted free, and it is in order to settle this question that bolting cloth, silk or worsted should be specified. Borax, not ground or otherwise manufactured. Articles have been admitted as borax which have been found to contain very little of that substance, and therefore the article dealt with by this resolution is confined to unground borax. Duck for belting and hose, when imported by manufacturers of rubber goods for use in their factories; mineral water, natural, not in bottle; pitch, that is from pine, in packages of not less than 15 gallons. It has been found that attempts have been made to enter as pitch articles for medicinal purposes in smaller packages, and it is in order to define what was no doubt the intention of Parliament, that we now declare that pitch in barrels only shall be admitted free. Pumice and pumice stone, ground or unground. A question has arisen between the different collectors as to whether ground pumice stone is a manufactured article, and we now place both ground and unground on the free list. Quercitron or extract of oak bark, for tanning; resin, in packages of not less than 15 gallons; steel railway bars or rails, not including tram or street rails. The Customs Department have for years decided that tram or street rails are subject to duty. They have ruled to that effect. But we ask for a declaration by Parliament on the point, so that no question can arise in the future. Tar, pine, in packages of not less than 15 gallons. We come now to articles in regard to which we propose to change the duty. By repealing all duties chargeable under any Act now in force or any of the articles hereinafter mentioned, except so far as they are the same as those hereinafter mentioned. Costume cloths, serges and similar fabrics, under 25 inches wide, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. We now come to the wincey question, which it has been found almost impossible to solve, and as parties are now manufacturing this class of goods in Canada we propose to place the duty at 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. Pickles and sauces increased from 20 to 25 per cent. *ad valorem*; bottles pay 30 per cent. and vinegar pays a higher rate than 20 per cent. Those engaged in the trade therefore very properly ask that they should be placed in a fair position, and we propose to place the duty at 25 per cent. Barrels containing petroleum or its products, or any mixture of which petroleum is a part, a specific duty of 40 cent each. A difficulty has arisen with respect to the value of barrels

and this change is the solution of that difficulty. Cutlery, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. In 1879 cutlery was not made in Canada and it was left at the regular tariff rate. Cutlery, knives and forks, are now made extensively here, and it is proposed to give the makers the benefit of another 5 per cent. Red prussiate of potash, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*. Mouldings of wood, plain, 25 per cent.; 25 per cent. is the present rate of duty on plain wood mouldings, but mouldings are introduced in a finished condition, and all that is required to convert them into picture frames is to cut them into certain lengths and put them together. Picture frames come under the head of furniture, for which the duty is 35 per cent. For the future, mouldings, gilded or otherwise advanced in manufacture, will be charged 30 per cent., being an increase of 5 per cent. Imitations of precious stones, not set, 10 per cent. instead of 20 per cent. Jewellery will remain at 20 per cent., because if a higher duty was imposed much smuggling would occur. We do not, therefore, propose to add anything to jewellery, but to give Canadian manufacturers the benefit of 10 per cent. on imitation precious stones. Manilla hoods, 20 per cent. instead of 25 per cent. This is an article which will be imported and finished in Canada. Umbrellas, parasols and sun shades of all kinds and materials, 30 per cent. At present the manufacturers have to pay 30 per cent. on silk, and we shall be able to get over the difficulty experienced by the Customs Department by placing all these goods at one rate of duty. China and porcelainware, 30 per cent. This is an increase of 5 per cent. Chinaware paid less duty than the coarser now manufactured in Canada, and it is proposed to remedy the anomaly by placing all at 30 per cent. House furnishing hardware, 30 per cent. Difficulty has arisen in connection with this matter. For instance, some articles have been entered at 20 per cent., as castings, and in order to remove the difficulty all furnishing hardware will be 30 per cent. Chains, iron or steel, over $\frac{9}{16}$ inch in diameter, 5 per cent. They are now charged 5 per cent. *ad valorem* when used for ships, but it is found that parties import this article in connection with the lumber trade, and therefore we propose to place all articles of this class at 5 per cent. Acid, acetic, specific duty of 25 cents per imperial gallon and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. It has been found that importers have brought in a gallon of acetic acid of sufficient strength to make 20 gallons of vinegar, and it has much interfered with the vinegar manufacturers as well as revenue. Tissue paper, white and colored, when imported by manufacturers of artificial flowers for use in their factories, 10 per cent. Glucose syrup, 2 cents per lb. Carpets, Brussels, tapestry, Dutch, Venetian and damask, 25 per cent. Plate glass, not colored, in panes not over 30 square feet, 6 cents per square foot; plate glass, in panes over 30 and not over 70 square feet, 8 cents per square foot; plate glass, in panes over 70 square feet, 9 cents per square foot. Colored labels, for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, confectionery and other goods, also tickets, posters, advertising bills and folders, 10 cents per lb. and 20 per cent.; sheet iron, hollow ware, and all manufactures of sheet iron not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. These goods now pay that amount, but owing to the different rulings at different ports it was considered advisable to name them, and thus to enable the departments to escape the difficulties which now beset them in that respect. Asbestos in any form other than crude, and all manufactures thereof, 25 per cent. This article is now manufactured in Canada; the duty in the United States is 25 per cent., and as we have plenty of the raw material it has been considered advisable to increase the duty. Axle grease, and similar combinations, a specific duty of 1 cent per pound; cotton bed quilts, exclusive of counterpanes and woven quilts, 27½ per cent., *ad valorem*; print cottons now pay 27½ per cent., and if these articles were made in the country the manufacturers would have to buy the material here, or import it at 27½ per cent.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

duty, and the duty collected on counterpanes would only be 20 per cent., so that this change will place them in the same position as the manufacturers of print cotton. Extract of fluid beef, not medicated, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*. This article is being made in Canada successfully, and it is considered fair to give them the benefit of the additional 5 per cent. It is quite clear from the returns received down to the present time and from the adoption of the Scott Act by so many districts that we will lose a considerable Excise revenue next year; and as cigars manufactured in the Dominion of Canada to-day pay into the Treasury but 10 per cent. of their value of Excise duty, it was thought, as the general revenue tariff is 20 per cent., that the Government might fairly collect from cigars a portion of the revenue they will lose on spirits and malt. It is proposed that on cigars of all descriptions, made in whole or in part from foreign or imported leaf tobacco, or any substitute therefor, an excise duty of \$6 per thousand—which is double the duty at present paid, making it about 20 per cent. that the consumer will have to pay instead of 10. On cigars of all descriptions made solely from tobacco grown in Canada, and in manufactories where no foreign leaf is used or kept, the duty shall be \$3 per thousand instead of \$1.50. On wet snuff a specific duty of 12 cents, when put up in packages of less than five pounds. The present duty is 8 cents. The trade are anxious to put up snuff in small packages, and to pay the additional duty, and we are willing to take the money and let them have the advantage. On cigars and cigarettes, the Customs duty, specific, to be just double what it is now. It is now 60 cents per pound, and the new duty will be \$1.20 specific and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. These are the propositions by which we expect to get back a considerable portion of the money we are liable to lose on spirits and malt liquors during next year. Then we propose the following resolution:—

Resolved, that it is expedient to repeal so much of Schedule A of chapter 15, 42 Victoria, as imposes a duty of 10 per cent. *ad valorem* on "endless felt for paper makers."

This article is now made in Canada, and it is proposed to strike out that exception, and as the manufacturers are prepared to furnish it at a reasonable price, there is no reason why they should not be permitted to do so. Further:

And the following parts of chapter 13, 46 Victoria, intituled, "An Act further to amend the tariff of duties of Customs," viz:—Item number 7, of section 2, and all of section 5, of the said Act; also to repeal section 9, chapter 15, 42 Victoria, intituled, "An Act to alter the duties of Customs and Excise," and to enact as follows:—In determining the dutiable value of goods, there shall be added to the actual wholesale price, or fair market value thereof—at the time of exportation—in the principal markets of the country from whence the same has been imported into Canada, all costs of inland transportation, shipment and trans-shipment, whether by land or by water, with all expenses included from the places of growth, production or manufacture, to the vessel in which shipment is made, and to and at the port from which such vessel finally clears for her outward voyage direct to Canada.

It will be remembered that from the application of this principle Great Britain was exempted, and when in England, last year, a deputation waited on me at Liverpool, pointing out the disadvantage under which they were placed by this provision which was intended for their benefit. Great difficulties have resulted from the importation of iron and the charges on it, and the merchants of Liverpool begged that we should either place a specific duty on iron or make the duty payable on the cost on board ship, and thereby obviate the difficulty which existed in Great Britain on this subject. It is proposed to make this change:

When any manufactured article is imported into Canada in separate parts, each such part shall be charged with the same rate of duty as the finished article, on a proportionate valuation, and when the duty chargeable thereon is specific or specific and *ad valorem*, an average rate of *ad valorem* duty equal to the specific or specific and *ad valorem* duty so chargeable shall be ascertained and charged upon such parts of manufactures.

There has been an attempt to bring in certain articles of manufacture and to evade the payment of the duties which Parliament intended to impose. It is proposed that we also add partridges, prairie fowl and woodcock to the articles the exportation of which is now prohibited. It is found that the shooting of these birds has been prohibited for a time in most of the States of the Union, and the result is that we have been overrun by people during the last year, who buy the birds and encourage their destruction. Before the adoption of the system of freezing the birds there was only a limited period after the frost set in during which they could export them; but they have established places at which they have freezing houses, and they have taken them in by thousands and sent them out of the country in that frozen condition. It is therefore thought necessary to take this step, in order to prevent the utter extermination of these birds.

Mr. MITCHELL. Have you nothing about cornmeal and flour?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The next change is as follows:

Resolved, that it is expedient to prohibit the importation into Canada of all goods manufactured or produced by prison labor, or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, gaol or penitentiary, and to attach a penalty to any such importation.

The Government have thought it advisable to ask Parliament to consider this question, because there are three large prisons in the United States in which labor is employed in manufacturing articles which are largely sent into Canada. They will not interfere with their own manufactures at home, and were we to double the duty they would, perhaps, still continue to send in the goods, to the destruction of the industries of the country; for while the honest labor of the country should receive, and has been receiving, \$2 per day, those who hire prison labour pay only 35 cents per day. It has been considered advisable, in justice to the honest and industrious artisan of Canada, that he should be protected from that kind of labor.

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that on and after the 1st day of July next (1885) all fish imported shall be chargeable with, and there shall be collected thereon, the following rates of duty, viz.:-

- Mackerel, 1 cent per pound.
- Herring, pickled or salted, 1½ cents per pound.
- Salmon, pickled, 1 cent per pound.
- All other fish pickled, in barrels, 1 cent per pound.
- Foreign codfish, imported otherwise than in barrels or half barrels, whether fresh, smoked, dried salted or pickled, not especially enumerated or provided for by this Act, 50 cents per 100 pounds.

We have adopted the exact words of the American Tariff and the rate at present imposed in the United States, and unless some arrangements are made in the meantime, it is intended, on the 1st of July next, to collect on the fish named when imported from our American neighbors the same duty that they will collect from us after that date.

Anchovies and sardines, packed in oil or otherwise, in tin boxes measuring not more than 5 inches long, 4 inches wide and 3½ inches deep, 5 cents per whole box.

Their duty is 10 cents; but it was thought that rate would be a practical prohibition, and therefore we placed on the different sized boxes of sardines and anchovies only half the duty they collect.

In half boxes measuring not more than five inches long, four inches wide and one and five-eighths deep, 2½ cents each; and in quarter boxes measuring not more than four inches and three-quarters long, three and one-half inches wide and one and a-quarter deep, 2 cents each; when imported in any other form, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Fish preserved in oil, except anchovies and sardines, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Salmon and all other fish prepared or preserved, not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Oil, spermacetti, whale and other fish oils, and all other articles the produce of the fisheries, not specially provided for, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

These are the terms exactly of their Act, but we add this provision:

Provided that the whole or part of the said duties hereby imposed may be remitted upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the Governments of the United States and the island of Newfoundland, or either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in said countries.

In the case of Newfoundland, for instance, there may be no great object in their imposing duties on Canadian fish; but it may be in the interest of Canada to make arrangements with the Government of that colony that in return for a reduction of duties on flour or other products of Canada, we will reduce or remove the duty on fish imported from Newfoundland. We are naturally anxious to have all the trade possible with Newfoundland, and also with the United States, but on equitable terms.

Mr. CHARLTON. If the Finance Minister will allow me, I will call his attention to a precedent with regard to these tariff resolutions, which, I believe, he would have been wise to follow. I find in the Budget Speech of my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) made in 1874—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to consider for a few moments evidence to show that the Dominion of Canada during the last five years, and even during the last year, has been in a much more hopeful condition than hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe. I take, for instance, the deposits in the chartered banks of Canada.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would the hon. Minister, before he proceeds to that branch of the subject, inform us whether he proposes to take the duty off cornmeal, or to increase the duty on flour.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not propose to deal with that question to-night.

CHARTERED BANKS.

Increase in peoples' deposit in chartered banks from 1st Jan., 1874, to 1st Jan., 1879	\$8,499,942 49
Increase of deposits in same banks from 1st Jan., 1879, to 1st Jan., 1884.....	25,903,564 75

SAVINGS BANK DEPOSITS.

Increase in savings bank deposits over withdrawals from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879	\$1,997,422 37
Increase in same from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884.....	20,009,853 84

BUILDING AND LOAN COMPANIES.

Increase in deposits and purchase of debentures in Canada between 1st Jan., 1884, and 1st Jan., 1879	\$5,787,516 76
Increase of same from 1st Jan., 1879, to 1st Jan., 1884	9,512,734 93

RECAPITULATION.

From 1874 to 1879.		From 1879 to 1884.	
Deposits in chartered banks ...	\$8,499,942	Deposits in chartered banks ...	\$25,903,354
Deposits in savings banks	1,997,422	Deposits in savings banks	20,009,658
Railway and loan companies.....	5,787,516	Railway and loan companies.....	9,512,781
	<u>\$16,284,940</u>		<u>\$56,425,936</u>

It may be said by my predecessor that the increased amount of deposits in saving banks is no evidence of the prosperity of the country. But I would call the hon. member's attention to a letter he addressed to intending investors in Canadian securities in 1875, in which he pointed out to capi-

talists that there had been a very great increase in the deposits in the banks and saving banks of the country. Therefore, I hope the hon. gentleman will consider it some evidence of the prosperity of the country and the financial condition of the people that they have increased their deposits in the banks from \$16,000,000 to \$55,000,000. The capital expended on factories since 1878-79, as shown by the return presented, is something like \$44,000,000. So that, from 1879 down to the end of June last, by the deposits in chartered banks, in saving banks and loan companies, by the purchase of loan companies' debentures, and by expenditure in factories, the people of this country have invested about \$100,000,000 in the manner stated. I might go further and point to the additional mileage of railways which has been built and which has involved the expenditure of a large sum of money. I might point to the different cities in Canada, where millions have been expended in the construction of houses that have found tenants since 1879, when those alongside of the recent erections were previously to let but now occupied. We might go further and speak of the other investments since 1879 to show that the people of Canada, and especially the masses of the people, must have had a very handsome surplus during those periods from their earnings which they have thus laid by for a wet day. An hon. gentleman opposite referred to what he termed the exorbitant rate of interest that is paid to depositors in the savings banks as one of the reasons for increased deposits. When I called his attention to the fact that we offered less inducements since 1880 to depositors than our predecessors had, the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) rose and with some degree of triumph expressed in his face said: Well, we simply continued the policy pursued by our predecessors. We, on this side, considered it a compliment that they should have found it desirable in the interests of the country to follow our precedent, but I do not know that it was a justification for their course, considering the line they have taken in complaining of the lower rate now paid. It has been said that a great injustice has been done to the people of the country, especially to the banks of the country, and to the men who obtain discounts, because the Government now give 4 per cent.—formerly, in many cases they gave 5, but to-day, we only pay interest beginning the month after the deposit is made. No interest is paid on any deposit during the month in which it is deposited. It is said this is an exorbitant rate, that we should not pay more than 3 per cent., and that then the banks would have more money to loan to their customers. If we will look at the returns of the banks, we will find that the most of them have as much money to loan as they can find good customers for. The Government are prepared to take this stand, that while it is of the utmost importance to obtain for Canada money on the lowest terms possible, the depositors of small sums, the hard working people of the country, the men and women who want a safe place to deposit their money, should have the fullest amount of interest this country is warranted in giving. An hon. gentleman said why the rate of interest has been reduced from 30 to 40 per cent. since 1878. I examined the rate of interest charged by the banks in 1878, and I find that it is just the same as it is to-day. There is, therefore, no reason why we should say to the 100,000 depositors you must take less than 4 per cent., in order that the banks may make more money out of their deposits. No, Sir, the policy of this Government is to grant the greatest benefit possible to the largest number of persons, and we feel that in paying 4 per cent. interest to the depositors we are paying them a fair rate of interest, taking all things into consideration. In 1879 what was the value of bank stocks compared with their values to-day? This paper has been handed to me by a gentleman who I asked to look into this question:

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

PRICES OF BANK STOCKS IN MONTREAL.

	Jan. 1st, 1879.	Jan. 1st, 1885.
Bank of Montreal.....	139	187
Molsons Bank.....	62	109
Merchants Bank.....	79	109
Eastern Townships.....	92½	107½
Commerce.....	101	117
Toronto Bank.....	118	175
Telegraph Company.....	185½	113

This gives some evidence of the prosperity of those institutions during the last few years.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Take 1878.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. In 1878 the weeding out of the bad debts made during the previous years led, of course, to a reduction in the value of stocks, but when these bad debts were ascertained, they started in 1879 knowing exactly the basis upon which they stood. It would appear that the business operations of the Dominion had not been disastrous during the last five years, judging by the statement I have just given. I stated something about the rate of interest charged by the banks in 1884. The following statement shows it:—

1884—Rates of discount at Montreal, 7 to 8 per cent. throughout the year.
Loans on stock collateral varied from 5 to 6 per cent.
1879—Commercial discount easy at 7 to 8 per cent. for the first 7 months of the year; firm at same rates during the fall and easy again after harvest.
Stock loans range from 4 to 6 per cent., until December, when they advanced to 6 and 7 per cent.

We now come to the mileage of railways, to show what has been done during the last ten years. The following statement shows the railway mileage from 1875 to 1884, constructed and open. Statement of railway mileage, 1875 to 1884:

	Constructed. Miles.	Opened. Miles.
1875.....	4,800
1876.....	5,157
1877.....	5,574
1878.....	6,865	6,143
1879.....	7,077	6,484
1880.....	7,229	6,891
1881.....	7,596	7,260
1882.....	8,069	7,530
1883.....	9,066	8,805
1884.....	9,949	9,575

This gives some evidence, I think, of the development of the country. Then with reference to the number of failures in Canada of which we have heard so much lately, there has been a very considerable increase; but if we take the five years from 1875 to 1879 inclusive, we find that the number of failures was 9,185, with liabilities amounting to \$143,128,724. From 1879 to 1885 there were 5,040 failures, with liabilities of \$57,467,724. The number of people engaged in business in 1884 in Canada was 69,924, so that the number of failures for that year would be equal to one failure for every 53 traders. Taking 56,000 traders, the number engaged in business during the five years ending 31st December, 1879, the average would be equal to one failure to 30½ traders; and taking 69,924 traders as the basis of the five years ending 31st December, 1885, the average would be equal to one failure to 75½ traders. Now a word or two as to the general condition of the country, and of the laborers of the country. I have before me an extract made recently from a speech of the leader of the Opposition, and I have a statement in tabulated form of the value of the different classes of labor in Canada, taken from the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario. There may be a question raised by the Opposition as to the statement made by the commissioners, that they were prepared by the employés of the Dominion Government, but as regards the statement made up in the Bureau

of Statistics of Ontario, I am quite sure hon. gentlemen opposite will accept it as quite correct. Mr. Blake, speaking at Toronto, attributed the prosperity of that city in part to the absence of highly protected manufactures, and as a consequence labor is better paid there than in other cities. I would call the attention of the House to one or two important facts.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that; that is not my speech.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh, it has been given to me as taken from the *Globe*.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is a bad source to get it from.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think it is just what the hon. gentleman might say. But this is noticeable: One gentleman who has a seat on the other side of the House visits Montreal, and makes a speech to the Montreal people, pointing out the terribly distressed condition of Canada and its people, that the emigration from it is marvellous, that the taxation is something unprecedented, and in making his statement he finds it necessary, if correctly reported, to refer to the fact that in Montreal perhaps they had not experienced as much of this depression as they had elsewhere. I can imagine that, comparing the condition of Montreal to-day with what it was in 1878, a great many of that audience, if they were told they were in a worse condition than they were in 1878, would question the statement somewhat. It was found necessary for the hon. gentleman to refer to that fact, and, supposing that this report also was correct, it was an evidence that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, speaking in Toronto, found it necessary to call the attention of the audience to the fact that matters were not as bad in Toronto as they were in some other places.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear. So I did.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is correct, then. That is very natural—that is what I wanted to get at—that matters in Toronto were better than they were elsewhere; and the statement which was given to me, and which he says is not correct—and, of course, I accept his statement—is that this was attributable to the fact that there were not as many highly protected industries there.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman added, “and that therefore labor was better paid there.” I said that I did not make that statement.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. But still Toronto was in a better condition; matters were better in Toronto than in other places, because there were not so many highly protected industries there.

Mr. BLAKE. No; I did not say that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. If the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) were making a speech in Brantford, where I am informed a quarter of a million of dollars have been expended in buildings in the last year, he would, no doubt, say that Brantford is an exception to other places. It would appear that, wherever hon. gentlemen go, it is necessary to show that the locality they visit is a favored locality. I think that, if I wanted to make a case, I would go to the locality which was the worst, and would point out to them their condition, and if they were warranted in the statement that it was the result of the National Policy, it would be endorsed by them and would have a greater effect. What said the hon. the leader of the Opposition:—

“I have no hesitation in saying to you that there is one test which I have always sought to supply when I have desired to consider what the material condition of the country was, and that test was, what is the material condition of the lowest class of honest labor in the country?”

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, and I endorse the whole of it:

“If I find the lowest class so fairly paid that there is enough for the support of a man and those dependent upon him, and something to lay up for a rainy day, I know that I need enquire no further.”

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Well, I may say that the tables show a state of affairs which will enable me to comfort the hon. gentleman by showing it to him. This is taken from the statement of the Bureau of Statistics of Ontario, and it shows that the blacksmiths and their helpers, the boiler makers and their helpers, the bricklayers, the carriage-builders, the carpenters, the cigar makers, the cotton mill men and their laborers, the machinists, the moulders, the painters, the plasterers and their laborers, the printers, the sewing machine men, the tin and coppersmiths and the tool-makers, have a surplus averaging \$18 at the end of the year, comparing the receipts with their expenses during the year. This will be a comfort, I am sure, to the hon. gentleman. It appears that the plasterers are put down as costing more to live than any of the others. I do not know why that should be the case. Of course, they are not employed as many days in the year as some others, and their receipts would be less, but I cannot understand why they should expend more than the others. It is stated that the laborer works 265 days in the year, that he averages \$1.13 per day, that his yearly wages are \$304, and his expenditure \$255, which leaves \$49 for him as a surplus at the end of the year, and for a rainy day. This statement should make the hon. gentleman supremely happy. He should accept the condition of Ontario at least as prosperous, when the laborer receives a surplus over his actual wants and expenses. The leader of the Opposition, referring to the state of the country generally, in his speech on the Address, alluded to the city of St. John, the constituency I have the honor of representing. I cannot take exception to the tone of his language on that occasion, but his declaration was that, for forty years, as he had been informed, matters had not been as bad in the city of St. John as they are at present. I think I know something of the city of St. John as far back as forty years, and I have seen several periods since 1845 when the people of that city were in a much worse condition than they are to-day. I recollect when the laborers in that city, in order that they might be saved from great want, were employed by the corporation at 1s. 6d., or 30 cents a day to cut down the rocks of that city. I know that, under the peculiar circumstances of the country at that particular time, there was great want felt everywhere throughout the Province. I know there was great depression. I know that has occurred two or three times since the date to which I refer, but to a less limited extent. Nothing of that kind exists at the present day. But I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that the city of St. John especially labors at this moment under certain disadvantages. Previous to 1873, there was a large ship-building interest in that Province. I know that in 1854 there were constructed 106,000 tons of vessels. It was then a very important industry in the Maritime Provinces, and especially in the Province of New Brunswick. At that time the city of St. John was the principal point where deals were manufactured from logs brought there. Now, a very large portion of the deals are manufactured near Fredericton, by Mr. Gibson, in mills owned and leased by him. The result has been that owing to the depreciation in the value of shipping, owing to the decreased demand for wooden vessels, owing to the depression in the shipping interests being so great at this moment that there is scarcely any demand for even iron ships in the old country, there is but a limited number of vessels being built in the Province of New Brunswick or the city of St. John to-day. And, Sir, were it not for the new industries that are being established and that are taking the place of those that will not be

restored to the position which they occupied from 1854 to 1868, there would be in that city and Province to-day an amount of depression much greater than that which now exists. The industries to which I refer have been replaced by other industries, and other manufactures have been brought into existence, and fostered by the operation of this tariff. Perhaps, Sir, it may not be out of place for me to say that to-night, in the city of St. John, there is depression and gloom. Unhappily within the last 48 hours a representative of that city and county, and a member of this House, has been summoned hence—a gentleman with whom I acted in concert for many years, a warm and a true friend and an honorable opponent, a gentleman I regretted to separate from on political issues, a gentleman universally respected and esteemed in that city, a kind father and an affectionate husband, a most enterprising citizen, and an able and zealous member of Parliament, has been taken away and to-day that city mourns. I take this opportunity, though politically opposed to each other of late years, of paying this passing tribute to his memory, because there are few men who could be removed from the city of St. John who will be more missed, whose loss will be more deeply felt, than that of the late ex-Minister of Customs. Sir, when I look at the country to-day and think what might have been its condition if we had not, in 1879, by the action of Parliament, established new industries in Canada, I think it is not so much a question of what depression exists to-day as it is of what would have been the depression in Canada had we not adopted a policy that has brought into existence the industries that have given employment, and are giving employment at the present moment to 50,000 more men and women than were thus employed in 1878. Sir, we know perfectly well that throughout Canada almost every city has thought it advisable to spend large sums of money for sanitary purposes. Take the city of Ottawa, for instance. When we came here in 1867 it was not as healthy a city to live in as it is at present. A large sum of money has been expended in the drainage and in procuring a supply of pure water. I know, myself, as a resident of the city and a house owner, that it costs more for water than it did when I first came here. But, at the same time, the reduction in insurance upon my property has been equal to the increased taxation, and the sum expended has given increased sanitary advantages to the city. And so it is in nearly all the cities of the Dominion of Canada. Sir, suppose that an epidemic should prevail here next year; suppose the cholera should, unhappily, be introduced into the cities of Canada, and large numbers of the population should be swept off by it. Why, Sir, it would be as inconsistent for some of the inhabitants of the towns to give as an evidence of the unwisdom of the expenditure for sanitary purposes, that the mortality had been increased by reason of this epidemic, and therefore to condemn that expenditure, though the death rate was not as great as formerly, as it would be for hon. gentlemen opposite, while this epidemic of bad trade exists all over the world, and has reached us to a certain extent, to denounce the protective policy because there are a few manufacturing factories that are not employed full time, and who have a less number of men engaged in them than they had six months or a year ago. I think the country understands this question very well, and I believe it will be found necessary for hon. gentlemen opposite, wherever they go, to use the language that has been used in some other cases, namely, that the locality in which they are speaking suffers less than other localities. Sir, I must apologise to you and the House for the time I have taken in quoting so many figures in laying these matters before Parliament. On former occasions, when referring to the amount of taxation per head of the population, I have merely stated the figures, but in this case I thought it necessary, in order to fortify myself, to take figures from

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

the Public Accounts and from official documents of the United States, and submit them for your consideration, as proof of the position I have taken. I feel that whatever may be the opinion expressed by hon. gentlemen opposite, the fact that the Pacific Railway has been completed, and that the large amount of money expended on the canals in order to complete them, with the light taxation I have mentioned, warrants me in saying that the taxation of the country has not been increased. When you take into account the amount that has been contributed for the support of the Provinces by the legislation of last year, and when, notwithstanding all these liabilities so incurred, the net interest paid upon the debt is only 1 or 2 cents per head more than was paid in 1879—I say when this is known, there will be a general feeling of relief in the country and a conviction that we have obtained wonderful advantages for the Dominion of Canada in developing its resources, in increasing the value of our magnificent estate in the North-West, in laying the foundation for a powerful nation, and in enabling us to realize that we are a great and prosperous people, and at the same time are subjected to smaller taxation than almost any other country in the world. Mr. Speaker, I move that you do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into Committee on the following Resolutions:—

I. Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Tariff of Customs Duties and schedule of free goods, as follows:—

(1.) By adding to the free list Schedule B, the following articles now admitted free by Order in Council, under authority of sub-section 12 of section 230 of the Customs Act, 1883:—

Gas coke, when used in Canadian manufactures only.

Woollen rags.

Steel, imported for use in the manufacture of skates.

Musk, in pods or in grains.

White shellac, for manufacturing purposes.

Jute cloth, as taken from the loom, neither pressed, mangled, calendered, nor in any way finished, and not less than 42 inches wide, when imported to be manufactured into bags only.

Salt cake, being a sulphate of soda, when imported by manufacturers of glass and soap for their own use in their works.

"Foot Grease," the refuse of the cotton seed after the oil is pressed out.

Tagging metal, plain, japanned, or coated, in coils not over 1½ inches in width, when imported by manufacturers of shoe and corset laces for use in their factories.

Locust beans, for the manufacture of horse and cattle food.

Hoop iron, not exceeding three-eighths (¾) of an inch in width and being No. 25 gauge or thinner, used for the manufacture of tubular rivets.

Buckram, for the manufacture of hat and bonnet shapes.

Recovered rubber, and rubber substitute.

Silver and German silver in sheets for manufacturing purposes.

Steel of No. 20 gauge and thinner, but not thinner than No. 30 gauge, to be used in the manufacture of corset steels, clock springs and shoe shanks, when imported by the manufacturers of such articles for use in their factories.

Cotton yarns, finer than No. 40, unbleached, bleached, or dyed, and not finer than No. 60, for the manufacture of Italian cloths and worsted fabrics.

Steel in sheets of not less than 11 nor over 18 wire gauge, and costing not less than \$75 per ton of 2,240 lbs, when imported by manufacturers of shovels and spades for use exclusively in such manufacture in their own factories.

Red liquor, a crude acetate of alumina prepared from pyroligneous acid for dyeing and calico printing.

Iron liquor, solution of acetate of iron for dyeing and calico printing.

(2.) Also, by adding the following unenumerated articles to the free list:—

1. Precious stones, viz:—

Agate, amethyst, aqua marine, blood stone, carbuncle, cat's-eyes, cameo, cornelian, crystal, crysolite, crossolite, emerald, garnet, intaglio, inlaid or incrustated stones, onyx, opal, pearl, ruby, sardonyx, sapphire, topaz and turquoise, not polished or otherwise manufactured.

2. Bichromate of soda.

3. Sulphate of iron (copperas).

4. Indigo auxilliary.

5. Fancy grasses, dried but not colored or otherwise manufactured.

6. Oil cake meal.

7. Paintings in oil or water colors, the production of Canadian artists, under regulations to be made by the Minister of Customs.

(3.) By adding to the following articles now on the free list, the explanations and additions attached to each respectively:—

1. Bolting cloths, of silk or worsted, not made up.

2. Borax, not ground or otherwise manufactured.

3. Duck for belting and hose, when imported by manufacturers of rubber goods for use in their factories.
4. Mineral waters, natural, not in bottle.
5. Pitch (pine) in packages of not less than 15 gallons.
6. Pumice and pumite stone, ground or unground.
7. Quercitron or extract of oak bark, for tanning.
8. Resin, in packages of not less than 15 gallons.
9. Steel railway bars or rails, not including tram or street rails.
10. Tar (pine), in packages of not less than 15 gallons.

(4.) By repealing all duties chargeable under any Act now in force on any of the articles hereinafter mentioned, except so far as they are the same as those hereinafter mentioned, and substituting therefor the rates of duty hereinafter mentioned respectively:—

1. Costume cloths, serges and similar fabrics, under 25 inches wide, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
2. Winceys of all kinds, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
3. Pickles and sauces, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
4. Barrels containing petroleum, or its products, or any mixture of which petroleum is a part, a specific duty of 40 cents each.
5. Cutlery, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
6. Red prussiate of potash, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.
7. Mouldings of wood, plain, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
8. Mouldings of wood, gilded or otherwise further manufactured than plain, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.
9. Picture frames, as furniture, 35 per cent. *ad valorem*.
10. Imitation precious stones not set, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.
11. Manilla hoods, 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.
12. Umbrellas, parasols and sun shades of all kinds and materials, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.
13. China and porcelain ware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.
14. Earthenware and stoneware, brown or colored, and Rockingham ware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.
15. House furnishing hardware, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.
16. Chains (iron or steel) over $\frac{3}{8}$ of an inch in diameter, 5 per cent. *ad valorem*.
17. Acid, acetic, a specific duty of 25 cents per Imperial gallon and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.
18. Tissue paper, white and colored, when imported by manufacturers of artificial flowers for use in their factories, 10 per cent. *ad valorem*.
19. Glucose syrup, a specific duty of 2 cents per pound.
20. Carpets, viz.:—Brussels, tapestry, Dutch, Venetian and damask, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
21. Plate glass, not colored, in panes not over 30 square feet, a specific duty of 6 cents per square foot.
22. Plate glass, in panes over 30 and not over 70 square feet, 8 cents per square foot.
23. Plate glass, in panes over 70 square feet, 9 cents per square foot.
24. Colored labels, for fruit, vegetables, meat, fish, confectionery and other goods, also tickets, posters, advertising bills and folders, a specific duty of 10 cents per pound and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.
25. Sheet iron hollow ware, and all manufacturers of sheet iron, not elsewhere specified, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
26. Asbestos, in any form other than crude, and all manufacturers thereof, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.
27. Axle grease and similar compounds, a specific duty of 1 cent per pound.
28. Cotton bed quilts, not including woven quilts or counterpanes, 27½ per cent. *ad valorem*.
29. Extract or fluid beef, not medicated, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to repeal so much of Schedule A of chapter 15, 42 Victoria, as imposes a duty of 10 per cent. *ad valorem* on "endless felt for paper makers," and the following parts of chapter 13, 46 Victoria, intitled: "An Act further to amend the Tariff of Duties of Customs," viz.:—

Item No. 7 of section 2, and all of section 5 of the said Act, also to repeal section 9, chapter 15, 42 Victoria, intitled: "An Act to alter the Duties of Customs and Excise," and to enact as follows:—

(1.) In determining the dutiable value of goods, there shall be added to the actual wholesale price or fair market value thereof—at the time of exportation—in the principal markets of the country from whence the same have been imported into Canada, all cost of inland transportation, shipment and transhipment, whether by land or by water, with all expenses included from the place of growth, production or manufacture, to the vessel in which shipment is made, and to and at the port from which such vessel finally clears, for her outward voyage direct to Canada.

(2.) When any manufactured article is imported into Canada in separate parts, each such part shall be charged with the same rate of duty as the finished article on a proportionate valuation, and when the duty chargeable thereon is specific, or specific and *ad valorem*, an average rate of *ad valorem* duty, equal to the specific or specific and *ad valorem* duty so chargeable, shall be ascertained and charged upon such parts of manufactures.

Also to add *partridge, prairie fowl* and *woodcock* to the articles the exportation of which is prohibited by section 9, chapter 13, 46 Victoria.

3. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to prohibit the importation to Canada of all goods manufactured or produced by prison labor, or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, gaol or penitentiary, and to attach a penalty to any such importation.

4. *Resolved*, That it is expedient to provide that on and after the 1st day of July next (1885), all fish imported shall be chargeable with and there shall be collected thereon the following rates of duty, viz.:—

Mackerel, 1 cent per lb.

Herrings, pickled or salted, ½ cent per lb.

Salmon, pickled, 1 cent per lb.

All other fish, pickled, in barrels, 1 cent per lb.

Foreign-caught fish, imported otherwise than in barrels or half-barrels, whether fresh, smoked, dried, salted or pickled, not specially enumerated or provided for by this Act, 50 cents per 100 lbs.

Anchovies and sardines, packed in oil or otherwise, in tin boxes measuring not more than 6 inches long, 4 inches wide and 3½ inches deep, 5 cents per whole box; in half boxes, measuring not more than 5 inches long, 4 inches wide and 1½ deep, 2½ cents each; and in ¼ boxes, measuring not more than 4½ inches long, 3½ inches wide, 1½ deep, 2 cents each.

When imported in any other form, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Fish, preserved in oil, except anchovies and sardines, 30 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Salmon and all other fish, prepared or preserved, not specially enumerated or provided for in this Act, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Oil, spermaceti, whale and other fish oils, and all other articles the produce of the fisheries, not specially provided, for 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Provided that the whole or part of the said duties hereby imposed may be remitted upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the Governments of the United States and the Island of Newfoundland or either of them have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in said countries.

Resolved, That there be imposed:—

1. On cigars of all descriptions, made in whole or in part from foreign or imported leaf tobacco, or any substitute therefor, an Excise duty of \$6.000 per thousand.
2. On cigars of all descriptions made solely from tobacco grown in Canada and made in a manufactory where no foreign or imported leaf is used or kept, \$3.00 per thousand.
3. On wet snuff, a specific duty of 12 cents per lb., when put up in packages of less than 5 lbs.
4. Cigars and cigarettes, a specific duty of \$1.20 per lb., and 20 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the task that lies before me to-night is one that I fear will be a disagreeable, as well, perhaps, as of a somewhat delicate character. Up to the present time I have not considered it necessary to pay much attention to the allegations so freely and so constantly hurled across the floor by hon. Ministers and their supporters, that it was a most unpatriotic thing on our part to prick any of their bubbles, or to tell the truth when the interests of the country required it to be told. I have always held, Mr. Speaker, than when hon. gentlemen opposite say that it is unpatriotic to make any particular statements about their actions, it meant simply this, that they are aware that there is no excuse whatever which can be offered for their conduct, and, therefore, they find it convenient to charge us with want of patriotism. But, on the present occasion, I am bound to say, that taking the view I do of the situation of the country, knowing what I know, having examined the data and facts, to some of which, but only to some of which, the hon. Minister has called our attention, I could wish, if it were permitted to me, if I could reconcile it with my ideas of my duty to the people who sent me here, not to be called upon to speak, not to be required to dissect the statements which the hon. gentleman has made, not, in a word, to say here what I believe to be the real facts about the state of the country. Unfortunately, it is not permitted to me to do that. I say, unfortunately, because I know that, in the present instance, much of what I have to say may grate unpleasantly on the ears of the hon. gentleman and his supporters. I am only too well aware, that those hon. gentlemen do not like to have their attention called to certain facts, however well those facts may be known, however clearly established those facts may be, when they interfere with the pet theories which the hon. gentleman has just been elaborating. Now, Sir, I hold that the position of this country has been very seriously compromised indeed by the misconduct of hon. gentlemen opposite. I say that it is needful for us to point out the causes, because our criticisms would otherwise be valueless, and although some temporary inconvenience may be risked by such a course, still I say that it is the only course from which any permanent benefit can possibly result to the people of this country. Sir, that convic-

tion has been increased by what I must call the rash statements which have been made recently in various places both by the First Minister and by the Finance Minister. I quarrel with no man for saying the best he can of the position of the country; but I doubt if the First Minister was wise, or was well advised when, on a comparatively recent occasion in London, he intimated that it was desirable there should be a large emigration to Canada. I fear, Sir, if his words bore the weight which those of a man in his position might be expected to bear, and if many emigrants had come to Canada, even to the Province of Ontario, on the faith of the statement, and against the advice of the trades unions and the trades councils, they would have found themselves in the position in which many other emigrants found themselves who were brought out to this country at the public expense by hon. gentlemen opposite, namely, that the only way in which they could have provided for themselves was by depriving some native-born Canadian of his proper and lawful employment. I am sorry that the hon. Minister who has just sat down should have deemed it necessary on this occasion to indulge in language somewhat similar to that used by the First Minister. The First Minister, perhaps, may be excused for not knowing so much as to the condition of the country as the Finance Minister is expected to know. I am sorry, therefore, that the Finance Minister should have indulged in some of the statements in which he has indulged, and which I shall feel it my duty to analyse and dissect before I go much further. I can hardly doubt that the Finance Minister does himself know that the situation is serious, although he would not admit it to-night. Although he appeared to have chosen deliberately to shut his eyes to a great many facts which ought to have warned him, I cannot doubt that the Finance Minister does know that the position of Canada at present is very far indeed from that in which he and I would wish it to be. In the speech just made by the hon. gentleman, he brought forward, as he said himself, a great many facts, not, the House will observe, by any means so much directed to the present condition of the country, not by any means so much directed to what he supposes to be the future condition of the country, as to comparisons with a period eighteen months or two years ago. There are certain rough tests by which, I think, you can determine with pretty considerable accuracy the condition of the country at the present time, and these I mean to employ. They are tests which the hon. Minister has often used, tests which on other and more favorable occasions the Minister has found it very convenient to employ, but from which he shrunk most carefully on the present occasion. We will take, first, the state of the revenue; next, the present amount, not merely of our nominal, but of our real taxation; we will take the volume of trade, the rate of increase in our population; the profits of our leading occupations, the number of bankruptcies, the number of persons unemployed in this country, the rate of wages, bank and railway statements; we will apply these successively, and we will see what the result is. First, I call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the present condition of the revenue. In 1833 we had a revenue of \$35,794,000. In 1884 that revenue had fallen to \$31,861,000, a reduction of very nearly four million. On 1st February, 1884, our receipts amounted to \$18,846,000. On 1st February last our receipts from all sources amounted to \$18,465,000. We had lost nearly \$400,000 in receipts on the operations of those seven months. In 1833 our expenditure amounted to \$28,730,000, and in 1884 it was \$31,107,000, or a difference in those two years of nearly \$7,000,000. Our receipts were less by \$4,000,000, and our expenditure was more by about \$2,500,000. We find that on 1st February, 1884, our expenditure was \$18,026,000; on 1st February, 1885, \$19,513,000, so we are in a worse position by \$1,500,000. The hon. gentleman appeared to think that because a new tariff was about to be brought down and changes made, and

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

therefore some considerable addition had been made to our revenue in the past month, that all would be well. I call his attention to these pertinent facts. In 1876, on 1st February, we had a deficiency of \$694,000. And as the House knows, we had a deficit at the end of that year. In 1877 there was a deficit of \$304,000 on the 1st of February and a deficit at the end of the year. On the 1st of February, 1878, we had a surplus of \$706,000, but nevertheless a deficit. On the 1st of February, 1879—and the same is true of 1880—we had also very considerable deficits, and deficits also at the end of the year; and taking all those years, except perhaps the last, on the 1st of March we had a distinct surplus. So that I fear the hon. gentleman is innocently deceiving himself, and is misleading the House, if he thinks there is any fair ground for anticipating that the income of the next four months is likely so far to overpass the expenditure for the next two months as to give him any reasonable surplus, even the very moderate surplus on which I understood he calculated. Now, Sir, there is another thing to which I call the attention of the House. On the 1st of July, 1883, the gross debt of Canada stood at \$202,159,000. On the 1st of July, 1881, it had risen to \$242,000,000; on the 17th of February it was given by the hon. gentleman himself at \$258,000,000; and there is only too much reason to fear that before the 1st of July, 1885, is reached, that debt will stand at \$270,000,000, judging from the statements made in the Public Accounts, which are now in our hands. Now, Sir, I do not enter into a computation of the net debt and the net assets for this reason: that there is no possibility that I and the hon. gentleman can agree in estimating what the value of the net assets will be. But we can see for ourselves that in a little more than eighteen months that debt has increased nearly \$60,000,000, and that the probability is very strong that it will have increased \$70,000,000 between the 1st of July, 1883, and the 1st of July, 1885. And I put it to the common sense of the House, is that state of the revenue and the public debt a token of prosperity? Are those, Sir, evidences that this country is in a wholesome and healthy state? Now, Sir, as to the amount of taxation. We found that in 1884 our nominal taxation amounted to \$25,485,000; our real taxation, according to my estimate—the money taken out of the pockets of the people, which did not find its way into the Treasury—was not less than \$36,000,000; and if the statements made by the Finance Minister be correct, it was a very great deal more. Now, Sir, I come to another test; I take our volume of trade. I find that in 1873, before Prince Edward Island was admitted into the Confederacy, our total volume of trade, eleven years ago, stood at \$217,801,000. This volume which has been laid on the Table, the Trade and Navigation Returns, shows that the total volume of the trade of Canada eleven years after that time, with Prince Edward Island added to the Union, amounts to \$207,873,000. Again I ask, is that one of the evidences of rapid growth; is that one of the evidences of steadily increasing prosperity to which the hon. gentleman desires to call the attention of the people of Canada? Sir, this matter requires more attention at the hon. gentleman's hands than it has received. I find that in 1873 the exports of our own produce (and they are more favorable to him than the ordinary statement—which includes bullion and short returns) amounted to \$73,240,000. I find that in 1884, on a statement which is not varied very greatly in 1883, our total exports of our own products amounted to \$77,132,000, making the same deductions as before; so that in those eleven years, with the addition of Prince Edward Island and practically of Manitoba, our exports are almost absolutely stationary. Again I ask the hon. gentleman, does he consider the fact that in eleven years a young and growing country like Canada has not added 5 per cent. to its own exports, an evidence of rapid and growing prosperity? The hon. gentleman enlarged on the

effect that his tariff had had on our trade with Great Britain. He takes five years of bad harvests, he compares them with another five years of substantially good harvests, he adds them together, and he divides the product. I say, Sir, that this is not the way to find out how the tariff has affected our trade with Great Britain. I will tell him exactly how it has affected our trade. Of our own produce, we sold to Great Britain, in 1873, \$31,876,000; in 1884, \$37,410,000 worth. We sold \$6,000,000 more of our own produce to Great Britain in 1884 than we did in 1873, and from the people of Great Britain, with whom he desires to favor our trade, we bought, in 1873, \$68,360,000, and in 1884, deducting bullion which he imported, I suppose to replace the gold the banks have drawn from him, we imported \$41,826,000. We sold them \$6,000,000 more than we did eleven years ago and we bought from them \$26,000,000 less, and the hon. gentleman considers that a proof, I suppose, of how favorable his tariff has been to the interests of our trade with Great Britain. I apply the same rule to our exports to the United States. In 1873, deducting bullion and short returns, we sold to the people of the United States \$33,416,000 worth of goods. In 1884 we sold \$31,632,000 worth. We sold them about \$2,000,000 more than in 1873, and deducting the goods in transit, with which the hon. gentleman has no right to complicate the account, although, I believe, he did it in many of his statements, we find that in 1873 we bought from the people of the United States \$38,147,000; and in 1884 we bought \$49,785,000—and that is the way in which we improved our trade with Great Britain and in which we diminished our trade with the United States. Our trade with Great Britain is \$26,000,000 less than it was eleven years ago, and our trade with the United States is \$12,000,000 more than it was eleven years ago. And, Sir, that is not all. Our trade with Great Britain was based on a much smaller population in 1873, and our trade with the United States in 1873 was much more in our favor than appears on the trade returns. Then it was we who did the smuggling; now it is the Americans who do the smuggling into this happy country. Then a large amount of such goods were sold to the Americans, and as the hon. gentleman knows, a great amount of goods are now sold by American merchants to their customers here which do not, by any means, go through our Custom offices. Then, I will give him another proof of how rapidly this country has improved under his fostering care. In 1878, of our own manufactures—and I hope he will attend to it—we sold \$4,127,000 worth; in 1884, of our own manufactures we sold \$3,500,000 worth—a most remarkable evidence of the skill of the hon. gentleman in fostering our general trade. But, Sir, there is another, and a much more important thing to which I call his attention, and it is this: The hon. gentleman has assumed a rate of increase of our population with which I can in no respect concur. The hon. gentleman stated just now that the whole population of Canada was 4,800,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Next year.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What may happen between this and next year heaven only knows. I do not suppose the hon. gentleman pretends to omniscience though he may pretend to omnipotence in the matter of the tariff; but I can tell him that there is the strongest ground, unhappily, for believing that since 1881, since the last census was taken, the increase of population in Canada has been exceedingly small, and it is very doubtful, indeed, if to-day, exclusive of Indians, there are 4,400,000 people resident in Canada. Now, Sir, I am not going, considering the lateness of the hour, although I should have liked to do so, to enter minutely into this question; but I will tell the hon. gentleman this: I have looked over all the attempts that have been made to answer the calculation that I submitted

to the people of Montreal, showing that there has been an enormous loss of population to Canada in the period covered by our census of 1861 and 1881. I showed there, and I repeat the statement here, that if you allow for the ordinary natural increase of our population from 1861 to 1881, and for the number of people who are alleged by our immigration returns to have come into this country, the total loss of population to Canada in that period must be reckoned by very many hundreds of thousands. Now, Sir, there is one point, and but one, to which exception may justly be taken. It may be that the rate of increase of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. per annum, was a little larger than was warranted. With respect to that, I would just say this: We possess in Canada one body, and one body alone, of vital statistics which is really worthy of respect, that is, the statistics which—to their honor be it said—have been computed for many years by the Catholic clergy of Lower Canada. If the hon. gentleman or any of his friends choose to examine the statistics furnished by these clergymen as to the Catholic population of the Province of Quebec, they will find, both before and during that time, that my estimate of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is perfectly correct; and if they choose further to examine the evidence from our own census returns, supposing them to be approximately accurate as to the ages of children, they will also find that, although it is quite true that the number of infants born in Quebec is greater than the number in Ontario, still the rate of infant mortality is so much greater among the children of Quebec than among those of Ontario, that by the time they have arrived at five years of age the proportion in favor of Ontario is fully made up; and, therefore, if $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is established for Quebec, it also holds good for Ontario. I may add, if the hon. gentleman takes up the matter, that the increase in Canada, prior to the date I refer to, is greater than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and that in the United States, when they had the same population as ours, it was very much greater than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent.; and if the hon. gentleman chooses to look at the position of countries in the same position as ours, he will find that I am strictly accurate in stating that an enormous loss of population must have occurred in Canada during the twenty years to which I have alluded. I may add also that these facts are strongly confirmed by the census returns of the United States. Now, Sir, since April, 1881, it is quite true we have not absolute facts, we have only an exceedingly strong presumption to go upon. Sir, I have called attention again and again to the lamentable fact, that not only the ordinary returns of children between the ages of five and sixteen, in Ontario, which are furnished by the assessors, I believe, but the number of pupils actually enrolled in our schools, which furnishes the only substantial evidence we have, shows that from 1881 steadily down to the present hour, there has been a serious decrease year by year, at the rate of nearly 5,000 children per year, in the enrolled school population in the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, I have heard one answer given to that statement, which I hoped the hon. gentleman who made it had never considered sufficiently. We are told that the school children in Ontario have decreased considerably in number because the population of Ontario, the greatest and richest Province of this Dominion, had been so degraded and reduced in circumstances, that they were no longer able to send the same number of children to school that they had sent formerly. If that be the argument, I give the hon. gentleman the alternative—either there has been a positive decrease in the population of Ontario or there has been a decrease in the standard of comfort or the capacity of educating their children among the people of Ontario. Now, Sir, I know my fellow-countrymen too well not to know the importance they attach to giving a good education to their children. I do not believe there has been that degradation in the condition of the population of Ontario. But, I

believe there has been a decrease, and a serious decrease, in the population of that great Province. Now, Sir, we have no means of ascertaining what is going on in the Province of Quebec in that respect, but I am told that there is a very satisfactory means, if only the hon. gentleman chose to use it, and desire to get at the facts, of ascertaining whether the same decrease that has gone on in the Province of Ontario has also been experienced in the Province of Quebec. If hon. gentlemen wish to contradict me, and wish to prove the truth against me, they may apply to the heads of the Catholic Church in Quebec, and ask them to give in detail the returns, which I understand are annually given to them, of the population of the several parishes in that Province. In that way it will be easy to see whether or not I have been mistaken in the statements I have made, that the people of this country, since 1881, have left it in greater proportions than they ever did before.

Mr. FARROW. Where have they gone?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid they have gone to swell the ranks of the neighboring Republic. But here is a fair challenge for these hon. gentlemen. I have the greatest respect for the statistics prepared by the Catholic clergy, and if hon. gentlemen desire to know the truth about this matter, I say they have the means in their hands, they can get that information in detail, and no doubt they will lay it on the Table of the House. If they decline my challenge, and do not choose to ascertain the facts, then the House will know that the statements made to me by many hon. gentlemen in this House coming from that Province, with reference to the lamentable exodus going on among the people of Quebec are absolutely true. I leave the hon. gentlemen to decide for themselves what they will do in that matter. Now, Sir, having dealt with this question of the rate of increase of the population, I would like to know what the hon. gentleman has got to say about the profits of the leading industries of Canada this year. Surely this House can recall the time when we were told that it was the duty of the Government to see that good prices were got for everything produced in the country. I ask the hon. gentleman has the price of lumber risen materially in the past year? Has the production of lumber increased under the operations of this beneficent policy? Does the hon. gentleman not know that for perhaps 30 years the prices of the leading cereals have not been so low in Canada as they are to-day? What of the prices of our stock? Have they risen under the beneficent influence of the hon. gentleman? How much dividends have our cotton mills been paying? What dividends have our sugar refineries declared? What is the present prosperous condition of these great iron industries into which the capitalists of the United States and the world were rushing to invest untold millions? What of all these new enterprises which were to spring up under the fostering care of the two hon. gentlemen opposite? While the hon. gentleman dealt very lightly, I thought, with the question of the increase of bankruptcies, I find that whereas the bankruptcies in 1883 amounted to \$15,949,000, they now, in 1884, amount to \$19,190,000. Now, that is much more serious than it appears, for this excellent reason, that in 1878, and before that, we had a bankruptcy law; we knew quite well who went into bankruptcy, we knew all about them. Now, unfortunately, under the existing state of the law, which I would be glad to see the Government, as they ought to have done, take in hand and remedy as they may think best—now, the fact is, that the bankruptcies reported are only a portion of those that actually occur. I know myself, I am sorry to have to say it, that in many cities in Canada there are numbers of persons who are in a state of bankruptcy, and whom their creditors choose to support, whom they do not wish to put into bankruptcy, because the state of the law is such, that the

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

bankrupt is subjected to great temptations, and in many cases, is very likely to defraud his just creditors. These figures are therefore much more significant than they appear on the surface. I believe they do not represent more than 70 or 80 per cent., at the outside, of the true bankrupts, and that the volume of bankruptcies to-day is as great as was ever attained in the last year of the depression, which ended in 1878. Let us take another test. Has the hon. gentleman, who discussed the increased mileage on our roads, paid the least attention to the great diminution in the receipts on those roads? Is he aware that the Grand Trunk, whose receipts in 1883 amounted to \$18,900,000, have only received \$16,700,000 in 1884? And it will not do to say that this is due to recent competition, because that competition has only affected them for a small part of the year, and they did not lose as much proportionately in that part of the year as in the eight months preceding. Then, with reference to the Intercolonial Railway, we were told the other day, that the receipts to January were \$1,208,715, and the expenditure \$1,415,499, showing a loss of \$200,000 for the half year in running the Intercolonial Railway. Is this another proof of the thoroughly satisfactory condition of the present trade of the country? The hon. gentleman spoke just now of the condition of the laboring class. Well, I wish with all my heart that the condition of the laboring class throughout Canada was as good as he represented it to be; but if the hon. gentleman were called upon to support a wife and four or five small children on \$300 a year, would he have a surplus of \$44 to invest at the end of the year? Or does he consider that \$304 is a satisfactory average year's wages? Does he consider that it is a very satisfactory exhibit of the state of the laboring class of Canada at a time when by his tariff he has enormously increased the cost of all these poor fellows have to buy? My hon. friend beside me (Mr. Blake) said, and said truly, that perhaps of all the cities of Canada Toronto was the one which had prospered most, all things considered, within the last four or five years. Does the Finance Minister know, or does he not know, that last Christmas in Toronto, the reports of the various societies there alleged that of the 100,000 people or thereabouts within the limits of Toronto, 8,000 people received relief at Christmas time? Does he know that one man in twelve, apparently, out of that 100,000, was in a condition in which he required to receive relief from his richer neighbors? If these men were in want, it is well that relief should be given them; but that is not a state of things on which any Canadian can look with pleasure, to which the Finance Minister can appeal as a proof that there is considerable prosperity in Canada, or even in the most prosperous city we can find throughout Ontario. Now, I shall, at a later period, have something to say as to the banking system; but I think if the hon. gentleman had perused carefully certain recent bank statements—those, let us say, of the Exchange Bank of Canada and of the Federal Bank, which we were recently considering—the hon. gentleman would have seen only too great cause to suspect that there was much rottenness beneath the superficial prosperity to which he alluded as existing. Let us sum up the results. In the first place, our revenue has fallen until it is barely sufficient for our present needs, and until, according to the statements of the hon. gentleman himself, there is imminent danger that there will be a considerable deficit next year, even when he has recourse to the extraordinary expedient of adding \$500,000 to income from Dominion lands, as I understood him to have done. We find there has been an enormous increase of taxes; we find there has been an enormous increase in our debt; we find there has been a serious shrinkage in the volume of trade, and even though that might be accounted for in part by the fact that there has been a shrinkage in value; still, taking into consideration the long periods of

time to which I have referred, that is a very serious matter. We find that our population in our greatest Provinces is stationary, if not absolutely decreasing; we find that profits are small in almost all trades, and in those which were the special favorites of the hon. gentleman, we find that the profits to-day are *nil*. We find that bankruptcies are reaching very high figures all through the country; we find that many persons are out of work. I am afraid the hon. gentleman would not have to go to St. John to find that out; I am afraid that all over Canada, and particularly all through Ontario, wherever he chooses to go to-day, he will find more persons out of work than there have been at any time within the last ten years. We find, moreover, very heavy unpaid liabilities. The hon. gentleman said very little about the millions for which he will have to provide within the next six months; he said very little of the liabilities incurred by our legislation of last year. He kept those things entirely in the back ground in any estimates he made of our probable indebtedness. Briefly, the result is this, that in 12 years, dating from 1873, it appears that the population of Canada has only increased a matter of 10, or at the outside 12 per cent. It appears that the exports of our produce have barely increased 5 per cent., as the hon. gentleman's own trade returns show; it appears that the total volume of our trade in these ten years has diminished by 5 or 6 per cent., and the returns laid on the Table of the House show a further diminution of five or six million dollars in the first six months of this year. We find that our debt in six years apparently has increased about 60 per cent.; we find that our taxes are increased at the rate of 150 per cent., the average amount to-day of taxes being 150 per cent. greater than they were six years ago. From about 17½ per cent. the hon. gentleman has made them very considerably over 35 per cent., taking them all round. We find our expenditure has increased by about 40 per cent. If I were to take those figures and place them in the hands of any statist of reputation, and if I were to say to him that, in a period of eleven years, or a period of six years, as the case might be, these figures exhibited the progress, the increase in population, the increase in exports, the increase in the total volume of trade, the increase in debt, and in the expenditure of a young country, having large fertile territories not occupied, why, Sir, that statistician would say to me: It is clear on the face of it from those figures, though I do not know to what country you allude, that some great calamity must have swept over it; either there has been a fearful pestilence, or there has been a fearful war, or there has been a famine in the land; no ordinary causes would account for such an exceedingly slow progress in a young country having large resources yet untouched; there must have been some great misfortune. And, if I came to explain to him that for twelve years not a shot had been fired in Canada, that we had had as good harvests and better than our neighbors, that we had been free from earthquake and pestilence, then that statistician would have been perfectly unable to account for the fact of this extraordinary and unprecedented stationary condition of a country like ours, until I had further explained to him that, although Providence had spared us man had not, and that for the last six years this unhappy country had had a protective tariff, administered by a Government of practical politicians, presided over by a philanthropic Minister of Finance, who desires to increase the greatest happiness of the greatest number—and I do not doubt the hon. gentleman's desire to increase their happiness—by giving to a few hundred persons, influential political partisans who had access to him, unlimited power to tax the millions of consumers who were not equally fortunate. The hon. gentleman apparently desires to make a sort of review of his whole connection with the finances of this country. I have here a statement written in 1874, just after the hon. gentleman had concluded his first con-

nection with the finances of Canada, by a perfectly impartial person, with whom I had no acquaintance then, nor, I suspect, had the hon. gentleman, and this is what that person said in 1874. He had been speaking of the administration of the hon. gentleman opposite from 1867 to 1874, and I may say at once that I am quoting from an eminent writer on the subject in the London *Economist*:

"Thus," he says, "a splendid position has been changed into one of danger, if not of imminent danger. At the beginning, there is a moderate surplus upon moderate totals of receipts and expenditures. Then these totals on both sides increase, with a very large surplus. Finally, there is an enormous increase of the total on the expenditure side with a deficit of nearly half a million pounds sterling. It is not difficult to see how all this has been brought about. First of all, the great expenditure on new works has gradually increased the direct charge for debt interest. The second cause of increased expenditure has been the maintenance and working of certain undertakings which were intended to be reproductive, but so far from having that character are a direct source of loss. The third source of increased expenditure has been the political extension of the Canadian Dominion. The incorporation of outlying Provinces like Manitoba is immediately a source of expense, just as Central Asia costs money to the Russian Government, and many of our Indian Provinces yield less than the cost of governing them. So Canada has added to itself a territory which is a burdensome charge. The older and richer Provinces of Canada are, in fact, paying heavily for the accomplishment of certain political objects, and, now that the penalty must be paid for all these extravagances, the history may be left to tell its own tale. There is no kind of expenditure which requires more careful study beforehand and more rigorous restriction by Governments than expenditure on new public works. Territorial expansion is also a luxury, the cost of which should be carefully counted beforehand. Canada has committed the most serious blunders in both respects, and the result is the large deficit and the disagreeable outlook we have described."

These were very wise words, addressed to the people of Canada in 1874 by a gentleman who then had no connection with anyone in this country, that I am aware of. The hon. Minister would have done well to lay them to heart, because they describe almost precisely the position into which his improvidence and folly and the improvidence and folly of his colleagues have again brought Canada in 1884. Now, I would like to contrast a little the statements made to-day and the statements made a couple of years ago by the hon. gentleman. Surely this House can hardly forget how, within less than two years, the hon. gentleman who now sits before me rose to tell the House that, had he been a young man, he would have crowded on sail and looked forward to ten years of unabated prosperity; how the pendulum, which he says always swings to and fro, was arrested, and seven years—not more nor less—of prosperity awaited this happy country. The hon. gentleman, five years ago, said something of the same kind. He promised us then that, if we would only be patient and give his policy time, we would certainly have very speedily a similar period of prosperity. I call attention to his statements then. I call attention to this also, that when times something like these—although there is no reason why they should be so severe as they are now, from anything which has occurred in the last year—had overtaken our people, not the hon. gentleman, because he was not here, but the First Minister and his colleague, Sir Charles Tupper, were constantly ringing in the ears of the people of this country every imaginable charge against the Government. The First Minister, in 1878, I quote from *Hansard*, said we had no work-people; that they had gone to the United States; that Canadian artisans were adding to the strength, to the power, and to the wealth of a foreign nation instead of to ours; that our work-people in this country were suffering from want of employment; that their cries were rising to heaven, and more to that effect. We know that the First Minister is a most tender-hearted person. I remember very well when the First Minister was out of office, how his heart bled, he used to tell us, for the woes of those unemployed and suffering workmen; and, now that he is in office, his heart has become so much more tender that, as recently happened in Montreal, he cannot bear even to look at a suffering workman. These hon. gentlemen would tell us now that it is unfair to hold them responsible; they would tell

us now that this is an epidemic of commercial distress that spreads over the country, and that no Government can prevent—that it arises from uncontrollable causes. I have been Finance Minister at a time when it might be said with truth that the causes of the depression were uncontrollable; at a time when we had three bad harvests in succession; at a time when our main industry, the lumber trade, was almost in a state of prostration; at a time when, not only in Europe, but in North America, there was almost universal depression from one end to the other; and at that time, Sir Charles Tupper, as reported in the *Hansard* of 1878, said:

“The hon. gentleman ought to know that, if Governments are good for anything, they are good to increase the prosperity of a country by Acts of Parliament.”

And again, at another page, 456, Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:

“The hon. gentleman” (myself I suppose) “says that the prosperity of the country cannot be obtained and promoted by Acts of Parliament. We deny it. We say that you may make the very taxation necessary to sustain the public credit by meeting the interest on the public debt and discharging the ordinary administration of public affairs, a means of so fostering our industries as to give to the people the money that is required in order to pay the taxes.”

And again:

“The policy the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating the country; it has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labor, the finest sons of Canada, to a foreign country, to obtain the employment their own country denies them. That is a fatal policy, and one which must induce us to forego all our aspirations for anything like a rapidly increased greatness for this country in the future, and to consent to become hewers of wood and drawers of water for our friends across the line in the great Republic of the United States.”

What a commentary on these statements, when we find from the municipal census of Ontario, and still more from the school returns of Ontario, that during the time when my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) was Premier, the population of Canada increased three-fold as fast as it has done under those hon. gentlemen. Why, Sir, in 1878-79, when we went out of office, there were 30,000 more school children enrolled on the school registers of Ontario alone than there were when we entered office. To-day there are 20,000 less, according to the school statistics, enrolled on the school register of Ontario than there were in 1879, when these gentlemen first began to restore prosperity, by Act of Parliament, to Canada. Now, Sir, the Minister of Finance last year had a good deal to say about bad harvests. This year the hon. gentleman has said very little about that, the harvest, providentially, having been good. But it is quite evident to everybody who listened attentively to the hon. gentleman that he was unusually perplexed. His tone was not confident, not at all as confident as we have been accustomed to hear. The hon. gentleman did really not appear to understand how it was that when he had laid on so many new taxes, when he had been so very civil, and accommodating, and obliging to all these manufacturers who pressed upon him—he could not understand how it was that the revenue was falling, he could not understand how it was that the exports were not increasing; he could not understand, apparently, how it was that all these things were going wrong. Now, in former times, to do the hon. gentleman justice, his mind was very clear on all these points, and it is not uninteresting to trace the workings of the hon. gentleman's mind. As I said, Sir, from 1873 to 1878 there was a good and sufficient cause why everything was not going right as it ought to have done. The hon. gentleman was not here, as he says himself, but he says, when he came back in 1879:

“Then, Sir, I could point with pride and satisfaction to the increased capital of our banks and the large dividends they paid. To-day I regret to say that we must point to depreciated values and to small dividends. Then I could point to the general prosperity of the country. To-day we must all admit that it is greatly depressed.”

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

He did substantially admit that to-night:

“Then I could point with satisfaction to the various manufacturing industries that were in operation throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, remunerative to the men that had invested their capital in them, and giving employment to tens of thousands. To-day, many of the furnaces are cold, the machinery in many cases is idle, and those establishments that are in operation are only employed half-time, and are scarcely paying the interest on the money invested.”

Now, this was in 1879, not in 1884, as you might naturally suppose. Then he says:

“We could point to the agricultural interest as most prosperous, with a satisfactory home market, and satisfactory prices abroad. To-day they have a limited market, with low prices, and anything but a satisfactory market abroad.”

As I said, the reason is clear to the hon. gentleman's mind; he had been absent from the Treasury. Now it is true that other causes have been assigned. It is quite true that during that period there was unusual distress in England and the United States. It is quite true that we had three poor harvests in succession, that our lumber trade had broken down, and that we had suffered from the extreme improvidence of the Government from 1870 until 1873. It is true that all this greatly hampered and impaired the prospects of Canada at that time, but the Finance Minister, with the eye of genius, divined the true cause of these troubles—it was because he was not here during that unfortunate period. But now, Sir, the hon. gentleman is here; he has been here for these many years, and I have no doubt it appears to him very odd that to-day there should be a drop of four million or five million dollars in the revenue with the prospect of a farther drop. It appears to the hon. gentleman very odd that when he was here the people should have grown poor and that when they grew poor they should have left this country. Well, Sir, I can tell the hon. gentleman that it will be very odd indeed if, under the burden of taxation which he has laid upon them, they should remain here; I can tell the hon. gentleman that it will be very odd indeed if, while he was increasing our debt in the fashion he has done, while he was increasing our liabilities and throwing away extraordinary opportunities, our people should not have resented it in the only way they could, which is practically, I am sorry to say, by removing themselves to another country. But when the hon. gentleman tells us that things were as bad seven years ago, I beg leave to differ from him. I say, in the first place, that that is not a correct statement of the case; and I say, in the next place, that it is no answer at all, if it were. So far as any Government whatever was responsible for the fact that there was a serious depression between 1875 and 1879, it was the Government which deliberately imposed the huge liabilities under which we are still laboring, and who imposed them in the years between 1871 and 1873, against the strongest possible protest on the part of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has other pleas. I think the business men of Canada will learn with some surprise that at a period when trade is known to be at its dullest, when prices are lower than they have been for a long time past, when enormous masses of our people are known to have left the country, when he knows that our leading industries are so much depressed, when our manufacturers are paying no dividends—although the hon. Finance Minister seems to think it of very little consequence—I say business men will be surprised to learn that the chief evidence of the well-being of our population appears to rest on the simple fact that our savings bank deposits have gone on increasing. The hon. gentleman implied, at the same time, that it was absurd to think there had been any serious loss of our population, because our factory hands had increased in number. Now, Sir, I say that this is no answer whatever; and I say, as regards the savings bank deposits, the facts are these: Within the last half dozen years there has been a great

fall in the rate of interest—and here I do not speak of the fall in the rate of discount at banks, as the hon. gentleman thought, although that has taken place—but there has been an enormous fall in the rates of interest at the great centres where money rules. It is no more wonder that at this present moment there should be large deposits, when the hon. gentleman is paying 4 per cent., than it would have been a few years ago if I had paid 6 per cent. At the time I paid 4 per cent. all the banks in the country were paying from 4 to 5 per cent., and now substantial banks throughout the country are barely paying 3 per cent. Sir, I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the annual cost to the country was immense. The hon. gentleman has borrowed an immense sum of money at call; for that he is not only paying 4 per cent., but paying the whole charges of management, and if he conducts his business as a prudent man should, then beyond all doubt a further large sum will require to be added as interest on the money, which he ought to keep to enable him to meet sudden calls. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman spoke of English practice. Here let me say that, as regards one part of the hon. gentleman's argument, I also am quite willing that every reasonable facility should be given to the poorer class of the population, to encourage them in thrifty and saving habits; but the hon. gentleman knows, and I know perfectly well, that the vast bulk of those depositors who deposit money with him are not, by any means, members of the poorer classes of the population. There are a certain number who are really such as the hon. gentleman described, and if the hon. gentleman would confine himself to those—if the hon. gentleman would do as they do in England—fix a reasonable limit, beyond which he would not take deposits, and place the money which he receives in the hands of commissioners, who would invest it in the national securities of the country and hold it in trust for those persons, then there would be exceedingly little risk of any considerable abuse in deposits. But I believe the facts are simply these: that of the \$31,000,000 now held through the medium of the savings banks, probably not more than \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 at the outside are held by persons whom he is justified in speaking of as among the poorer classes of the community. I think, in dealing with the savings banks, the hon. gentleman has committed a great mistake, and the effects of his folly or rashness are likely to do very great damage to the class whom he claims to desire to serve. Canada is not a lending country, but a borrowing country. If the Minister chooses to borrow many millions from the people of this country, it follows that our people must in turn borrow other millions, and in all probability they will borrow them from foreign countries and pay a much higher rate of interest than was necessary for the hon. gentleman to pay if he availed himself of the credit of the country. We know, and the hon. gentlemen must know, that most of the industries of the Dominion cannot be carried on without very large sums of borrowed money, and that the rate of interest is unusually important to persons dealing thus with borrowed money. He knows that the rate of interest which those men pay goes a very long way in deciding the rate of wages; that many enterprises cannot be gone into because the rate of interest is higher here than in other countries. He has made that fact a ground in part for the tariff he introduced, and yet we find that the Minister of Finance is doing the very utmost in his power to keep the rate of interest up, to diminish the wages which the laborers are paid, and to prevent persons in this country from going into new enterprises, which they are ready to enter upon if they can obtain money at low rates. I point out to him another serious cause of mischief, due, as I believe, more to the rate paid for this money in the savings banks than any other cause. It has a very bad effect on weak banks, by increasing the rate of interest which they are called

upon to pay. The stronger and better banks do not suffer from this. No one cause contributes more to bad banking than being obliged to pay larger interest than the money is really worth, and whether the hon. Minister knows it or not, and I do not suppose he knew and intended it, the hon. gentleman is largely responsible, in my judgment, for much of the bad banking which has occurred in Canada during the last few years. He has deliberately contributed to raise the rate of interest beyond what was safe; the banks which have to pay more than they should pay are constantly being tempted to enter into perilous speculations, are constantly being tempted to risk their money abroad, and in that way, it being distinctly due to the hon. gentleman's conduct, there has been a very serious loss, as has been shown to have occurred in the case of many banks, and notably in the cases to which I have referred. Then there is a third objection to the hon. gentleman's policy, and it is this: Every dollar the Minister of Finance pays out of the Treasury costs the people of this country a very great deal more than that sum itself. Before you can put one dollar in the Treasury you must take a great deal more out of the pockets of the people. Under the protective system of the present Government, for every dollar paid out they take two dollars out of the pockets of the people, and it is not in the interest of any portion of the community to pay a higher rate of interest than the money is worth, for the simple reason that it involves the imposition of very heavy unnecessary taxation on the people. I repeat that I do not object to the hon. gentleman dealing very liberally with the poor class of depositors; but I suspect that if the returns which are moved for are brought down, it will be apparent that the bulk of the money now on deposit in the savings banks is held in large sums, and held by persons who cannot by any possibility be considered as deserving the particular protection of the Finance Minister. In England, I find the limit is £30 per year, equal to \$146, and the savings bank will not receive more than \$735 in all, while here it ranges to \$3,000. I may point out that no possible harm could have occurred from giving 4 per cent. interest in 1877 and 1878, for the simple reason that it was the minimum rate at which money was lent at call in Canada at that time. Now, the circumstances are entirely altered. Money is now lent freely in this country at 3 per cent. on call. But the hon. gentleman deliberately chooses to pay 33 per cent. more than the money is worth in open market, and he does this in a way that costs the people 25 per cent. more than it might be got for elsewhere. I may point out another danger, of which I shall have something more to say on another occasion. The hon. gentleman has gone into a huge banking business. The Government are the largest note issuers in this Dominion. They have besides \$31,000,000 of the people's money at call; in all, they hold very nearly \$50,000,000 at call. The hon. gentleman deliberately chose to abolish the rules which I had laid down, which required the maintenance of a good gold reserve, and he is practically in this position, which is contrary to all sound rules of banking, of having nearly \$50,000,000 at call and only \$2,500,000 of gold with which to meet his liabilities. That is one of the things which the hon. gentleman has done, thoughtlessly, it may be, but the consequences of it, as may be very easily imagined, might involve very serious danger to the people of this country. Now, I come to deal with the hon. gentleman's factory statistics. Again I say that these prove nothing, if true, as to the question whether depopulation is going on or not. It may be true that the hon. gentleman has caused the employment of 47,000 people in the Dominion; it may be true—we will discuss that question presently—but that would not in the least show that the hon. gentleman had been successful in keeping our population in the country. I tell the hon. gentleman what it does prove. But first, lest I should

unwittingly misrepresent him, I desire to know whether the statement which he made, and which is substantially the same as that recently made to the House, is correct. I find that on a late occasion the hon. gentleman declared that the number of hands employed over and above the number employed in 1878 was 47,828; wages paid \$15,000,000; increase of manufactures, \$77,543,000; increase of capital invested, \$39,000,000. He changed the last amount to \$44,000,000, I observe, in the course of his recent remarks. Now I take it that that is substantially what the hon. gentlemen stated, and if otherwise, I am ready to be corrected.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That statement was made before the returns were completed—a month before they were sent in, and therefore it has increased by additional enquiries made since then.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then it is under the mark rather than over.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then I cannot, in the least degree, injure the hon. gentleman by using it. Now, I want the House to understand what this means. He declares in that statement that the present tariff causes us to produce and use \$77,000,000 worth of goods which we would otherwise import. The hon. gentleman does not object to that.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes. The increased value is the increased labor connected with it. For instance, a portion of this is raw material—sugar and articles of that kind.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Of course; but what the hon. gentleman stated is, that the increase of manufactures was \$77,000,000, the wages paid \$15,000,000, and the increased capital \$39,000,000 or \$44,000,000. Now you can only pay \$15,000,000 wages if they produce about \$77,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, according to the hon. gentleman's own showing. The hon. gentleman has, as I said, practically stated that his tariff caused us to use, in 1883, or in 1884, \$77,000,000 worth of goods, including the price of the raw material, which otherwise we would have imported. Now I do not think the hon. gentleman had reflected on what that statement made at Toronto involved. I find that of dutiable goods, which are substantially the same as these same manufactures, we imported in 1874, \$76,000,000 worth; in 1878 we only used \$59,000,000, and in 1883, \$91,000,000 worth, so that practically the statement of the hon. gentleman is that the people of Canada (in addition to the goods they made in 1878, which were no trifle) required to use \$168,000,000 worth of these same classes of goods in 1883, against \$59,000,000 worth in 1878. That is the inevitable inference to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's statements, made at Toronto and made to-night. I leave that statement to the House. Everybody knows that we were manufacturing large quantities of those goods in 1878, and I ask what sort of foundation can there be for a report which declares that, whereas \$59,000,000 worth of those goods, which we imported in 1878, sufficed for the needs of the country, we now, adding together the dutiable goods which we imported and those we made by virtue of the tariff, which otherwise we would have imported, consume \$168,000,000. I think that is sufficient proof of the accuracy of the statement which has been submitted to the hon. gentleman by his commissioners. I point out certain other deductions which result from that statement and are clearly inevitable. These \$77,000,000 worth of goods are made by virtue of a protective tariff, which ranges from 30 to 70 per cent., and therefore it is clear, and I call the attention of the House to this fact, that if the hon. gentleman's statement can be taken to be accurate, he has imposed upon us an additional taxation equal, in all probability, to over one-quarter, and probably equal to one-third of \$77,000,000, so that our additional taxation is from \$22,000,000 to \$25,000,000 a

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

year, if his statement be correct, and his 47,000 hands, cost us from \$400 to \$500 a year each. Sir, that is worse than a standing army; it is worse than pauperism; and I say that it is no wonder if, as appears to be the case, by the statement of the immigration Department, between 500,000 and 600,000 people left the country during the last four or five years—as I will be prepared to show from the statements made by that Department. But, Sir, I do not think the case is as bad as the hon. gentleman would have us believe. In the first place, I say that we had no reliable data to start from, as to the condition of things in 1878. It is impossible to-day, in 1884 or 1885, to obtain any reliable evidence of the number of factories, the number of hands, the amount of capital and other necessary details of the state of things in 1878. Moreover, the parties whom the hon. gentleman selected to do the work had a clear and distinct object of their own in exaggerating the matter. I dare say that a large number of these persons mentioned in this report had nothing to do with, and received no benefit from the hon. gentleman's policy. Moreover, the growth of this country, even under the worse circumstances, must be something. Besides, when we have a series of good harvests the manufacturers reap the benefit, to a large extent, and the hon. gentleman is not entitled to take credit for his policy for the fact that there were three successive good harvests in 1881-82-83, and three poor harvests in 1876-77-78. Such an argument merely requires to be stated to be exposed.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). But if you came in, we would have bad harvests again.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. But I will not base my statements merely on *a priori* arguments. We have had the facts given us with respect to one or two towns, which will show the accuracy of the statements of these commissioners, to whom many thousands of dollars were paid to in order to obtain an accurate report of our industries. I find that in Chatham they reported that in 1878 there were four factories, and in 1884, six; that in 1878, 63 hands were employed, and in 1884 329 hands. Now, Sir, I find that in 1878, instead of their being four factories of various kinds there were 50 factories, and I am prepared to give the hon. gentleman the names. I find that of the nine foundries at work in Chatham in 1878, four are now bankrupt, and of the remaining number of industries, 13 have succumbed, making 17 in all. But of all that there is not a word in the report. All of these facts escaped the attention of the hon. gentleman and his commissioners. But I will turn to another place, one of the most important, and formerly one of the most thriving manufacturing towns in Ontario—Oshawa. I am informed by the member from that place, that whereas Mr. Blackeby, or whatever his name is, reported that in 1878 there were six factories, employing 421 hands, and in 1884 there were eight factories, employing 575 hands, the facts are, that instead of there being six in 1878, there were 21 factories, of which I hold a list. I find also that whereas in August, 1878, there were, at least, 800 men employed, without counting the men dependent on allied trades, there are apparently now not more than 300. Those are the facts, vouched for by a man who is, at least, as competent to know all about Oshawa as the hon. Minister or his commissioners. When those statements come down I trust that hon. gentlemen will take special pains to analyze and examine them. But I do not wish to rest the statements I make merely on *a priori* arguments, or merely on those two instances. I believe that the Minister has been most grossly deceived, and that fortunately for us instead, of our now being compelled to purchase \$77,000,000 of manufactured articles, as the hon. gentleman appears to think, it is very doubtful if one-third or one-fourth of that amount is being manufactured under the influence of this tariff.

Still the reality is bad enough. It is bad for our farmers that they should be obliged to pay more than they need pay for the goods they consume and require to use to produce their crops. It is bad for the bulk of our manufacturers; it is bad for the settlers of the North-West that they should be subjected to the operation of a most unjust and injurious tariff; and, Sir, if the hon. Minister of Finance be correct, the triumph of his policy has forced us to pay \$77,000,000 for what was worth in open market from \$50,000,000 to \$55,000,000. He has given temporary employment to 47,000 people, and most probably driven 600,000 away; and now I have a word or two to say touching the immigration into this country. Sir, I find that from 1881, the time the census was taken, to the present time, 397,897 immigrants are reported to have come and settled in Canada—47,990 in 1881, 112,458 in 1882, 133,624 in 1883, and 103,824 in 1884. Of this number the same returns show that 65,539 are said to have settled in the North-West down to the 1st of January, 1885. So there remain to be accounted for 334,358 immigrants. Now, Sir, every man here knows right well that Ontario, with its 2,000,000 or thereabouts of people, has always absorbed an enormous percentage of all the immigrants that came to this country. No man pretends that the immigrants go to the Maritime Provinces. In fact, the answer given in this House the other day shows, even on the calculation of the Department, that only a paltry few hundreds go to the Maritime Provinces. So, if you strike out the North-West, and allow Ontario two-thirds of the remainder, what do you get? If your statements are in the slightest degree accurate, Ontario, instead of diminishing in population, ought to have increased in these four years by 224,000 immigrants, and by 200,000 of natural increase. Does the hon. gentleman, or any hon. gentleman, suppose that there are to-day, in the teeth of the municipal census and the school returns of Ontario, 424,000 more people in Ontario to-day than there were four years ago?

Mr. POPE. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. Minister of Agriculture believes it. Then, where are they? I have seen very recently the details of the returns of the municipal census of Ontario, and if these, which are much more favorable than the school returns, show anything, they show this: That it is physically impossible that these men could have come to Ontario, but that if they have, they have driven out from Ontario an equal number of our own people.

An hon. MEMBER. You would be glad of that.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. No, Sir; I would not be glad of that. I would think that an extreme misfortune. I think a native-born Canadian is worth very much more to us than any imported immigrant. But I think this whole system is a fraud and a sham. I think this system of bringing in immigrants is about the greatest waste of public money that has ever been made. I do not believe that we have received 397,000 or 334,000 people, or that, apart from those who have settled in the North-West, any immigrants at all of any value have been brought into Canada through the medium of assisted immigration. I believe the time has come to abolish that system altogether, and I heartily concur in the view expressed by the labor council in Toronto and elsewhere, that it is a most shameful waste of the money of the people of Canada, and a most serious departure from the sound rules of government, to bring people from other countries for the purpose of taking the bread out of the mouths of our own mechanics and artisans. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman boasts of his success in dealing with the sugar question and in establishing the West India trade. He was cautious, in the face of some recent developments, not to say that it was a matter of great congratulation to the people of

Canada, that whereas in Glasgow to-day you can buy a fair quality of sugar, I am informed, for \$2 per 100 pounds, in Canada we have to pay \$5 per 100 pounds for sugar of the same quality. The hon. gentleman said that he got as much revenue as before. Why, from the importation of a little over 100,000,000 pounds in my time, we got a revenue in excess of that which the hon. gentleman now receives from 170,000,000 pounds. True, that is not of first-class quality; true, about 20,000,000 pounds of that is wasted in the process of refining; but even so, we are probably to-day importing the equivalent of 150,000,000 pounds of refined sugar. Now, that sugar stands us at least 3 cents a pound more than it could be bought for in the open market. That represents \$1,500,000 of taxes levied on the people of Canada, of which \$2,500,000 goes into the Treasury, and \$2,000,000 I know not where.

Mr. HESSON. We get better sugar, and get it cheaper.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Because sugar has fallen enormously in all the great centres of production, not because we have been foolish enough to tax it 50 per cent. more than we did half a dozen years ago. Let us take the case of cottons. The hon. gentleman would not tell us what the increased production of cotton was. I have had a series of estimates submitted to me on this subject; I have been told that the production was \$7,000,000, that it was \$5,000,000, that it was \$4,250,000; what it is, I do not know; but whether it is four or five or seven millions, it is equally clear that we have to pay more for it than we could buy it for in the open market, if the tariff were removed. It may be true, as the hon. gentleman has said, that for a short time, until the happy condition which he sketched has arrived, when the manufacturers will lay their heads together and decide how much they will tax the people of Canada, we may get cottons nearly as cheap, if not quite as cheap, as they are in the United States. But the Minister himself declared that he did not expect or desire than state of things to continue. His desire, apparently, was, that these poor innocent cotton manufacturers should be so protected that they could levy a considerable tax upon the people of Canada, even if it involved the necessity of paying many millions of dollars in pensioning off some of them, as has been done in many cases in the United States and elsewhere. Now, I take the whole truth of this matter of cottons to be briefly this: I believe the climate is rather against us for the manufacture of cottons. I believe that those acquainted practically with the manufacture of cottons will admit that where there is a small market you manufacture at a greater disadvantage than where there is a large market; and we know that the cost of fuel, the rate of interest and the price of other things necessary to manufacturing, are higher in Canada, and we cannot manufacture cotton here as cheaply as can be done elsewhere. Although I do not pretend to say that the manufacture of cotton is not a desirable thing *per se*, I do mean to say that there is no ground for the hon. gentlemen inflicting a grave loss on the whole people of Canada for the sake of encouraging a few of these people. More than that, while they had a moderate revenue tariff these people were doing exceedingly well; they were doing better, in point of fact, than they have done under the hon. gentleman's highly protective tariff. It is worth while noticing this for many reasons, and for this in particular, because it shows clearly, as I always maintained, and my hon. friend behind me maintained, that there was a steady growth on the part of textile manufacturers during the period from 1874 to 1878. It is worth noticing, that whereas in 1874 the importation of raw cotton amounted to 3,500,000 lbs. or thereabouts, in 1878, in spite of the depression and bad times, the importation of raw cotton, which is the true measure of the growth of manufactures, had increased 120 per cent., or 7,000,000 lbs. and more. It is

curious enough, that since then the growth has not, in proportion, been much more rapid, although for a time it was very unduly stimulated by the policy of the hon. gentleman. Briefly, the position appears to be this, that what the hon. gentleman has done is really rather a measure of the loss he has inflicted on the public. The hon. gentleman has succeeded in adding enormously to the real taxation of the country; he has imposed a taxation nominally of \$25,500,000, but which, in all human probability, is not less than \$36,000,000 or \$37,000,000; he has succeeded in locking up a very large amount of capital, although not so great as he supposes, in unproductive operations. If the situation were less grave, it would almost be ludicrous to recall the innumerable processions of the hon. gentleman and his friends, the innumerable visits the hon. gentleman made to all those manufacturers from one end of Canada to the other, and the receptions they gave him. Now is the time when, if the hon. gentleman were such a wonder-working magician, he might use his presence to advantage by visiting these distressed manufacturers and enlightening them as to their own business, by showing them how to improve, and explaining to them in detail wherein they had gone wrong; and he might, perhaps, be instrumental in bringing them together in the way he has suggested, so that there might be a comfortable combination of monopolists arranged in the office of the Finance Minister, in the case of all these distressed industries. I have now to say a word or two as to the hon. gentleman's own administration, and first of all I want to call the attention of the House to some actual facts as to his administration of 1884. The hon. gentleman claims, I see, that he had a surplus that year of \$700,000 or more. Now, I maintain that the hon. gentleman's mode of book-keeping is not quite correct. I think it will be found, if we look into the statements which he has submitted, that he had no right to claim any such surplus, if indeed, he had any right to claim any surplus at all. He says last year he had a surplus of \$754,000; but when I come to examine the hon. gentleman's charges, I find that on the Intercolonial Railway alone there are such charges as these put to capital account: for rolling stock \$441,000; for Intercolonial commission \$22,000. There are also charges for Prince Edward Island Railway rolling stock \$9,000; for Canadian Pacific Railway commission a matter of \$19,000. So that, in point of fact, when you deduct these items, all of which ought to be charged properly to ordinary revenue account, we find that the hon. gentleman has scarcely got a surplus of \$260,000 in place of a surplus of \$754,000—or a surplus of just about the amount which he has so carefully deposited, as a matter of permanent investment, I suppose, in the Exchange Bank of Canada. Now the hon. gentleman said a great deal as to the mode in which the Intercolonial Railway had been managed. He claimed great credit, indeed, for the fashion in which the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway had been reduced. Now it would have been no wonder at all, considering the country that railway runs through and the date at which it was completed, if the hon. gentleman were able to make a better showing to-day than my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), could possibly have made during the time he administered the Intercolonial Railway. The House will recollect the long array of figures the hon. gentleman presented on that point. He showed, I think, that whereas we had a deficit of several hundred thousand dollars a year, he had merely an insignificant deficit. But he did not choose to call the attention of the House to this fact, that whereas, when my hon. friend went out of office, the capital account of the road was closed and stood at \$36,091,000, the capital account on the 1st of July 1884, under the management of the hon. gentleman and his friends, stood at \$43,866,000. There can be no very great difficulty in making both ends meet when you add \$7,866,000 to capital account, consisting largely of items

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

such as those I have alluded to. We find that, in 1878, the item of stores was charged at \$345,000; to-day it is put down at \$837,000, being, to all intents and purposes, the addition of another half million dollars to capital account; and if you include the \$800,000 we are to spend this year on the 1st of July, 1885, the capital account will stand at \$45,204,000, against \$36,000,000 at which it stood when my hon. friend went out of office. The consequence is that the cost to the country, for interest alone, is \$420,000 more, or will be on the 1st of July, than it was when we went out of office. Such book-keeping as that is a positive disgrace; it is only calculated to mislead the people. I desired to close the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, when I was in office, for this obvious reason, that I knew perfectly well that, so long as a Government keeps a capital account of the sort open, all manner of improper charges will be added to it. It is the interest of the Minister and his subordinates to throw everything into capital account. Every bunker, every coal shed, every piece of rolling stock that can by any possibility be charged to capital account will be carried to it—and who is to correct it? Who is to tell us whether rolling stock to-day is really maintained? That rests entirely with hon. gentlemen themselves. Hon. gentlemen have added very nearly \$10,000,000 to the capital account of the Intercolonial Railway, and yet they claim that they have been very economical, compared with my hon. friend, in the administration of that railway; because, after adding \$420,000 to the interest on their capital account, they produce an annual saving apparently of \$10,000 a year. Judging, however, from the statement to which I called the attention of the House, the hon. gentleman apparently, in six months, has been able to reduce this to a deficit of \$240,000. Now, the hon. gentleman alluded to his management of the loans in London. I do not desire to criticise too severely what the hon. gentleman did there, and for this excellent reason, that it is very difficult, at a distance, to know whether the hon. gentleman took the best advantage of the condition of the market or not; but as the hon. gentleman challenged comparison with the loans previously made, I may point out it is not a matter for very great wonder or commendation that in 1884 Canada should be able to borrow at 3½ per cent., whereas in 1876 she was only able to borrow at 4 per cent., or to speak more accurately, that in 1884 we borrowed at 4 per cent., whereas in 1876 she was only able to borrow at 4½ per cent. The fact of the matter is, that the interest on money, as every security in the London market shows, has fallen very considerably since that time, and at the time the hon. gentleman went over to effect this loan, indeed considerably before it, the Chancellor of the Exchequer had announced his intention of reducing the English 3 per cent's. ultimately to 2½ per cent., a fact which every capitalist knows ensured every fair security being at once rapidly taken up at a rate lower than before. If the hon. gentleman could show that he had reduced the rate of interest on our bonds in proportion to the fall of money within the last six or seven years, then I would say he had made an excellent bargain, but I doubt very much if, on a fair comparison, he would be able to establish any such claim. The hon. gentleman said nothing about the various charges which he had incurred in connection with this same loan. If I understand aright, the sum of 1½ per cent. was paid by way of commission and in brokerage, in all a sum of £67,000 sterling, wholly independent of advertising, and so on.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. One and a-quarter.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. £67,000 would be more than 1½. In addition to that, there are the allowances. He did not say how much he computed them at, but they would represent, I suppose, the better part of 1 per cent. I do not say that it is any discredit the transaction, but it means that the price

of 91½ really netted us 89, or thereabouts. What I object to in the conduct of these loans is this: We have at this moment an unusually large sinking fund, a much larger sinking fund than our debt in London at all requires. I have again and again called the attention of the hon. gentleman to the desirability of dispensing with the sinking fund, and I very much regret to see that, in the prospectus, he has found it necessary to retain the sinking fund, so that we pay 4 per cent. or nearly that—£3 18s 3d, I think is the figure—for our loan, besides an additional ½ per cent. to the sinking fund. I again repeat the remark I have made before, that it is very inexpedient to allow our sinking fund to be loaded down in this way, and to be compelled to raise money by way of taxation for the payment of a sinking fund, and that for the plain and obvious reason that on all occasions taxes cost the people a great deal more than the money that comes into the Treasury. I regret, too, although at this moment I am not going to insist too much upon it, that the hon. gentleman was unable to pay off his 5 per cent. loan when it matured on the 1st January. It would have been better for our credit, and would have saved us, probably, \$125,000, because, if he could have obtained the money at a little less than 4 per cent. it is clear that the ½ per cent. he has had to pay during the present six months would have been saved to this country; and I think it was an error on his part, and negligence on his part, that he did not provide for that repayment in January, either in the way he has indicated or in some other way, and so save us this unnecessary payment of \$125,000. But, Sir, when I come to look closely into these accounts for 1884, I find that these are very far indeed from the only cases in which the hon. gentleman has been, in my opinion, exceedingly careless of the interests committed to his charge. I find in the accounts of 1884 a number of charges, the like of which I venture to say have never appeared since Confederation. I find charges like this: For printing and advertising, \$163,000, wholly apart from all the regular printing, amounting probably to as much more, done in connection with *Hansard* or statutes, or a great variety of matters in connection with this House; I find for extra clerks alone \$175,000; for law costs, wholly apart from our Department of Justice and legitimate costs, there is put down a sum of \$66,000; for two commissions I find \$40,985 charged, and I find also that in these cases a good deal is charged to capital which belongs to ordinary account. Now, that we may understand the full effect of this statement, I will just run out briefly a comparison with similar expenditures in England. Our income is to the English income as 1 to 14, so that if Mr. Gladstone, when submitting the Public Accounts, was to produce charges for printing and advertising amounting to £400,000 sterling, it would no more than represent in England the equivalent of the \$163,000 the hon. gentlemen have paid here, and if, further, it were to appear that this £400,000 included allowances of £20,000 a year apiece to the *Times*, *Daily News*, *Morning Post*, *Pall Mall Gazette*, *Standard* and *Telegraph*, I wonder what Englishmen would think of that mode of encouraging and fostering an independent public opinion in the press. And yet these monstrous charges are not one whit more, having regard to the relative revenue of the two countries, than the charges which are actually paid by the hon. gentleman to several distinguished organs of public opinion, which I will not enumerate here, but which are well known to a great many members of this House, and in which some of the members of this House have a lively and active interest. Then, for extra clerks, which I take to be a synonym for useful political friends, in some form, Mr. Gladstone's expenses should be £450,000 sterling, and to Mr. Gladstone's legal friends, had he adopted the plan the hon. gentleman has done, apart from all the regular sums paid in due course, £200,000 would have been paid. For commissions £100,000 would have been paid, with the result that about

£2,000,000 sterling would have been distributed among a number of claimants who, if they had any just claims, ought to have preferred them before the courts, and probably were referred to these commissions because there was not the slightest chance that the Exchequer Court or any other court would entertain their claims. Those are the reasons, those are some of the ways in which our expenses have been run up from \$23,500,000 to \$32,850,000 in the space of about seven years, that being the sum the hon. gentleman tells us he expects to expend for the service of the current year. Now I have a word or two to say as to certain more serious errors of policy which I lay to the charge of the hon. gentleman. Although those I have spoken of are grave enough, although they are indications of fearful waste and extravagance, and although in many respects they are much more objectionable—for I hold that a Minister can hardly do worse than use the funds placed at his command to corrupt and debauch the representatives of the press, as has been done in this case, and on a very extensive scale—I come now to deal with other and larger errors of policy for which the hon. gentleman is responsible. The hon. gentleman, in common with his colleagues, but he, more particularly, because it fell to his duty to warn and caution them of the results of their conduct, is responsible for the great and unnecessary concessions which were made to the Canadian Pacific Railway last year, and for the still more mischievous concessions which were made to certain members of this House, for the purpose of inducing them to sanction that outrageous loan. The hon. gentleman ought to have known and ought to have warned his colleagues, I think, what very serious issues were involved in making these grants to the Canadian Pacific Railway at that particular time. The hon. gentleman does not know to-day whether the people to whom he expects to pay this 5 per cent. loan will accept his terms. The hon. gentleman therefore must know that he may have to raise \$25,000,000 by way of loan in London, for the purpose of refunding our debt. He must also make provision for the \$13,000,000 of floating debt which he has incurred up to the 1st March, and from this time out there are, as he knows, other large expenditures going on, which will involve further large loans. The hon. gentleman occupied, prior to 1884, a very good position indeed. I pointed out to him, before this loan was granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that for his own sake he ought to have refused his consent to that proceeding, because it would most seriously hamper and impede him in dealing with the refunding of the debt which would necessarily come on this year. At the present moment it is impossible to say how much the hon. gentleman has lost or how much he may lose; but I believe that wholly independent of the unnecessary sinking fund which he consented to create in the loan of \$25,000,000 to which he has alluded, he lost at least ½ per cent. by reason of the serious injury to the position and credit of Canada, because of our unwise concession to the demands of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I believe if that could be traced out it would be found that whereas we have had to pay practically 4½ per cent., including the sinking fund, for the loan recently negotiated, that it could have been obtained in London, prior to that unfortunate error on his part, in all probability, at a mere fraction, if at all, over 3½ per cent. And, Sir, it remains to be seen how far the large loan which it is inevitable that the hon. gentleman or somebody else must obtain in London within a few months, will be affected by the results of that unfortunate transaction. I tell him that it would not in the least surprise me if, when we meet again next year, it should be found that an enormous sum of money annually had been lost to this country for the next 25 years, as a result of that most unfortunate proceeding. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman ought to have seen and ought to have warned his colleagues that granting these other demands was

going to lead to most interminable entanglements, that by granting those demands you have set up a precedent from one end of this country to the other for all kinds of claims and demands being made upon you, which you will find it difficult indeed to refuse. You have tied your hands by your own action, and the hon. gentlemen opposite, unless I greatly mistake, are at present experiencing, and seriously experiencing, the results of their impolitic concession on that occasion. Now the hon. gentleman takes great objection to the comparison I made between our position and that of the United States. Sir, he might have taken the trouble to see what I actually did say. The hon. gentleman, had he referred to my speech—my Toronto speech, to which, I suppose, he is alluding—would have seen that what I have said is this: That whereas seventeen years ago we were in a very advantageous position as compared with the people of the United States, the enormous increases in our expenditure and in our taxation which took place between 1867 and 1873, and between 1879 and 1885, have completely reversed our position. I did not say that our present taxation was twice that of the United States; what I did say was, that in 1884 the expenditure of the United States was \$5 per head, and our expenditure was something at the rate of \$7 per head—and that I shall proceed to show. The hon. gentleman says that our taxation has increased, I think he said 10 cents per head. Well, Sir, if the hon. gentleman will condescend to look up our taxation for 1878 he will find that even adding the million of deficit which occurred in that year, our total taxation did not amount to more than \$18,500,000. Our total taxation in 1883—I am excluding, of course, items which appear on both sides—our total taxation derived from Customs and Excise amounted, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, to close on \$30,000,000. Now, does he mean this House should believe that whereas the people were taxed \$18,500,000 in 1878, while they now pay \$30,000,000, they only pay 10 cents per head more? And will he say that whereas the people were taxed \$25,449,000 in 1884, while they only paid \$18,500,000 in 1878, allowing for the deficit in that year, the people are only taxed 10 cents per head more? Now I am not going to take up the time of the House by following the hon. gentleman through that most ingenious calculation which he took off surpluses and applied them in reduction of the rate of taxation. First, he takes our money; he takes \$20,000,000 more than he wants; then he deducts this sum and says: Because I took \$20,000,000 more, by an expensive process, out of your pockets, than I required, therefore, gentlemen, you are \$40,000,000 better off. I have here the financial report of the United States, and it contains some facts to which I call the attention of the hon. gentleman, and of the House. I find that the net debt of the United States on the 1st of November, 1884, deducting cash in the Treasury, was \$1,408,000,000. Now, the hon. gentleman knows well that in all human probability our net debt will be very little less than \$240,000,000 on the 1st July. So here are we, a people of 4,400,000, with a net debt, in all human probability, on the 1st July, of \$240,000,000, as against the net debt of the United States of \$1,408,000,000. I find, Sir, from that same report, that the annual interest charges of the United States is \$47,000,000. Now, in the estimates which the hon. gentleman has submitted, the annual charge, deducting the sinking fund appears to amount to \$9,400,000. So that under the guidance of the hon. gentleman we have brought things to this pass: that we, who are barely one-thirteenth as numerous as the people of the United States, are paying one-fifth of the total sum of interest paid by the people of the United States. Is that a pleasant or a satisfactory state of things? And which of the two statements, mine or his, do these facts most fully bear out? We look in the same volume, at the statement of the expenditure, and I find the net expenditure, deducting the amount which goes for the reduction of the debt, amounted to \$244,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

Now, Sir, \$244,000,000 are the total expenditures required by the people of the United States, with an estimated population, in 1885, of about 56,000,000—not 54,000,000, as the hon. gentleman supposed; my hon. friend near me says 57,000,000. Judging from the rate of increase which took place between 1871 and 1881, I think 56,000,000 is about the exact figure. Then this result follows, that the people of the United States, as I said, are thirteenfold as numerous as we, and we are required, deducting the sinking fund, to expend this year \$31,800,000, or thereabouts. The hon. gentleman says he will want \$32,850,000, but I deduct a million for the sinking fund, which is about the amount he expects to pay. He expects to provide \$31,850,000 from various sources, while the people of the United States are required to provide for an expenditure of \$244,000,000. Well, Sir, this is very little more than one-half per head for the expenditure of the United States. Let the hon. gentleman divide \$31,850,000 by 4,400,000 population, and he will find that it amounts to very nearly \$7.25 per head. Let him divide \$244,000,000 by 56,000,000 population, and he will find that it very little exceeds \$4 per head. Now, Sir, as to the other argument which the hon. gentleman had recourse to—the argument that because a large part of this money goes for the payment of subsidies, goes to pay for the maintenance of public works, etc., therefore a comparison is not fair. I beg to call his attention to the fact that the Americans pay huge sums of money for which we have no equivalent whatever. Where have we an equivalent to the \$55,000,000 pensions which I find entered in the American expenditure?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That does not affect the case.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It does affect the case most materially. My argument is this, that we are in a worse position, compared with the Americans, than we were seventeen years ago. The hon. gentleman answers that we are not in a worse position, because we pay subsidies, they do not; while the fact is that, although the expenditures are not precisely similar; that although we have some items which the Americans do not pay, they have some items which we do not pay, such as pensions, and maintenance of the army and navy, the latter of which amounts to some \$57,000,000. When the hon. gentleman tells us that he must include the municipal expenditures of the Americans and the expenses for State and other purposes, does the hon. gentleman suppose there are no municipal taxes in Canada? Does the hon. gentleman not know that very large sums of money are raised, particularly in the Province of Ontario, for municipal purposes?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not refer to the municipalities; I might have done so.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Had the hon. gentleman referred to the municipalities, so far as Ontario is concerned, he would have found this result: That the municipal taxation of Ontario compares with the State and municipal taxation of the Union. In any case, it is a total mistake on his part, to refer to the State and municipal taxation. The great bulk of the State expenditure is supplied by the municipalities. They do not, of course, supply it all.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is an assessment on personal property and real estate.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is collected from the municipalities. The hon. gentleman will find, if he chooses to go into that matter, if he takes all we have to pay in the municipalities, particularly in our major Province—it is not so to the same extent in the Province from which he comes—the comparison will not come out as he has stated it, it will not by any means be such as he appears to think. Nor does it in the least affect the point I made, which was this: We were in a more favorable position 17 years ago, as com-

pared with the American Federal expenditure, than we occupy to-day. That was the point to which the hon. gentleman ought to have directed his attention, and when he has shown, and not until he has shown, that we have improved relatively as compared with the position which the Americans occupied 17 years ago, he will have been able to satisfactorily dispose of the argument I have used. The fact is this: The hon. gentleman has chosen to disregard the whole past history of this country. The hon. gentleman has disregarded every well-known rule of finance and has disregarded every plain dictate of common sense. He and his colleagues have chosen to try a most risky experiment. They have chosen to introduce a total revolution in our fiscal system, and have selected that period for a most uncalled for expenditure and for involving us in wholly unnecessary liabilities. More than that. They have thrown away very great opportunities, which opportunities may never again recur. The hon. gentleman, when he came here in 1879, had every advantage he could well ask. It was perfectly clear to everyone that it was a time at which an improvement all over the world might be looked for. There had been an unusually protracted period of distress in the United States, and signs of revival were apparent. It was quite clear that our speedy revival depended almost entirely on the speedy revival of trade in the United States. Then the hon. gentleman had—I suppose he will claim that for the National Policy also—several successive good harvests, and the country obtained good prices for the grain. There was a very great fall, as I have again and again pointed out, in the price of money all the world over. The North-West had been opened up, not by him, but by the energy of other persons, with whom he had nothing to do. The foolish bargain made by his colleagues with British Columbia had so far been modified that full time was given to complete the obligations entered into. More than that, the vast increase in the expenditure, which had been going on from 1867 to 1873, had been checked by the action of my hon. friend and his colleagues. In every possible way, therefore, the hon. gentleman had the way made easy to him. All those difficulties to which I have been alluding, which confront him, though he may choose to say they are not very serious, are self-sought by hon. gentlemen opposite. They have flung away their advantages; they have deliberately created all these difficulties, and now they appeal to us for consideration, and tell us they are the victims of uncontrollable circumstances. They are not so. They are the victims of their own deliberate disregard of the plainest rules of common sense and the plainest rules of finance. It is quite clear to us, as it is to everybody, that Canada has very formidable competition ahead. We no longer enjoy, in North America, as we thought we would do years ago, anything like a complete monopoly of the supply of cereals. We have not even the control—although the hon. gentleman appears to think so—of the stock trade with the mother country. Our farmers are called on to compete with farmers in all parts of the world—with California, New Zealand, Australia, India, Russia, and the Danubian Provinces, while they are exposed to the competition to which they have always been exposed in the United States. What method has the hon. gentleman taken to relieve the serious position of the agriculturalists and to help them? He assisted our agriculturalists by weighing them down with enormous taxation. I say it is the *ne plus ultra* of folly for the hon. gentleman and his colleagues to say that the farmers are better off under a load of heavy taxation. What the hon. gentleman has been telling us to-night is briefly this: that we are better off because we have wasted, taking into account the liabilities we have incurred, \$52,000,000, which we need not have wasted, and which we have been compelled to borrow; because our taxes are now treble what they should have been; because heavy duties hamper all our producing industries; because our lumber costs us much

more than it should do to produce, our grain costs us more to raise, our cattle more to feed, because our clothing, fuel and almost every necessary of life has been largely increased in cost by reason of the policy of the hon. gentleman. All I can say is this:

“The force of folly can no further go,
Than taxing men that they may richer grow.”

Let me contrast for a moment, as the hon. gentleman has challenged me to do, the policy of the Mackenzie Administration. I say that Government was not only frugal itself, but it produced frugality among the people. That that Government was a frugal Government I will give the hon. gentleman proof from his own Public Accounts. When they came into office the controllable expenditure was \$3,300,000; when they left office it was \$6,500,000. To-day, in the very last statement which the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table of the House, we find that the controllable expenditure, which we left at \$6,500,000, has been increased to \$11,300,000. It is all very well for the hon. gentleman—we will examine this in detail at a more fitting opportunity—to offer excuses more or less plausible for the enormous increase in that expenditure. What possible expenditure was ever incurred by any Government for which an ingenious gentleman could not offer some plausible excuse? I take my stand on this plain fact, that the expenditure which alone the Government can control was reduced by 25 per cent. by the Mackenzie Government and increased by nearly 100 per cent. by hon. gentlemen opposite. We preached frugality ourselves; we inculcated on the public thrift and self-reliance, and a great many of the facts to which the hon. gentleman has alluded go to show clearly and distinctly that, in spite of all the talk of distress which existed from 1874 to 1878, the great industries of the people were in no respect damaged; that the people, during that time, were accumulating property, the very property which they used afterwards and of which the hon. gentleman makes such boast. Sir, the \$100,000,000 which he mentioned, if it did exist, and so far as it did exist, was largely the result of the thrift and frugality which were necessarily practised by the people during the years 1876-77-78, and not of the extravagant folly which took its place under the *régime* of the hon. gentleman. As to the Provinces, our policy was neither to meddle with or trample upon their just rights, nor to bribe them. Our policy was to settle our new territory with all possible speed, and the House must remember how my hon. friend was denounced because, under circumstances of great difficulty, he proceeded with the opening up of that new territory at the earliest possible moment. I must say that the Finance Minister should have been the last man in Canada to criticise the Government of Mr. Mackenzie and his colleagues; and for this excellent reason, that more than to any other human being, was it due to the imprudence and lack of foresight of the Finance Minister that there was any difficulty in administering the finances of Canada. Sir, in 1873, what the hon. gentleman did was this: He came down to this House, as he came to-night, with an estimated expenditure of \$20,000,000. He did not tell us, he did not breathe a word, he did not give a hint, which might lead us to suppose that there were millions upon millions of other expenses of which he gave us no intimation; and before the House rose, that hon. gentleman had added \$4,000,000 a year to the permanent expenditure for which he had made no provision whatever. In the first place, by the terms upon which he admitted Prince Edward Island, an annual addition of \$820,000 was made to our expenditures. By the better terms he granted to the New Brunswick and the other Provinces, a further addition of \$320,000 was made. By the Mounted Police Bill which they introduced, \$330,000 was added; by increases of salaries, \$300,000 more was added; by the loan which he negotiated, and of which he

said nothing at the time, \$450,000 was added; by Indian treaties negotiated, and for which, I admit, his colleagues were more responsible than the hon. gentleman, \$300,000 or \$400,000 were added, and besides that, he and his colleagues had committed the country to a huge series of public works, the cost of which, for interest alone, he himself estimated as amounting to about \$3,300,000 of a permanent addition.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. For interest alone?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Yes. I do not charge him with all this interest, but for at least \$1,000,000 a year the hon. gentleman was chargeable. He made no provision for that addition; he did not inform the House of it; he went out, leaving behind the certainty to his successors that that they would have to provide for all these huge sums which he added. Sir, I say that the object was twofold. The House will recollect the circumstances under which that was done. First of all, the hon. gentleman and his colleagues supposed, at one time, that by all this extraordinary extravagance they could induce the House to condone the fault they had committed, and in the next place, though I do not charge the hon. gentleman with it, I fear his colleagues intended that if they did fall they would leave behind such a precious legacy to their successors that no skill, on their part, would enable them to cope with it successfully. And what is the policy of the hon. gentleman now? First of all, he imposes excessive taxation, he stimulates inflation in every conceivable way. The second result of his policy has been that the hon. gentleman offered extraordinary inducements to many men to rush into manufactures, extraordinary inducements to put capital into those enterprises to which he alluded; and he no doubt succeeded for a time in blowing the bubble. He has immensely increased our debt. He has enormously increased our expenditure, and he has further needlessly incurred monstrous liabilities. Now, Sir, what was our policy with respect to manufacturers? The hon. gentleman has alluded to that. Our policy was briefly this: to keep taxation as low as possible, and for this reason: That the lower we kept the taxation the less cost the manufacturers would be at in producing articles. They would have a better chance of competing abroad with other competitors; they would have more and better home customers, and what is quite as important, as they have since discovered, they would have less indiscreet competition at home than they were formerly subjected to. The hon. gentleman has adopted a precisely opposite policy, and here we see the fruits of it. He has given us very high taxation. He has increased to all manufacturers the cost of production, and he has therefore exposed them to a considerable extent more than before to foreign competition, because in a good many cases among the manufacturers the report which reaches me is this: That owing to the increased cost of production under his tariff they suffer more from foreign competition than they would have had to suffer under a moderate revenue tariff. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman, has seriously interfered, as is quite clear, with their chances of exporting. I showed just now that although we ought to have increased our absolute exports of domestic manufactures, there had been a decrease of one-half million; and the hon. gentleman behind me tells me that in several branches of trade in which we were doing well before, our progress has been exceedingly slow since 1878. There are other things of importance to which the hon. gentleman should have alluded to-night. The hon. gentleman knows the position of the Maritime Provinces; he knows that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and, I fear, in Prince Edward Island, many industries are languishing; that the people are not profiting in the slightest degree by his tariff, but are earnestly looking forward to see whether the hon. gentlemen are taking any steps whatever to en-

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

sure them reciprocity with the United States. Not a word, not a syllable, did the hon. gentleman say upon that question, or as to our fisheries, although he knows that, within a few months, our treaty with the United States will expire, although he knows that, within a few months, a large portion of the most valuable market of the Provinces with which he is specially connected may be taken away from them. He has nothing to tell us on all those important questions; he preserves an ominous silence, and perhaps he is right, because, unhappily, his policy has placed us in a far worse position to negotiate a reciprocity treaty than we were in before. One significant thing occurred in the recess, to which no allusion was made, but to which it is well that we should allude, because it shows, in a very marked degree, the extraordinarily desperate position to which the public mind has come with respect to the position of the country, especially in the Maritime Provinces. I allude to that rather remarkable proposition to annex Jamaica to the Dominion of Canada. Now, it is quite clear that the steps taken in that matter were not taken without some concert with some person high up in the councils of the Dominion, and it is remarkable that when that matter was first alluded to in the press, we found that the paid subsidised Ministerial organs, from one end of the country to the other, took up that project, and pointed out what an extremely desirable thing it would be for Canada to annex an island 2,000 miles off in the Caribbean Sea; and what an extremely desirable thing it would be for the hon. gentleman to have 25 or 30 additional supporters, in order that he might be prepared for the worst emergencies. Now, the hon. gentleman did not deal—and I do not know that we can blame him too much for that—he did not deal much in forecasting the immediate future. I fear, Sir, from old experience, the hon. gentleman has suppressed a good deal. We know perfectly well—and there are gentlemen in this House who have not hesitated to tell us, although the hon. gentleman has preserved a discreet silence—the position in which the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are placed. The hon. gentleman did not say one word as to the policy of the Government on that head; he gave us very little indication as to what we might expect. Now, Sir, I shall not stop at present to analyse the various remarkable statements made to us on the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway, although I did notice that the hon. gentlemen told us that the expenditure he had incurred was likely to give us railway facilities quite unequalled in the world; and if the statement I have seen as to the grades and curvatures on the Canadian Pacific Railway be correct, I am bound to say that we are likely to have a railway in that respect quite unequalled in the world. I could very well believe that the original cart road proposed to be laid in British Columbia would not have had a bit steeper grades than those which appear by the returns to be permitted by the Government. The hon. gentleman cannot tell, and I do not know, what the future of the production of grain will be. I do not believe that the prices will, for a long period, continue to rule as low as they are at present; but when next the hon. gentleman is making a statement of our prospects, he would do well to remember that we may be confronted with low prices in various directions. The hon. gentleman knows that there has been a large diminution in the production of lumber. The hon. gentleman does not, I suppose, anticipate any such difficulties as we had to contend with in 1877 and 1878. I do not anticipate them, and I hope, for his sake, and for the sake of the country, that he will not have to face any such a disastrous period. But it is quite possible that the value of imports will continue to fall, and that on account of the cessation of the enormous expenditure going on on the Canadian Pacific Railway, there may be a very serious collapse; that there may be a heavy reduction in the total volume of our imports, and consequently of the revenue of the hon. gentleman. He recognises that contingency, but he

does not profess to make any preparation on that account; and I say nothing of other contingencies that may occur, or claims that may be made upon the Government. But these are things that cannot be omitted, if we desire to make an accurate forecast of the future; and I think it would be well that the hon. gentleman, when reviewing the situation of the country, should have given us some little more idea than he did, as to how he proposes to deal with the serious contingencies that may arise, or in the event of any one—I do not say any two or three—of these things to which I have called attention, taking place. Now, Sir, I have once or twice pointed out, though not in this place, the political issues which have been involved by the conduct of the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman and his colleagues, when they came into power in 1867, ought to have proposed, I think, these three things above all others. They ought to have endeavored to see that our Provinces should rely upon themselves. I have never denied that there were difficulties to be overcome in carrying on our Confederation. It required much mutual forbearance and concession on the part of all the Provinces who brought it about. But it is plain to every man acquainted with the debates which took place, or acquainted with the history of the United States, that you can do no greater injury to Confederation than to encourage all these Provinces into believing that when they get into difficulty they have a right to have recourse to the general Exchequer. I say the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, by their conduct in that respect, have done a great injury to their own cause. They have placed us at a great disadvantage in a comparison with the United States, and they have not pursued the third object that should have been put before them, that is, the speedy development of the North-West. I want to call attention to the effect of the course pursued with respect to these various Provinces. Unfortunately, in both Ontario and Quebec, for different reasons, grave difficulties exist. We know that Quebec has been making demands and is continuing to make demands on the Dominion Treasury which it may be difficult to grant and difficult to refuse; and Ontario, in like manner, has been, through the mouths of her responsible Ministers, calling attention to the fact that Ontario has claims which cannot be overlooked, and rights which must be respected, and that Ontario must insist when grants are made to the other Provinces that like grants are made to her who, to say the least, pays her full proportion of the revenue which the hon. gentleman disburses. When I come to the Maritime Provinces, what do I find? Theirs, I must admit, is a hard case. They were brought into this Confederation by distinct promises on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues, which have been ruthlessly violated. It was at least a tacit understanding that no such tariff as that we now labor under should be imposed upon them. They appear to be injured at all points. They are largely an importing people, a maritime and fishing people, and it is absurd to say that such a tariff as the hon. gentleman has imposed can be otherwise than injurious to those Provinces. Their trade has been taken away at both ends. We need not say anything of the city of St. John, as the hon. gentleman admits it is in a distressed condition; but I may point to the fact that some of the hon. gentleman's own friends have been advocating annexation as the only possible means of escape from the distressed position in which they are placed; and the other day resolutions were laid on the Table of the Nova Scotia Assembly, proposing that the Union with the rest of Canada should be dissolved, and that that Province should resume its old station under the Crown. Then, turning to the North-West, I do not think the hon. gentleman can say that its condition is one that he can look on with satisfaction. There, too, primary rights have been trampled on. Without excuse, and in defiance of their own interests, the hon. gentlemen have interfered with the development of that country and have probably

prevented many thousands of most excellent settlers from going in there. I say nothing of their land policy, which will come up for discussion further on; but if these hon. gentlemen had the slightest understanding of the wants of that country, they would sooner have cut off their right hands than have flung away, as they did last year, \$30,000,000 of the people's money. I say no greater blunder was ever committed than the throwing away of that amount of money to carry a railway around the rocky coast of Lake Superior or through the gorges of British Columbia, when one-tenth of that sum, judiciously expended, would have secured for that North-West country 200,000 settlers within the space of two years. I tell the hon. gentlemen that they have not yet realised the extent of their folly with respect to that country. Had they left it alone and not interfered with its natural development, it would have been in a much more advanced position to-day. Those years which have been thrown away are true seed years; they are years that cannot return; long time must elapse before we shall find ourselves in half as favorable a position as we were before the hon. gentleman chose to interfere on behalf of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Not only have we to begin at the beginning, but we have to conquer the bad reputation the hon. gentlemen have established for themselves. Hon. gentlemen should remember that it is only too true at this moment that there are about a million of native-born Canadians in the United States, a large portion of whom would have been in Manitoba but for the maladministration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that these people will continue to attract a very large number of their fellow-countrymen who, under more favorable circumstances, would have been only too happy to have settled under the British flag. Now, I have spoken of the adverse comparison which our policy compels everybody to make between it and that of the United States. I have pointed out, in addition, the effect of our fiscal policy on our trade with Great Britain; in fact, we have been treating Great Britain worse than a foreign country. The hon. gentleman opposite me (Sir John A. Macdonald) has thrown out vague and lofty promises as to his desire to co-operate in some scheme of Confederation, a subject as to which, however, it has not been convenient for him to give us any indication here; but I point out to him none of those things can be done without large contributions from our Exchequer, and the House knows now only too well how difficult, how almost impossible it is for us to contribute practically or effectually to anything of the kind. I do not pretend to say that all the mischief I have pointed out has been due to protection. If it has been due to protection indirectly, it has been more due to the extravagance of the present Government, to their mistake in over-taxing the people and thus acquiring great surpluses, the possession of which always tempts a Government to gross extravagance, as it has tempted the present Government. But I do not pretend to say that with us, any more than with the United States, protection in itself would have been anything more than an impediment. What is really damaging our position is not the effect of the protective system so much as the effect of the enormous extravagance of the Administration. I desire to call your attention briefly to the position at which we have now arrived, the position to which gentlemen opposite have brought us. Practically speaking, the federal taxation alone will involve, according to my calculation, very nearly one-sixth of the income of our people. Practically speaking—I do not take the extravagant estimates of the Finance Minister, but my own much more moderate estimate of the real taxation—practically speaking, the taxes which we are levying from our people would suffice to maintain about 130,000 families in comfort, or very nearly the sixth part of our whole population. The efforts of the Government to bring people into this country, their enormous expenditure, the so-called National Policy, have resulted in this, that

according to our own returns and statistics there is, as I have said just now, only too great reason to fear that out of every native-born Canadian now in existence, one man in four is to be found in the United States, and out of the immigrants that we pay for and bring to this country, three out of four, if not nine out of ten, exclusive of those who go to Manitoba, find their way to the United States also, as is most conclusively shown by the census returns recently laid on the table. As I have said, the population in our chief Provinces is nearly at a standstill, the outlying Provinces are clamoring for annexation as a remedy, and what have these hon. gentlemen done? They have failed to get reciprocity; they have failed—and failed utterly—to make commercial treaties; they have failed in colonising the North-West; they have failed entirely to restore the balance of trade or equilibrium between exports and imports, to which the hon. gentleman attached so much importance; so that, instead of having an equilibrium, the imports have been \$20,000,000 or \$30,000,000 more than the total volume of exports. They have failed entirely to keep their promises in the matter of keeping up the prices of agricultural products; they have failed to satisfy the Provinces, for every single Province in the Dominion is knocking at our doors for more; they have failed to keep the advantage they had over the United States; they have failed entirely to keep our people in the country, and they have failed in obtaining the enormous amount of revenue which they alleged they were to have extracted from our Dominion lands. Why, the amount of revenue extracted from those lands will not pay the expense of surveying them, an expense which they charged to capital account; but their course has not been an entire failure; no doubt they have succeeded in some things. They succeeded in producing an inflation in business; they have succeeded in turning what might have been honest prosperity into a sort of South Sea Bubble—or North-West Bubble, if you choose to call it so; they have succeeded in creating huge monopolies, and they have succeeded, to a very great extent, by means of subsidies to the press and by other similar means, in degrading the moral sentiment of the country. If the question be asked, can we repair this? I say frankly and candidly that the effects of such evils as these are likely to be very lasting. I do not believe, for my part, they will be very easily removed. I fear that the taint has gone deep. One of the worst results of the extravagance of the Government is this, that, to a very great extent, and for a very long time to come, it will tend to make any honest government impossible, and so the people of Canada are discovering to their cost. A very sharp surgery will be needed. In these six years our position has altered very materially for the worse, and not only materially, but morally. Our case is much like that of the man in the parable. We did succeed in casting out the evil spirit of 1873, but in 1878 he returned again, and if the evil spirit did not quite fulfil the direction of the parable and bring seven other spirits worse than himself with him, probably it was because, having searched diligently, he could not find them. I say that we have wasted great opportunities; I say that we have greatly impaired resources which, wisely used, might have given us in the North-West a more prosperous Province than any we now possess; I say, moreover, as I pointed out, that we have incurred great liabilities to which the Finance Minister made no allusion, but which will undoubtedly have to be met. I admit frankly that the way out of this is not going to be easy, that it will be painful, tedious and difficult. It is true, we are not without good points; it is quite true that all over Canada at present food is cheap and abundant, and is likely, for many years to come, to be cheap and abundant; it is true, we have great resources in our fertile lands which, year by year and day by day, will become more valuable, because a very large proportion of equally good country in the United States is likely to be used for

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

other purposes than wheat growing. I know that there are great potential resources in the country, and that in time we might regain the vantage ground we have lost. Moreover, it is quite true that, in spite of these difficulties, there is, and always will be in, a country like this, a considerable growth, even though it be in a one-sided direction, but no man can consider the facts I have laid before this House and say that the increase in our population, that our progress, that our position, are at all such as we had a right to expect they would be when we first entered Confederation some seventeen years ago. I am aware that in stating all the facts, I have been obliged to state some very unpalatable truths, and I am quite prepared, hon. gentlemen opposite and their press and friends should attack me in any way they please; they will find it much easier to attack me than to refute the arguments I have used. These gentlemen are fond of declaring that my speeches are mischievous; an hon. gentleman opposite was good enough to say that I had done mischief by my speeches, not only in Canada but all over the world. It is not my speeches, Sir, that are mischievous, but the acts that call them forth. It is those acts and not my speeches that have done injury here and elsewhere. Now, I say it is for us to face the facts. We challenge investigation. This is the third time at least that we have taken issue with these hon. gentlemen. We took issue with them in 1871 and in 1872 and in 1873, and, had our advice been listened to then, Canada would have been the richer to-day by hundreds of millions than it is. We took issue with them in 1878, when they entered on this foolish mis-called National Policy, of which they will in a very short time be reaping the unpleasant results. We took issue with them in 1880 and in 1881, when they chose to deliver over the most valuable portion of this continent *in posse*, if not *in esse*, to a monopoly, the like of which never before existed in any country under the sun. Again we take issue with them, and we say that, if they persist in their recklessness and go on piling up debt and piling up expenditure as they have been doing, for a year or two more, the end is near. We tell them that there is less real union among our people than there was twelve years ago, and that it is their maladministration that has been the cause of it. Where is there a Province that has not got some separate grievance of its own, that has not got some separate demand? We have some Provinces alienated from us by our unjust tariff. We find that, while our population remains stationary, our debt keeps increasing in an enormous ratio, the like of which has never been known or seen in Canada before; and all this is the result of a most unusual combination of favorable circumstances. No man could have had better fortune; no man could have had greater luck; and the result of all these favorable circumstances is, that they have dragged us a great deal deeper into debt, that they have enormously added to our expenditure, and that they have driven away an enormous mass of our population. I say in conclusion, and I say it, not as a matter of rhetorical statement, but as a simple matter of fact, capable of mathematical demonstration, that I believe to-day, if we sat down and counted the cost, we would find that this country has lost more in six years of evil Government relatively to its population and its resources than the people of the United States did in the four years of desperate civil war which immediately preceded the formation of our Confederation.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I desire to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I propose that the House should go into committee now in reference to the resolutions affecting cigars, and should take the report of the committee before adjourning.

Motion agreed to, and House resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. BLAKE. There may be some enquiry needed afterwards, and I suppose we shall have the same privilege as if we were in committee?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Just the same.

Resolutions in reference to the duty on cigars (p. 333) agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved that it is expedient that these resolutions should take effect from and after the 4th day of March inst.

Motion agreed to; and resolutions to be reported.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:55 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 4th March, 18-5.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Fort McLeod Rancho Telegraph Company.—(Mr. Ives.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited).—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Kootenay Railway Company of British Columbia.—(Mr. Small.)

AMHERST AND PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. TOWNSHEND moved for leave to introduce a Bill to incorporate the Amherst and Prince Edward Island Railway Company.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). Before that motion is carried I would like to enquire whether the rules concerning the introduction of Bills have been complied with in reference to this Bill. I may say that in connection with this Bill I was present several times before the Standing Orders Committee, and I there found that the necessary notices had not been given, and I was informed by the chairman of the committee that it would be impossible to introduce that Bill this Session. As this Bill would affect the constituency in which I am interested, and no notice has been given of it in that constituency, I think it is unfair that it should be rushed through contrary to the rules.

Mr. SPEAKER. The Committee on Standing Orders to-day have reported that among the petitions which they examined and found correct, was one of Moffatt and others, of Amherst County, praying for an Act incorporating the Amherst and Prince Edward Island Railway Company.

Mr. WOOD. Is that sufficient?

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose that the report is the usual report of the Committee on Standing Orders, that the

notices have been complied with. We are left to infer that the proper notices have been given.

Mr. BEATY. The matter stands in this shape: The hon. member did appear before the committee on a former occasion, but the time was enlarged so that notices might be proved. Since then, evidence of publication has been produced, and the committee decided to report favorably on the Bill. We regret that the hon. member was not present, but the clerk stated he had notice of the meeting; and as the notice has been proved, the committee saw no reason why the Bill should not be reported.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). No notice was given to me, and I am bound to oppose the Bill at the present stage, as it will affect my county.

Mr. BLAKE. I understand that the rule with respect to the action of the Standing Orders Committee, is this: When the committee come to the conclusion that the notice was such as to actually comply with the rules, they simply report the fact. But when they come to the conclusion that the notice was not sufficient they state the fact and call the attention of the House to it, so that the House has the opportunity of dealing with the particular question upon its merits. The committee appears to have deviated from the course. It seems the notice was not sufficient at the time, according to the strict rules.

Mr. BEATY. The committee thought there was not sufficient reason to make any special remarks about the matter.

Mr. BLAKE. We ought to know on each occasion upon which the Standing Orders Committee has come to the conclusion that the notice is not sufficient on the day on which they act, and a recommendation should be made to the House. Such committee has heretofore recommended that the notice be deemed adequate and the Bill allowed to proceed. Then the House has an opportunity of considering the matter; but until the statement was made by the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood), we had reasons to suppose that the rules had been complied with, because the terms of the report are such as have hitherto been confined to that class of cases. The proper course for the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) to adopt is, to move that such portion of the report as refers to the Bill in question be referred back to the Standing Orders Committee.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In this case you find that one of the members interested in this matter, because his county is interested in it, says he had no notice, and that the committee's report as presented to the House does not cover the ground; it only states that the committee considers the notice sufficient. We have another member of the committee who goes further and says that the time fixed by the regulations of Parliament have not been complied with; but inasmuch as the time fixed in those regulations would expire before the Bill could reach the Railway Committee, the committee decided under those circumstances they would report that the Bill was satisfactory. An hon. member (Mr. Wood) who is interested in the project claims there should be more time allowed. It would be proper for the motion for leave to introduce the Bill to be withdrawn, as suggested by the leader of the Opposition, and that such portion of the report as refers to this matter be referred back to the committee to give them time to report according to the rule.

Motion withdrawn.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland) moved that so much of the report as refers to the Bill to incorporate the Amherst and Prince Edward Island Railway Company be referred back to the Committee on Standing Orders.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

Mr. MITCHELL. As I see the right hon. Premier in his place, I would like to ask him, with the permission of the House, whether he is prepared to bring down the list of Grand Trunk stockholders, which was ordered by the House last Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am not prepared to bring it down because I have not got it to bring down. As I understand, my hon. friend moved for this return by an Order of the House. The Order was granted and was sent in the ordinary way to the Secretary of State, and his Department sent it to the Railway Department, seeing that it was a railway matter. They however did not communicate it to the Grand Trunk.

Mr. MITCHELL. It got buried there, I suppose.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They have, however, sent it to the Grand Trunk, and they have forwarded it to England in order to get the list.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is all right; we will get it some time or other. I would also ask the Premier at what time he will send us down the agreement between the Government and the Grand Trunk about the million pounds sterling.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am glad the hon. gentleman has reminded me of it; I will hunt it up and bring it down.

TEMPORARY LOANS TO GOVERNMENT BY BANKS

Mr. CHARLTON asked. What is the total amount of temporary loans made by the Government from banks up to February 25th, the date and amount of each loan and from what bank made, and the terms of each loan as to time—whether upon a call or otherwise?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There was a loan to the Government by the Merchants' Bank on the 7th of November, 1884, of \$500,000 for six months; by the Imperial Bank, on the 17th December, 1884, of \$250,000 for six months; by the City and District Savings Bank, on the 9th of January, 1885, \$250,000 for eight months and \$250,000 for twelve months; and on the 18th of February, \$250,000, for six months; by the Bank of Montreal, on the 1st of February, 1885, \$2,000,000 for eight months; total in Canada, \$3,500,000. In England—the London and Westminster Bank, on the 1st of January, 1885, £1,300,000 sterling for six months; from Baring Bros. & Co., at various dates, and Glynn, Mills & Co., for Baring, Mills & Co., £233,986 12s. 9d., due in September, 1885; from Glynn, Mills, Curry & Co., £267,500, due in September, 1885; total in England, £1,801,486 12s. 9d., in all about \$12,500,000.

SHORT LINE SURVEY FROM ST. CHARLES STATION.

Mr. LANDRY (Montmagny) asked, Whether the Government have issued orders for an instrumental survey of the line beginning at St. Charles Station, on the Intercolonial Railway, passing by the second range of the Township of Montmagny near River Du Sud, and thence towards Sever Islands?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no application for this survey in the Department of Railways and Canals.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RELIEF.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to propose any measure for the relief of the Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Canadian Pacific Railway Company from its embarrassments?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There has been no application from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to propose a measure of relief from its embarrassments.

INTEREST OF LOANS TO THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Canadian Pacific Railway Company has paid to the Government any, and if so, what amounts for interest on the loans of last Session; and at what dates? If not, has any, and if so, what arrangement has been made as to such interest?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. All the interest due on the loans made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company up to the present day have been paid, and the following are the amounts: \$147,136.87, on the 17th August, 1884; \$273,750.78 on the 12th of September, 1884, and \$147,769.24 on the 17th February, 1885.

APPRAISER OF CUSTOMS AT SUMMERSIDE.

Mr. YEO asked, Why was the office of appraiser of Customs at Summerside abolished, and who at present is acting, and what is his pay?

Mr. BOWELL. The office of appraiser at Port Summerside was abolished on the 1st of September, 1879, the service of the officer not being required. The collector is, by virtue of his office, the appraiser, and his salary is \$900 per annum.

SUPERANNUATION OF J. B. SCHURMAN.

Mr. YEO asked, Why was the locker, Mr. J. B. Schurman, superannuated, and who at present fills his place, and at what salary?

Mr. BOWELL. Mr. Schurman was superannuated on account of age, and his services were no longer required. There being nothing for him to do no successor was appointed, and consequently no salary was paid.

COLLECTOR OF INLAND REVENUE AT SUMMERSIDE.

Mr. YEO asked, Why was the collector of Inland Revenue at Summerside discharged, and who is at present filling his office, and at what salary?

Mr. COSTIGAN. The services of the collector of Inland Revenue at Summerside were dispensed with on the repeated reports of our inspector that he was entirely unfit to discharge the duties of his office, that he made not even a pretence of keeping accounts, and that he was so infirm as to be unable to attend to the office. No successor was appointed, the work has been done by the staff, and there is no salary paid for the office.

ETCHEMIN RIVER LINE.

Mr. LESAGE asked, Whether the Government have come to a decision as to an instrumental survey of the line by the valley of the river Etchemin, of which a barometrical survey has already been made by Messrs. Light and Wicksteed? If so, when will the survey be commenced?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A barometrical survey has been made, and the Government are now considering the question of an instrumental survey.

IMMIGRANT SHEDS AT MEDICINE HAT.

Mr. WATSON asked, Did the Government call for tenders for the construction of the immigrant sheds at

Medicine Hat, or was the contract let without tenders being asked for?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Tenders were called for the construction of the immigrant sheds at Medicine Hat in the papers of Winnipeg, Emerson, Minnedosa, Morris, Regina, McLeod, St. Boniface and Selkirk.

STAGE LINES TO AND FROM FORT McLEOD.

Mr. WATSON asked, Have the Government subsidised a stage line between Medicine Hat and Fort McLeod, as well as a stage line between Calgary and Fort McLeod? If so, who are the contractors and by what route are the mails to and from Fort McLeod carried?

Mr. CARLING. There is no subsidised stage line between Medicine Hat and Fort McLeod. There is a contract for carrying the mails between Calgary and Fort McLeod. The contractor is Mr. J. Stewart. The route is direct from Calgary to Fort McLeod.

MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS.

Mr. WATSON asked, Were tenders advertised for by the Government for the erection of mounted police barracks at several points in the North-West Territories before the contracts were let?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It has not been the practice heretofore to advertise for tenders for the erection or repair of mounted police barracks. The services of the men being largely utilised for that purpose.

GRANT FOR WHARVES ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Whether the sum of \$53,222.19 voted last Session to the Government of Prince Edward Island for the construction and maintenance of certain wharves on said Island has been paid to that Government? If so, at what date? Was that Government required to sign a receipt in full of all claims on the Dominion Government in relation to those wharves as provided for in the Minute of Council agreeing to the payment of the money? If not, was any other, and what agreement come to with reference to the claim of the Island Government, and is it intended to pay the latter Government any further and what amount on account of said wharf claims?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman will see that it would be much more convenient to embody this question in an order for papers. If he does so they will be brought down immediately.

Mr. DAVIES. But I do not know that anything has been done.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The fact that I suggest that to the hon. gentleman shows that something has been done.

Mr. DAVIES. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to transform this into a notice of motion? If he does, I will move for a return.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It will come at the proper place.

Mr. DAVIES. Does the hon. gentleman give me an answer or decline?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I said that if the hon. gentleman made the motion, it would be granted and we would bring down the papers. But he must see that this is beyond an ordinary question; I cannot come down and read all these papers; it is really one of those questions that should be embodied in a notice of motion. We do not intend to

refuse the papers; on the contrary, they will be brought down as soon as the motion is made.

THE GOVERNMENT GOLD RESERVE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Copies of all correspondence since 1st January, 1884, between the Minister of Finance and any of the banks of the Dominion in reference to withdrawals of gold from the Government, together with a statement of all sums of gold imported by Government from the 1st January, 1884.

He said: In moving for this return I desire to say that at the present moment the amount of our gold reserve in proportion to our total liabilities appears to me to be exceedingly small. I will require to go back a little in order to explain to the House why I entertain that opinion. The elder members of this House no doubt recollect that almost immediately before the formation of the Confederation the Government being then in great straits for want of money, practically seized upon one-half of the gold reserve theretofore held by the banks, and substituted for that reserve their own legal tender notes. Now, I do not want to discuss that original measure further than to say that I opposed it at the time, believing that it would perilously reduce the total amount of gold held in the Dominion, which I thought was quite as small as a country in our position ought to hold. After I became Finance Minister, I took steps at once to increase the amount of our reserve of gold; I altered the law in such fashion that after we issued \$9,000,000 worth of notes, we were compelled to hold up to \$12,000,000 at least, 50 per cent. in gold. After \$12,000,000 were issued, we held dollar for dollar. I may also state that that step was taken not only for the purpose of giving greater security to our note-holders, but also because it was found that the amount borrowed at call from the people through the medium of the savings banks was increasing. Later on this measure was repealed, and the present measure substituted, which reduces the total amount of gold held by the Government to 15 per cent. of the total note issue without any reference to the amount of that note issue; and it provides that 10 per cent. are to be held in notes guaranteed by the Imperial Government. I desire to call the special attention of the House to this. In 1866 the position of the banks of Canada was as follows: On the 1st of January, 1866, the various banks held \$7,594,000 in gold against a total liability of \$43,000,000. A little after that date, as I have said, the Government took possession of a large portion of the gold. In 1878, the position of the Government gold reserve was as follows: We had on the 1st of July, in gold, \$2,519,000, and our total liabilities payable at call, whether they were in notes or for savings bank deposits, amounted to \$18,900,000, so that against \$18,900,000 we held an available reserve of gold of \$2,519,000. We had also at that moment a large amount of guaranteed securities, although they were not specifically pledged as security for our notes and savings bank deposits. Now, by the return in the *Gazette*, I find that on the 1st of February last, we had \$2,610,000 in gold, against a total liability for notes and savings bank deposits of \$47,750,000, in round numbers; so that although we had added very nearly \$30,000,000 to our liabilities, payable at call, we had not increased our gold reserve at all, or only to the extent of a few thousand dollars. It is quite true there is the sum of £600,000, not quite \$3,000,000, guaranteed bonds, which are, as I understand, by law specifically pledged for this purpose. Nevertheless, I doubt very much whether it is expedient for us to reduce our total holding of gold to the sum I have named. Anybody who chooses to compare our bank returns of to-day will see that at this moment, with total liability on the part of our banks of \$133,000,000, we only hold about as much gold as we did in

1866 when our total liabilities were only \$43,000,000, the remainder of the cash reserves being made up of about \$11,000,000 of Dominion notes. The exact figures are as follows: On the 1st of February, 1885, the gold held by the various banks amounted to \$7,620,000 and the Dominion notes held by them to \$11,923,000. Now the gold and also the Dominion notes represent that amount of cash which the banks hold to be an adequate reserve for their \$133,000,000. It bears nearly the same proportion, not quite one-sixth, to their liabilities, which the gold they held in 1866 did. It is quite clear that if the banks had been left to their own devices, there would have been at present at least \$20,000,000 gold held by them as against any calls that might be made upon them. At present they only hold \$7,600,000, and the Government hold \$2,600,000, so that in point of fact all the gold in Canada is just about one-half of what it would have been, in the natural course of things, had no interference been made. It is quite true that it is not very likely that any very large amount either of savings bank or post office deposits will be called upon, at the same it is quite possible that circumstances may occur which may produce a sharp withdrawal of them, and that is a thing that should be carefully taken into our reckoning. We are, at this moment, practically carrying on a very large banking business. We have a bank note issue of \$16,660,000, we have also borrowed from the people at call \$31,000,000, so that we owe \$48,000,000 in round numbers, against which we hold in gold only \$2,600,000. It is quite true that we hold, or did hold, a considerable amount of guaranteed securities; no doubt those are a very valuable class of securities, no doubt, when reasonable notice is given, the Finance Minister can from time to time obtain gold for them. But I submit that notwithstanding all that, that so large liabilities as \$47,000,000 would justify us, on ordinary banking principles, in holding a very much more considerable reserve in gold than the very small sum of \$2,600,000; I submit further it is doubly desirable in this country that the Government should be fortified with a large amount of gold, because our position is considerably worse than those of other countries where the circulation is dependent on a gold basis. In the United States the Government have in their possession an enormous amount of gold and silver bullion. I think that at present they are the largest gold holders in the world, in any case, they hold an enormous sum which would be available in case of any disturbance in their markets. Then in England there is a very large amount of gold in circulation, because there the bank notes in use are of very much higher denominations than our own. I doubt whether it would be safe for us to hold bank deposits as a sufficient reserve against these large liabilities in Dominion notes and deposits on call. I doubt this for the excellent reason that in a time of stringency and contraction, by drawing on these bank deposits the Government would only aggravate the evil, and the securities, whether they be our own or guaranteed securities, are not by any means, a perfect equivalent for gold. I do not know and I intend to ask the Finance Minister to state what he has done with this £600,000 sterling. He has imported a fair amount of gold, and I desire to know whether, for the purpose of obtaining that gold, he found it necessary to pledge or to dispose of any part of the £600,000 guaranteed 4 per cents. But wholly apart from that, even if there had been no inconvenience in dealing with this question of gold reserve and of the withdrawals of gold on the part of the banks, it would be desirable on general principles that a Government having such huge liabilities should strengthen their hands and should hold something more than the exceedingly small amount of gold which they now hold. I am informed, and it was freely stated in the public prints, that all through last year, very considerable practical inconvenience resulted

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

from the small amount of gold held by the Government; I am informed that demands were often made by the banks to the Finance Department for gold, to which it was found exceedingly inconvenient to accede; I have been told that in point of fact there was almost a feud between the Department and the banks, the banks wanting the gold and the Department finding it exceedingly inconvenient to give it, that remonstrances, written or verbal, were addressed by the hon. Minister or his Deputy, on several occasions, to several banks which, in the natural course of business, wished to withdraw gold for Government legal tenders. If that be the case, I say it is very unfortunate, and I say it is desirable the Government of Canada should be in a position to retire at call all its own tenders which the banks may require the Government to retire. I am quite aware the hon. gentleman has incorporated a provision requiring the banks to hold a large percentage of their cash reserves in legal tenders, but the more stringent is the rule the more the hon. Minister should see it is not worked to the detriment of the public. If the banks see fit to reduce their cash reserve and to send in a demand for gold, they should not be told that the Government considered their proceeding a very unfriendly one. Judging by the statement which the hon. gentleman laid on the Table, it appears to me great inconvenience might arise should a stringency unfortunately occur in the money market in the great money centres. Every day it is becoming more and more clear that, when money stringencies occur, they are likely to occur very nearly simultaneously all the world over. It is very probable that stringencies might occur within a very short space of time in New York and London and Paris and other great centres. Then very likely there would be a demand on the part of the Canadian banks for gold, and, with the very small reserve which the hon. gentleman possesses and looking at the serious liabilities he has incurred, very grave and very unfortunate results might happen unless our reserves are strengthened. There is due at call or on very short notice for the savings banks deposits and notes an amount of \$47,700,000. The hon. gentleman has just told us that he has borrowed some \$12,500,000 at short dates, all of which, I think, matures within four or five months; also, that he has given notice in London absolutely and positively to repay \$25,000,000 on the 1st July, and it is well known to this House that there are constant expenditures going on on capital account which will probably compel him between this and the 1st July to borrow other large sums of money, possibly not less than \$10,000,000, or it may be \$12,000,000. It appears to me, in reference to all these facts, that, if circumstances should arise under which the banks would require to draw large sums of money from the Government, to exchange large amounts of these legal tenders for notes, very serious mischief might accrue unless the gold reserve is strengthened. I do not want just at this moment to complicate the discussion by offering any suggestions, but I desire to call the attention of the House and the attention of the country to the fact that, in the actual working at this moment, as evidenced by what took place last year, considerable practical inconvenience has accrued from our having so small an amount of gold considering our large liabilities; and to press upon the Finance Minister the extreme desirability of strengthening his hands and providing himself, under these circumstances, by holding a larger amount of gold, if necessary, than the law requires, for such demands as were made before and may at any moment be made again. With a view of giving the hon. gentleman the opportunity of stating his own views on the subject and also of giving us such information as he has as to what he has done with the £600,000 guaranteed by the Imperial Government—whether that is still actually in his possession or whether he has pledged it or disposed of it in any way for the purpose of

obtaining gold—and also ascertaining if possible what correspondence has passed between him and the various banks, I beg to submit the motion of which I have given notice.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There can be no objection to furnishing the returns asked for by the hon. member. I might say to him, however, that there is no correspondence between the Finance Minister and the banks since the date named. There has been some official correspondence between the Deputy Minister and some of the banks during my absence last summer.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Then we can amend the motion, or will you bring that down without the amendment?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; I will consider that it includes the Deputy Minister. The hon. member has called the attention of the House to the position in which the law stands at present with reference to the security for the gold that is required to be held and other securities for the redemption of the Dominion notes, and he has also called the attention of the House to the large amount that is due to the savings bank. I think there is very little to be feared with reference to the savings bank deposits. They are separate and distinct from the note circulation. I think, when I refer to the fact that, during the five years from 1874 to 1879, during the depression that existed at that time, there was an increase in the deposits in the bank amounting to \$1,900,000, that is an evidence that, judging from the present condition—gloomily I have no doubt considered by the hon. gentleman who moves this resolution—there is very little chance of any considerable sum being called for over and above the deposits that are made. I think we are perfectly safe in that respect, especially when the temptations and inducements are so great as the hon. gentleman pointed out yesterday in the interest given to the 100,000 depositors in the savings banks of Canada. As to the change in the law since 1878 with reference to the gold that is to be held, he has stated that in 1878 the Government were required to hold 25 per cent. of gold up to \$9,000,000, from \$9,000,000, to \$12,000,000 50 per cent. additional, or \$1,500,000 for the additional \$3,000,000, and for all above \$12,000,000, dollar for dollar. That was practically providing that the circulation should never go beyond \$12,000,000, because the Government would never put out a circulation for which they would have to hold dollar for dollar in gold. There was no advantage, in that at all. That was amended, and we were authorised to issue \$20,000,000 circulation, and 15 per cent. of that was to be held in gold, and 10 per cent. in securities guaranteed by the Imperial Government. There has been little or no inconvenience resulting from that down to the present time. The amounts withdrawn by the Government from year to year, whenever they had to provide for the demands of the banks, have not been exorbitant, and I think it is unfortunate that the hon. gentleman should have stated here that difficulties have arisen during the last year when demands were made to which it was found difficult or inconvenient to respond. That requires some little explanation, and I may say that there was no difficulty whatever in meeting the demands that were made, only that it required to be done at the expense of the country in importing that gold for the purpose of making the payments. Never was there an application made that was not responded to, but I state, as I have stated before, that the Government have, in addition to the amount held in the banks, various amounts from \$2,000,000 to \$3,000,000 over the 15 per cent. in gold required by law, and those are generally left in the banks without interest. This has had this effect that, if the Bank of Montreal or any other bank held, in the moneys they received from customs and excise and post office, \$300,000 or half a million not paying interest, it was a question for them to consider whether they would ask

for gold from the Government as the Government would call upon them to pay up the money, or whether they would refrain from asking for gold. The correspondence will show that, when some of the banks, in May or June last, were asking for considerable sums of money, they were informed that, if they continued to draw the gold, the Government would be under the necessity of drawing upon them for the balance in their hands to provide that gold. Sir, in June £200,000 of gold was imported by the Government to meet the demands that were made. I do not at the present moment know how much gold we have had to import during the past year, but the return asked for will show the amount exactly. At that time it was not necessary to sell any portion of the 4 per cent. guaranteed securities for the purpose of procuring that gold, and about the month of January last, in order to meet the advances that had been made by our agents in England, £200,000 of the £600,000 was disposed of by our agents in London—I am quite sure £150,000 were sold; I am not quite sure whether the other £50,000 was sold or not, but I know they have authority to sell £200,000 when a favorable opportunity offers. Therefore, as the circulation under the authority of law cannot exceed \$20,000,000, it is only necessary that we should hold, under the provisions of the law, £400,000 or less of the guaranteed bonds of the Dominion Government. At present, I think, the circulation is something like \$15,000,000 or \$16,000,000.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. \$16,000,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We reduced the circulation a million about the 1st of February, because we found the amounts held by the banks were considerably in excess of the 40 per cent. required to be held as a portion of their reserve. But the whole matter has changed since 1878, because the amendment to the Banking Act required that 40 per cent. of their reserve should be held in Dominion notes, and so far as that amount goes we cannot very well be called upon for it; and the one dollar, two dollar and four dollar notes have gone up to something like \$6,000,000 the last year or two. This is in the hands of the public, and is not presented for gold except in small sums. The notes presented for gold are \$100 and \$1,000, for the convenience of transactions between the banks, and there has been no difficulty in providing it. But it is just a question now whether, instead of leaving in the banks the entire sum of money that may be necessary to meet any demand that may be made for gold, we ought to strengthen our reserve and keep it in gold, or whether we ought to leave it as we have been doing, and as the hon. member did himself. But there is no fear whatever of any difficulty arising. The only question is as to what the Government would lose in the importation of gold to meet any demands that may be made; and with the view of keeping that in hand, as I say, the Government have reduced the circulation a million within the last month. Therefore, I think the hon. member may rest perfectly easy with reference to the character of these notes, and as to the probability of their being redeemed in gold when they are presented. We consider that the provisions of the law are ample, and that we have taken the precautions necessary on that subject to strengthen our position by keeping a very considerable reserve in the bank available to purchase gold if necessary.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has thought it his duty to warn the Government as to the prospects in store for us by their not having a sufficient amount of gold on hand. I think it is unfortunate that he should have endeavored in drawing attention to that matter, to create distrust in the minds of the people of Canada. If there is any circulation that is well established and well received by the public, and that has the confidence of the public, it is the Government

Dominion note issue. Now the various chartered banks of Canada are required to keep 40 per cent. of their circulation in Dominion notes. Well, what are the facts to-day? The circulation of the chartered banks is \$31,935,933, and they are holding, of Dominion notes, \$17,620,000. Now, if any gentleman will take the trouble to make the calculation, he will find that they are holding at present 50 per cent., and consequently the Government cannot be in any danger from that quarter at present. I rose chiefly for the purpose of pointing out, as I have done on one or two occasions before, that the great danger we will have to meet in the future arises chiefly from the privilege possessed by the chartered banks to-day of circulating their own paper instead of circulating Government notes; and I can easily see that it is possible for the banks to grasp the whole of this issue of \$16,000,000 in Dominion notes, and that the balance they hold over and above that, as required by their charter, may at any moment be presented to the Government for redemption in gold. That is the only danger I see from that circulation, namely, that the banks may accumulate that extra circulation and that the Government may not have the advantage of circulating the \$20,000,000 which they took the power to circulate, and which I feel the country ought to have the benefit of. Now, if the hon. gentleman wanted to throw distrust upon the institutions of the country, he might have drawn attention to another fact which I think ought to be patent to all who consider the circumstances of the banks. He will find that the depositors in the various chartered banks to-day are creditors to them to the amount of \$93,309,870 in deposits, partly on call and partly on time; and all these depositors feel that they may go at any time and draw specie for that amount. The chartered banks to-day hold \$7,469,753 in specie. Will that meet their nearly \$32,000,000 of circulation? Will it meet the demand for \$93,000,000 in deposits? Will the \$7,000,000 cover the whole of that? The hon. gentleman might have pointed out that fact in saying that they have certain reserves. Are they in specie? Are they available? Are these reserves held in such a position that the banks of the country cannot at once lay their hands upon them? Then why throw distrust upon the Government circulation, which everybody ought to know is in the interest of the whole country? This is a very wide question, indeed, and I am not now trying to throw discredit or distrust upon the banks of the country, or intimating that those institutions are not perfectly solvent and able to meet any ordinary emergency. But when the hon. gentleman, in presenting the case to the Finance Minister, suggests that difficulties may arise because he has not a sufficiently large specie reserve, he is fixing his attention altogether too much on the dark side of the question, as he is accustomed to do. Mr. Speaker, I have no hesitation in saying that the country will accept that issue from the Government gladly in preference to any bank issue that was ever made. The Government will have the means of redeeming that circulation; they have now the means of redeeming it under all circumstances, because they have the power of taxing the people and of collecting a revenue. The Government now hold over \$2,000,000 of the specie to meet this demand. From what source can that demand come? It could not come from the banks of Canada if they were restricted in their circulation; and if it was entirely withdrawn then they would no longer have a Dominion note circulation to meet, and they would be only too glad to see the circulation of the \$37,000,000 now lying idle. Is it not a fact that there is something like \$18,000,000 lying in the hands of the banks and not earning a dollar? Is it not also a fact that there are millions lying idle, although first-class business men may offer the very best security? Not because there is not sufficient bank circulation, but because the chartered banks control it. I hold that if the only note circulation of the country was in the hands of the Government the difficulty

Mr. HESSON.

would not arise, and the banks would be able to lend all the money they possess without being afraid of not being able to stand a run on the bank. No country professes to make a circulation for people outside of their own boundaries. We are not called upon to do that; but a circulation to pass from hand to hand to enable us to meet our liabilities and to pay our debts is all that the people want. Such a circulation established and endorsed by the Government and paid by the people, will be the best source of credit, and the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) should not attempt to throw distrust on the Government's course in this matter. The Government should, indeed, be encouraged to go forward in this direction, and I trust several hon. members will have the courage to speak out. So many members are bound up by being stockholders in banks or by being embarrassed by reference to this subject, that they are unwilling to express their feelings; and I regret that the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright), who ought to know something about the welfare of the country, should have attempted to throw discredit and distrust on the Government's policy so far as they have gone in this direction.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) has stated that there are many members who are tied up by being stockholders in banks or are embarrassed by being debtors to banks so that they are unwilling to express their opinions and vote according to their convictions. No doubt the hon. gentleman made that statement after making due enquiries.

Mr. HESSON. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me if he thought I said vote. I said unwilling to speak their sentiments.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose the hon. gentleman's accusation has reference to the way of voting as well as speaking. I suppose the hon. gentleman made due enquiry before he cast such an aspersion on so large a proportion of the members of this House. It is not exactly proper when an hon. member sets up to act the role of accuser of others that he himself should be so careless on the subject of casting aspersions. The hon. gentleman in the early part of his observations, when contrasting the position of the Government with that of the banks with respect to the specie reserve, spoke only of the specie reserve, and adverted to the \$7,000,000 as the sum which the banks held to answer the large amount he mentioned as due to depositors. At that time, and indeed for a considerable portion of the speech the hon. gentleman took no account whatever of the \$11,000,000 or \$12,000,000 legal tender which the banks also have—although he did in a parenthesis subsequently mention the fact, but only in that part of his speech in which he said they had nothing. The banks have specie reserves and the legal tender as their bases of credit. It is by means of having that cash, or what is supposed to be equivalent to cash, that they are able to secure that measure of confidence which the people, rightly or wrongly, choose to place in them. That is the proposition which my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) sets out. He does not propose, as does the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Hesson) any radical change. The hon. gentleman is dealing with the policy which has been in existence for a considerable period of time and through various Administrations—the policy of a note issue more or less extended, guaranteed by, in fact the issue of the Government of the country, and the principle of security in respect of that issue. He has pointed out that this Government in its former state of existence proposed that the measures with respect to the security to be given to the public in respect of that issue, should be very much more stringent than that which at this time obtain. He pointed out that such as they were they had not met his view of what was right, and when he had the opportunity of direct-

ing, to some extent, the legislation of the country, he had taken still greater precautions, and he has pointed out that the present condition of things is one which deserves, and ought to attract, the attention of the House. So far from those observations being unkindly, it appears from the answer of the hon. Finance Minister that they were kindly in the extreme, because the hon. Minister states that it ought to be a fair question for consideration by the Government whether a considerable portion of the deposits in banks at this time, without interest, should not be put into gold and reserved expressly and specifically as a further security against the outstanding obligations of the Government. So it is very clear that when the Government itself acknowledges that the question is one for consideration, as to whether the gold reserve ought not to be strengthened, it cannot be said to be unkindly when an hon. gentleman on this side, who has filled the position of Finance Minister, urges that greater security be afforded than now obtains should point that out. I should like to know from the hon. Finance Minister at what time during January the guaranteed debentures were sold, the £200,000 to replace the million.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was in January.

Mr. BLAKE. But at that time, was it not necessary to sell the guaranteed debentures?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; because we took the proceeds out of the loan.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has stated that it was some time in January that he sold the guaranteed debentures. About what date?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I forget; I cannot say.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman was correct in supposing that January was the date, and he has told the hon. member for Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) this afternoon, as the dates of the various loans indicate, that he would not feel disposed to retain those guaranteed debentures under those circumstances. I call the hon. member's attention to the fact that in the *Gazette* statement indicating the condition of finance on 31st January, it is represented by the Government that the whole of the £600,000 guaranteed debentures was in hand. The hon. Minister shakes his head. I will read him the statement:

Specie held by the several Assistant Receivers General on the 31st January, 1884.....	\$2,550,473 14
Additional at Montreal.....	90,000 00
	\$2,640,473 14
Guaranteed sterling debentures.....	2,920,000 00
	\$5,530,473 14

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think that must be a mistake on the part of the clerk who prepared the statement.

Mr. BLAKE. I dare say it is a mistake; that is the conclusion to which I came. When I heard the Finance Minister state that during January he sold £200,000 of the £600,000 guaranteed debentures, and I found that on the 13th February the hon. gentleman represents to the public that he had that £200,000 of debentures in hand as against those notes, I was sure there was a mistake somewhere.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is a matter of very little importance, and the mistake was committed no doubt by the clerk who made up the statement. But, under the law, all that was required was less than £400,000, to make up 15 per cent. Therefore, as far as that is concerned there was no disadvantage arising from it and no violation of the provisions of the law. My attention had not been called to it, and the attention of the clerk who made up the statement has not been called to the fact that the £200,000 had been authorised to be sold.

Mr. BLAKE. Although it is a fact that the law requires only a sum less than this sum, in the aggregate of specie and guaranteed debentures, it is also a fact that the law requires, for the security and information of the general public, that the amount actually held should be monthly returned and made public; and it is also a fact that the public relies upon this statement of the amount in gold and guaranteed debentures held as indicating the degree of preparation that the Government has made at any one time to meet possible demands, and it is a serious thing to be told that there is a blunder of five or six millions in the statement which the Government presented to the public of the resources it was holding specially against its issue. The hon. gentleman says the clerk has made the blunder. I find here the signature of Mr. Courtney, the Deputy Minister of Finance, so I suppose as the clerk made a blunder the hon. gentleman made a blunder; and of course he deals in millions—he deals in so many millions that he tosses them about as if they were playthings, and the habit has got into the office, and the clerk did not think it worth while to knock off a million, and the Minister did not think it worth while, and so the public is told that there exists—what? An excess of this enormous sum—an excess of specie and guaranteed debentures of \$1,364,423, that the excess is nearly \$1,400,000, when, in truth, the excess was only about \$400,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Pounds.

Mr. BLAKE. No; the aggregate excess of specie and guaranteed debentures is stated at \$1,363,000, and it was less than that by something approaching a million of dollars, and therefore the public was told that the Government was doing far more than its duty; that while it was bound to hold only so much it was holding nearly \$1,400,000 more; it was not repeating the operations of June when it ran the proportions away down; it was not repeating the operations of June when they had to warn those calling on them for money that if they drew on them they would have to draw in revenge. They had imported a million, and they were going to keep on the safe side. That is the appearance which the thing presented on paper, but the paper does not represent the case in truth and in fact, for as a matter of fact the amount held by the Government was only one-third or one-fourth of the amount they represented. What security have we got for the gold? Perhaps we will be told when we come to enquire about the gold that some other clerk has made a mistake about it.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not think the hon. member need have got so excited about a matter of this kind, though, it is true, he has had small ground for fault finding this Session so far, and I am not surprised that a little mistake of this kind in the preparation of the paper should be made a great deal of. What is required is, that at the end of every month there is so much gold held in reserve, and that reserve must be over 15 per cent. of the amount of notes in circulation. The amount of guaranteed bonds required to be held for circulation would only be £300,000 to cover the provisions of the law. But we had £600,000 of unguaranteed securities when the law was passed, and, therefore, feeling that we held them and that it was not necessary to sell them, we retained them for the purpose of meeting any demand that might come for the redemption of notes. We held in the hands of our agents in England £600,000 when it was not required that more than £300,000 should be held. Therefore, I say that it did not affect the case. All that was necessary was that it should be shown that we held in reserve for the purpose of meeting these notes £300,000 or £280,000 as the case might be. Well, these securities have been deposited in England for that express purpose. The clerk who has been in the habit of making up that statement gets a state-

ment of the gold reserves, and shows what they are, from our representative in Montreal—the man in charge of the matter has put this amount down at £600,000 and carried it on in that way. But as for the public interest suffering, as for any insecurity or any liability on the part of any man holding a note of the Dominion of Canada, or his being affected by the question of whether it was £600,000 or £400,000 held for their redemption—he cannot be affected by it in the least. The hon. gentleman has called my attention to it, and I will make enquiry and ascertain exactly where the matter rests. Of course as Minister of Finance I am responsible for the mistakes, but my attention has not been called to it nor had I noticed it till the hon. gentleman referred to the figures.

Mr. CASGRAIN. When this change in the addition to the borrowing power of the Minister was made by statute, I had occasion to call the Minister's attention to the amount of gold that was required in order to secure his paper money, and I desire to repeat in a few words what I said to him at that time. I said, and I maintain at the present moment, that for the amount of gold he has to redeem, his notes are entirely too extensive to make that security sufficient. Whatever he may say I accept, in so far as that he believes it, but he does not leave the impression on my mind that the security is sufficient. I believe and assert, whatever damage it may do the Minister, that the amount of bullion is entirely insufficient; and we need not go very far back to know what the value of paper money is, when we know what took place on the other side of the line some years back, or what I saw myself in Germany and Italy when I bought Government securities for 50 or 60 or 80 per cent. discount. I suppose the same thing may happen at any moment in this country, for we may have some difficulties on this side of the line too. The present state of the Imperial Government is not so sound as that we may not have some little trouble on this side of the water; and I would like to know what would become of the \$18,000,000 of paper money which is on the markets of our country to-day. It would drop down like the paper money of other nations. That is what I wanted to say, and that is the danger which may be apprehended, and which may come upon us at any moment.

Motion agreed to.

RELIEF OF MUNICIPALITIES FOR GRANTING RAILWAY AID.

Mr. WILSON moved :

For copies of petitions from the County Council of the County of Elgin, presented to the Governor General in Council or the Minister of Railways and Canals, praying for a general measure of relief to municipalities of Ontario which have aided railways, declared to be for Dominion purposes by granting bonuses to them, and of all correspondence in reference to such petitions.

He said: I think I will be able to convince the Government and the House that the County Council of Elgin was fully justified in presenting their claim to this House for compensation, on account of aid granted to railways by that county. My first reason for making this assertion is that during last Session, when the railway resolutions were presented to this House, the Minister of Railways on that occasion declared as a reason for granting aid to the Quebec Government that it was on account of aid granted to a railway that was really in the interest of the Canadian Pacific Railway. He knows full well that the amount paid to these various railways—to the road running from Quebec to Ottawa was very large, and also that the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental received a large sum in the same way. Now, Sir, although I have been all along opposed to the system inaugurated in this Parliament of granting aid to railroads in the manner in which it was granted during the last Session, yet I think that after this House, by an over-

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

whelming majority, has declared that it is the policy of the Government to grant aid to municipalities or to Governments on account of their having granted aid to railways, the county I have the honor to represent is fully justified in presenting its claim to this House. That is true, I think, if I can show that the circumstances in connection with the relief sought for by the County of Elgin are the same as those other cases. Now, Sir, you are aware that during the last Session of this House about \$30,000,000 were granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway; that the greater portion of that amount will be paid by the older Province of Ontario; that the municipalities throughout that Province will have to bear a large share of the burden of that vote; and that the several counties in the west have granted aid to railways which are now being used and operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway. If that be the case those municipalities which have thus granted aid are justified in coming to this Parliament, and I cannot for the life of me see how Parliament can resist their just claims. Further, we know that during the last Session, the Government not satisfied with granting aid to the Canadian Pacific Railway so far as that road was constructed in the North-West, went further and granted a charter for the construction of a road from some point near the Town of Ingersoll through to the Detroit River. The application for that charter was made by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and it was very evident that they intended to utilise that road in connection with the Credit Valley and the Ontario and Quebec as one of the principal lines for the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway. That being the case, a considerable amount of the money granted by the Government to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is likely to be utilised for the construction of branch lines through the older portions of Canada; and in that event, of course, it would be no more than reasonable that we should be refunded the money which we have already given in aid of the construction of roads now operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Some few years ago there was a road projected from Toronto westward, which was to be a farmer's road. It was understood, when the charter for that road was obtained from the Local Legislature, that it was intended to enable the farmers to have their freights conveyed cheaply from the west to the principal city in the Province, Toronto; and certain agreements were entered into between the municipalities and the company, securing to the municipalities, as far as an agreement of that kind could secure, that privilege. That road was first built as far west as Ingersoll. After reaching that point, it was found that the road was not in a paying condition, and its promoters felt it necessary to project it further. They accordingly made application to the municipalities lying between Ingersoll and the City of St. Thomas for aid. We in St. Thomas granted very liberal aid indeed. Now, Sir, if the moneys granted by this Parliament be used for the construction of a branch line from Ingersoll west to the Detroit River, it will very seriously impair the usefulness of that road to those who granted so large an amount towards its construction. It will be unreasonable to expect us to give a large bonus for the purpose of bringing freight and traffic to that locality, if a road is to be built by means of public aid which will destroy to a great extent the advantages we anticipated when we were asked to grant the bonus. I will detain the House only for a few moments in order to show the amount of aid granted for the construction of this Credit Valley Railroad. We find that the County of Oxford, along with the towns of Ingersoll and Woodstock, granted \$200,000; the County of Wellington, \$135,000; the County of Waterloo, \$110,000; the County of Peel, \$75,000; the County of Halton, \$70,000; the City of Toronto, \$350,000; the City of St. Thomas, \$50,000; the Town of Milton, \$30,000; the Town of Brampton, \$20,000; the Town of Ingersoll, \$10,000; the Town of Orangeville, \$15,000; the Village of Streetsville,

\$20,000; the Village of Elora, \$15,000; and the Village of Fergus, \$15,000; in all, there was granted by the municipalities between Toronto and Ingersoll, \$1,165,000. I remember very well that a deputation from the City of Toronto came to St. Thomas and urged upon us the propriety of granting aid to this road, and the representations made by that deputation. Among the reasons they urged why this road should be constructed, they said it would be a direct connecting link between Ottawa and St. Thomas; they urged and pressed upon us the propriety of granting aid, and the amount I have mentioned was accordingly granted. In addition to all this, the Ontario Government granted aid to the amount of \$457,500. We find therefore, that the total amount of aid granted to the Credit Valley Railway by the municipalities between the City of Toronto and the City of St. Thomas, and by the Ontario Government, was \$1,622,500. The people of the locality to which I belong have granted aid to other roads. Prior to that time, the County of Elgin granted \$200,000 for the construction of the Canada Southern Railway, and the City of St. Thomas granted \$25,000, making in all for the county and city \$225,000 granted to that road, and the Government of Ontario also granted to the Canada Southern \$147,858.65. The Canada Southern, to a very great extent, is a very important link in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the various municipalities granted a total amount of \$470,358 on account of its construction; or making a total amount, if we take the total amount granted by the municipalities and the Government, of \$2,092,858. If this large amount was granted for the construction of this road which is being now, to a certain extent, either utilised or operated by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which is admitted to be an important road in the interests of the Dominion, I say that the county which granted so large an amount ought to be recouped for the aid it has given. Mark you, I do not complain, nor am I offering here the excuse that because the Dominion Government has assumed those roads as Dominion roads, I base this claim on the Government. I say on the contrary, that as the Dominion Government has intimated that it is part and parcel of its policy to recoup the Provinces and municipalities which have rendered assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that being a road in the interests of the Dominion of Canada, these municipalities I have mentioned are entitled to just as much consideration as the municipalities in other Provinces. It is true that the representatives from Ontario, who are generally found supporting the Government, are not so firm and determined on getting equal advantages and rights as the representatives of some other Province. It is true they gave their votes in favor and in the interest of the Government, regardless of the interests of their Province; but when they come before their electors, when they appeal to the country for re-election, they will be asked why they gave their votes and encouragement aid to one Province, and when the question was put them refused to have the same rights, privilege and justice granted to their own Province. It is no more than reasonable, right and just, no more than what the Government ought to consider it their bounden duty to carry into effect, to grant this aid to the municipalities now praying for it. It is unfortunate that the time has arrived when the Provinces find that their only means of obtaining redress is by insisting that what is granted to one Province must be granted to another, but as the Government have inaugurated that policy, upon them be the responsibility, and I hope they will be found equal to the occasion and come forward and grant the aid to the municipalities I have mentioned.

Mr. LISTER. The importance of the subject involved in the motion of my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) must force itself upon the attention of the Govern-

ment and this House. The other day, when a motion somewhat similar was before the House, I took the opportunity to say a few words in favor of it, and I was then surprised to find that in this whole House there was not one Conservative from the Province of Ontario who had the courage to get up and advocate any aid to the municipalities and to the Government of Ontario for the moneys they have expended in the construction of railways in that Province. We know that large delegations have waited upon the Government from the various municipalities in Ontario, urging the Government to do what in their opinion is right and just, by repaying to them the whole or at least a part of the money they expended in the construction of those roads. We know also that reports have been made for the purpose of turning away to a certain extent those delegations, for the purpose of making them believe that they have not an honest claim upon the Government for the money which they seek to recover. How far the delegations have been successful I am unable to say, but I do say that any delegate who fails to urge vigorously and honestly the payment of these moneys is recreant to the trust the people have imposed upon him, and I say any Conservative member who fails to urge upon the Government this simple measure of justice is not doing that duty which to my mind he owes to his constituency. It is said that it is the intention of the Government to repeal this Act. I say that if the Government take that stand, they take a cowardly position, but whether they repeal the Act or not does not affect the principle involved here, namely the right of these municipalities and of the Provincial Government to be repaid, to a certain extent, the moneys they have expended. It is the boast of the Minister of Railways that this Government, during the past few years, has expended large sums of money in the construction of railways, that it has given, as it were, an impetus to the building of railways, to the benefit of this country. I would remind him that long before this Government got into power, the Ontario Government invested millions of dollars in the construction of railways, and it is wholly to that cause, if not wholly, at all events to a certain extent, that Ontario owes her prosperity. So long as the Dominion Government were willing to leave the Province of Ontario in the position she occupied, so long that Province could not demand one dollar from this Government, but without a word of warning, the Government thought proper to change its policy under the pretence of the British North America Act, because I say that the Act passed last Session was a pretence, was passed under a misconception, a deliberate misconception, I believe, of the position under which the Minister of Railways took this power. They took away from the Province of Ontario the roads which that Province had so much assisted to construct. They took away from the Province of Ontario the roads which the municipalities of that Province had so liberally contributed towards. We find that the Province of Ontario expended in railways from the Provincial Treasury no less a sum than \$6,630,000 and we find that the municipalities of the Province of Ontario contributed \$13,961,000, or between the Government and the municipalities upwards of \$20,000,000. That money was expended under certain stated conditions. These railways were chartered by the Provincial Parliament. Those charters gave to the municipalities certain rights. The Provincial Parliament had the oversight of those railways. Whenever they thought it necessary in the interest of the people to pass Legislation preventing amalgamation, fixing the tolls, and doing everything that was necessary, they had their own Legislature, directly under the control of their own people, to appeal to for that purpose. But this Government takes away from the Province the railways, the right to legislate as to those railways; in a word, it alters the position that existed when this money was expended. On that ground, if on no other, I

contend that, if these railways are in the interest of the Dominion, if they have been confiscated, as it were, in the interest of all Canada, it is but fair that Canada should pay to the Province the money expended. The ground is strong, the reasoning is powerful, so powerful that I believe this Government cannot resist it, that they will be forced to it. Let the representatives who support them be false to their duty now, and I venture to say that many of them will never come back to this House again. Now, what was the policy of this Government during the last Session? It was that Provincial Governments ought not, had no right to aid and assist provincial railways, that provincial railways were for the benefit of the Dominion, and in carrying out that policy certain resolutions were brought into this House. They were for the purpose of giving aid to the Province of Quebec; and they have a right to get it, I do not find any fault with the representatives of Quebec if this Government is weak enough to yield to them; let them get what they can. But the policy of the Government, as announced, was to assist local railways. What was the state of affairs then? We find that the Government of Quebec had constructed the North Shore Railway. We know that that was a Government work. It was paid for exclusively by the Provincial Government. We know that that Government sold the railway out and out to a railway company. At the time this resolution was brought before the House, they did not own one nail or one tie in that railway. They had parted with every interest they had in it, but, in the face of that, this Government, urged, I suppose, by hon. gentlemen from the Lower Province who represented their case as favorably as they could, became convinced that they were entitled to take from the Dominion Treasury a certain amount of money for the construction of that road. The Government then, in pursuance of the policy they had announced, gave to the Province of Quebec, which did not own one tie in that road, \$3,350,000. If Confederation is to be continued, the Government must act honestly, squarely and equitably with every Province in this Dominion. It cannot give aid to one Province in this way and deny it to another Province. The Province of Quebec had no more right and can show no more equitable claim to this money than the Province of Ontario and the municipalities therein can. If the Province of Quebec had a right to get this money from the Dominion Treasury, then, by parity of reasoning, the Province of Ontario and the municipalities therein have the same right to get aid from this Dominion Treasury. It is a question which must inevitably force itself upon the attention of the Government. Delegations have come from all parts of the country. Those supporting, as well as those opposing, hon. gentlemen opposite have united upon this question, and they must face it sooner or later. They cannot face the difficulty by repealing the statutes which confiscated our railways. They have announced a policy—and, if they had not, they might have got out of the difficulty in that way—and that policy is that it is the duty of this Government to aid railways, and, in carrying out that policy, they gave between three and four millions of dollars to the Provincial Government of Quebec for a road which had entirely passed out of their hands. I repeat that the recent action of hon. gentlemen opposite must hold good, as far as the Province of Ontario is concerned. I said a moment ago that I believed it was a misconstruction of the British North America Act to take over these roads at all. I believe that, under that Act, this Government had no right to take them over. I believe that, under the true meaning and intent of that statute, they had no right to take over those roads. The very wording of this Act shows that there were to be two classes of roads, roads that would be beneficial to the whole Dominion, and other roads. We will admit that every road in every Province of the Dominion is for the benefit and in the interest of the whole

Mr. LISTER.

Dominion; and, if it was not intended to except certain roads, the Act would have said that the Government should have the right to take over all roads, but it says certain roads in the interest of the Dominion. I take it that that statute means only interprovincial roads, and does not bear the forced construction put upon it by hon. gentlemen opposite, that, if a road touches or crosses a through line, it must necessarily be a Dominion line. That is not a proper construction to be put upon it, but that is the construction which the Minister of Railways thought fit to put upon it, and, under the authority of this statute, he took possession of these roads. I can only express the hope that a number of hon. gentlemen whom I see before me, whose counties are deeply interested in this question, will have the manliness to stand up here and insist upon the Government doing what is right in regard to them. If they do not, if they fail in discharging that duty, I almost venture the prediction that the men who were true to them before will perhaps treat them as they are treating their own counties and the Province, and will forget them when they need to be remembered.

Mr. CASEY. My hon. friends who have preceded me, the mover of this resolution (Mr. Wilson) and the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Lister), have gone over the ground very thoroughly. Yet, as seconder of the resolution, and representing the county which has sent down the petition, I wish to say a few words on the question. It has been assumed by too many who have discussed the subject of recouping municipalities which have given bonuses to railways, that the only, or at least the chief, ground for asking such compensation is the assumption of jurisdiction over these railways by this Government. Now, in my opinion, as in that of the gentlemen who have spoken, that is not the only ground, nor even the strongest ground, for asking such compensation as the county of Elgin and other counties are demanding. The great basis of our demands, which we consider just in substance and obvious to everyone who considers the question without bias, is that the Government has established and declared a well-defined policy of giving general aid to railways throughout the Dominion. The Canadian Government, in the first place, began by building a railway of their own, the Intercolonial Railway. Then we built a large portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and afterwards engaged a company to build the rest of that road. Finally, within the last two Sessions, a policy has been developed of aiding, not only the feeders of that great transcontinental road, not only the feeders of the Intercolonial Railway, not only the roads touching the frontiers, and which might be regarded as international in their character, and therefore properly coming under the legislative authority of this House, but local roads, purely and simply local roads, colonization roads, in all parts of the Dominion. I might instance the colonization road known as the Quebec and Lake St. John; the Gatineau Valley Railway; the Napanee and Tamworth; the Kingston and Pembroke, and various other railways in Ontario, which are, in their essence, purely colonization roads. I have named one or two in each Province to show that the principle of aiding local roads has not been confined entirely to one Province, although the great bulk of the money has gone to Quebec. We have adopted the principle of aiding purely local roads throughout the Dominion, and that policy has been defended in each case on the ground of the usefulness of the particular road in the locality through which it passed. It has been argued in favor of these roads that they would develop a large extent of territory along their course, that there was a large amount of timber somewhere that they would reach, and that their construction would lead to the rapid settlement of a large extent of new country. The argument was put

forward by my hon. friend from Ottawa county (Mr. Wright) that the population along the Gatineau Valley was specially intelligent, and the large population on the line of that road have certainly shown their intelligence by frequently sending him back to this House. Sir, I merely quote these instances to show that the grounds urged for aiding these roads were not at all that they were of Dominion interest, not at all that they were of Canadian interest, in the sense of connecting one part of Canada with another, in the sense of opening up a new territory belonging to the Dominion of Canada, but simply that they would be useful to the localities in which they were to be built, useful in opening up provincial lands, useful in giving facilities to active, intelligent and energetic settlers in that particular locality. Now that the policy has been clearly established, of aiding purely local roads for purely local reasons, I claim that that policy, or its equivalent, should be extended to all parts of Canada which can show equally good reasons for receiving local aid of that kind. I claim that, in justice, the new local roads should be aided in every locality which can show as good reasons for it as the localities which have already received aid, or else that the municipalities that have spent large sums for local roads should be recouped for the money they have thus spent. So much for the general question. I think my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Lister) effectually disposed of the contention that the responsibility of the Dominion Government could be got rid of by repealing the Act under which the Government assumed jurisdiction over these roads. He has shown clearly enough that, even if the repeal of the Act were possible—and I doubt whether it is possible, without rendering illegal all the grants that the Government have made under that Act—but even if the Government were inclined to try such a foolish trick, in order to get rid of their responsibility, it would not free them in the least from their obligations to those parts of the country to which aid has not been extended. The tax-payers in every part of the country have contributed to the grants made to purely local roads elsewhere, and every part of the country has a perfect right—and would have just as good right if that Bill were repealed—to ask that they should be compensated to some extent for their own expenditure upon railways. Before coming to the particular claims of the county of Elgin, I must refer to what I have just seen in the large Railway Committee room. I have just had the pleasure there of meeting with a large delegation, composed of more than 60 reeves and deputy reeves from the Province of Ontario, representing 20 counties and cities, who came there to demand from the Government what they conceived to be justice in regard to this subject. I was not able to wait and hear the reply made by the Ministers who were present, the right hon. Premier and the Acting Minister of Railways, but I heard from the latter a hint in the shape of a question, that gave me some idea of the line that might be taken by the Government. He said: "Do you suppose, gentlemen, that the municipalities along the line of the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway, were recouped for the bonuses they had given to that road?" I understood him to argue that as the Province only had been recouped in that case, the municipalities in Ontario had no claims in regard to railway bonuses in that Province. I cannot, for the life of me, see the distinction. If it is proper to recoup a Province for the money she has spent in building a road, and which has since become a part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system, it is proper to recoup a municipality which has aided a road that has become a part of the same system. I have since heard, since the deputation withdrew, that the leader of the Government stated to them that the Government had never adopted the policy of granting money to a road already built. If that is not a correct representation of what he said I hope the hon. gentleman will correct me—I see he is now present—

because I wish to draw certain conclusions from the statement I heard attributed to him, that the Government had never adopted, and did not intend to adopt, the principle of granting aid to roads already built.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No; I did not say that.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad the right hon. gentleman has put me right on that point, because if he had said what is attributed to him he would have taken a false and unfounded position. I could refer him and the Minister of Railways to one or two instances where aid had been granted in consideration of roads already built. And since that plea against compensation has been put forward and may arise again, I may as well refer to the roads now. I will refer to the International Railway Company, which received a grant, in 1883, for 49 miles of its road, from Sherbrooke, in the Province of Quebec, to the United States frontier, not exceeding \$3,200 per mile, and not exceeding, in the whole, \$156,800. This part of the International Railway was then built and in operation. A further grant for a part of the road to be built through the State of Maine was also made. I may remark also that the principle of giving aid in consideration of roads already built was established by the grant to Quebec in consideration of the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental road, for which they received \$954,000 in regard to the whole road, and \$1,440,000 in regard to the part from Ottawa to Montreal. Then, Sir, the principle of aid to local railways generally has been established; the principle of recouping Provinces, at all events, who have given aid to railways or built railways of a similar character, has been established. The question is, Why has not this principle been applied more extensively in Ontario? My hon. friend from Lambton has urged that the Conservative members from Ontario should do something towards securing the granting of that aid—though he has not been able to see why they have not done so. Well, Sir, I am able to say, to some extent, why they have not done so. My attention has been called to the fact that some of these Conservative members, while they are opposing or, at all events, not supporting, the claims of the municipalities generally to receive this compensation, have quietly succeeded in obtaining Government grants for railways under construction in their own constituencies. They have used their influence, not for the benefit of Ontario municipalities generally, but for the benefit of their own localities. We had grants made for this and the other railway, a whole string of them, last year, and when proposing those grants the Minister stated that he had consulted Mr. so-and-so, in connection with the line, perhaps the member for the county or the promoter of the line, and he had found out what amount would be necessary to secure the construction of the road, and that amount he had placed in the estimate. That was the explanation given time after time. It is not so much to be wondered at that those hon. gentlemen who have been so fortunate as to secure grants for railways in their own constituencies should not be very eager for an extension of similar favors to other municipalities which have not the good fortune to be represented in this House by Conservatives. Yet I believe there are some Conservative members who have not secured such favors for their counties. There are some Conservative members whose counties have given large bonuses to railways, which counties have not been recouped for those bonuses and which still have claims on the Government and I shall expect that at least those counties will add to the general outcry raised by Ontario municipalities to have justice done them in this connection. In regard, more particularly, to the claim of the county of Elgin, I have to point out that her case is exactly parallel to the case of the Province of Quebec, except as to the amount of money paid towards the construction of the railway in question. The Province of Quebec built a road, to which I have referred once or

twice already, from Quebec to Ottawa *via* Montreal. A part of that road is now incorporated with the Canadian Pacific Railway; the other part remains an independent road, but is a very important feeder to the Canadian Pacific Railway. The reason given for the grant of \$954,000 to the whole road was, that it was an important feeder to the Canadian Pacific Railway, that it connected the Canadian Pacific Railway system with the city of Quebec, and therefore the Province of Quebec should be allowed \$954,000 on account of that part of the road. The reason given for our paying the full cost of the railway from Montreal to Ottawa was that it was already incorporated into the Canadian Pacific Railway and had become a part of their through system. Let me show the parallel between that and the case of the county of Elgin. That county, in 1871, secured the construction of the Canada Southern by giving a bonus of \$200,000. We were assured by the promoters that if we did not give that bonus the road would not be built, and I have no reason to doubt that such was the fact; that the receipt of that amount of aid at that particular time enabled the company to make arrangements for building the road which otherwise would not have been made. At a subsequent period St. Thomas gave a bonus of \$50,000 to secure the extension of the Credit Valley from Ingersoll to St. Thomas. No doubt that road would not have been so extended, at all events at that time, if this aid had not been granted. These two bonuses secured the construction of the Canada Southern and the extension of the Credit Valley to the city of St. Thomas. The Credit Valley is in exactly the same position as the Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental road, between this city and Montreal. It is incorporated with the Canadian Pacific Railway and is part of that company's line. The Canada Southern is in the same position as the North Shore road, between Montreal and Quebec. Although it is an independent line, still it is the only through western connection of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it is in such intimate relations with that railway, being its principal feeder from the west, that it may almost be regarded as part of that system. It is as much and, in fact, far more part of the Canadian Pacific Railway than is the North Shore from Montreal to Quebec, because the latter is controlled at present by the Grand Trunk, a rival of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I claim, then, that the position of Elgin is so strong that it cannot be successfully attacked. I have not thought it necessary to elaborate the case very much, for that reason, and I have given more attention to the claims of other municipalities. I believe that the uncommonly large deputation of respectable and influential gentlemen of both political parties which I saw in the Railway Committee room this afternoon, is a sign of what is going to happen in Ontario. The tax-payers of the municipalities interested have been paying from year to year their share of what has been paid to the Canadian Pacific Railway and to other lines, in which they have no more interest than they would have in a railway to the moon, and they are beginning to ask where it is going to stop, and when they are going to receive something in return. Upwards of 60 of the most influential men of the respective municipalities were in the Railway Committee room, asking that question to-day, and I am afraid they got a very unsatisfactory answer. There were gentlemen present of both political parties, and of all classes, and they were unanimous in the feeling that the time had come when their municipalities should have some share in the general distribution of the surplus of this Dominion which has been going on during the last few years. I said they were tired of always paying without receiving. My constituents and those of the hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), have special reason to be so tired. Not only have they taxed themselves to the extent of \$275,000 for the railways mentioned, but they have also been taxed, taking the average *per capita* share of the taxation of

Mr. CASEY.

the Dominion, to the extent of at least half a million for aid given to other railways in Canada. Out of their pockets at least \$775,000 have been taken, and they have not received from this Government a single dollar of recompense. I am bound to point out, in this connection, that the justice of the principle of recouping municipalities which have bonused railways, was acknowledged by the Ontario Government at the time the municipal loan fund was arranged and part of the then existing surplus distributed. It was recognised by the Provincial Government as just that those municipalities which had paid for railways for themselves should be considered when railways were being built at the public expense for the benefit of other municipalities which had made no such grants. To a certain limited extent, limited by the amount of money at the disposal of the Government, attention was paid to the claims of those constituencies. Some of them were given large and others small sums. At all events, the principle was established, and it was one of fairness and justice, which has done very much to establish Mr. Mowat, the leader of the Ontario Government, in the confidence of the people of the Province, a confidence which he still possesses to a degree which is remarkably annoying, no doubt, to hon. gentlemen opposite. I must tell this Government that if they wish to retain the confidence of even their own friends in Ontario, they must imitate the fairness, justice, and even-handed dealing of the Premier of the Local Government in connection with this matter.

Some hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. Some hon. gentlemen who are howling "hear, hear," represent counties which received very considerable sums from the distribution of the Ontario Municipal Loan Fund, and yet they howl in derision when the name of their benefactor is mentioned in this House. This is not a spirit which I would expect to find in the representatives of the respectable Conservative population of Ontario; it is not the spirit of that population throughout the Province. Conservatives as well as Liberals, in Ontario, are willing to recognize fair treatment when they get it. They have got it from Mr. Mowat in his dealings with the railway question. If they do not get it from the leader of this Government they will soon let the First Minister and his supporters understand that they know when they get fair treatment and when they do not get it. I have no doubt, Sir, that the agitation which has already obtained such striking proportions, as shown by the size of the deputation to-day, will attain to still more striking proportions, and that it will extend to every county in Ontario which has not received Government aid for railways in which it is interested; and I have no doubt, as my hon. friend from East Elgin (Mr. Wilson) said, that in the end the Government will do as they always have done when the agitation gets strong enough, they will yield to it; they will do as they did when the members from the Province of Quebec, who for years had been urging her claims to these moneys, on the grounds of justice and fair play, and did not get them. Last year they put their foot down—or rather I should use the plural, and say feet, though they put them down as one foot—they put them down solidly and said: If you do not give us justice we will not vote for you. The hon. gentleman admitted that constitutional pressure had been brought to bear on him by members—that is the only interpretation that could be put on the circumstances. Now it is time that the Conservatives of Ontario set up a little *Maison Bleu* of their own, for the representatives of Ontario, if they intend to remain representatives of that Province, will have to put their foot down and say to the Government, If you do not do justice to our Province, and to our constituencies, we have as much spirit as any *Bleu* in the Province of Quebec, and we are prepared to show it, and then the Government will back down and give what they had refused them while using argument alone.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). This matter of aid to railways is one with respect to which we may as well have it understood that the Government, under its present leader, has done justice, not only to Ontario, but to Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It is a known fact that at Confederation the proportionate debt which would have to be paid by Ontario was \$6,000,000. It is a known fact that the proportionate debt by the Province of Quebec was \$4,000,000. The Government of John Sandfield Macdonald collected and saved altogether \$4,000,000 to pay the debt of Ontario the time it was decided what the amount was which the Province of Quebec would have to pay. This Government assumed the \$6,000,000 of debt, and therefore left \$6,000,000 for Mr. Mowat to expend in building railways in Ontario. He spent \$6,000,000 and Quebec spent \$14,000,000, and the little Province of New Brunswick spent \$6,000,000. We are told that if we do not do so and so, and insist on the Government giving aid to the municipalities throughout the length and breadth of Ontario, we need not expect to occupy seats in this House again. That is the threat, that is the prophecy, but I do not believe it is correct. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Province of Quebec got some \$12,000 per mile for the distance from the city of Quebec to the city of Ottawa. Does the hon. gentleman forget that Ontario got, on the line between Pembroke and Gravenhurst, \$12,000 per mile; that the Province of Ontario got, on the line from Callander to Rat Portage \$12,500 per mile; and that \$12,000 per mile was given for the road from Gravenhurst to Callander in order to connect Ontario with the Canadian Pacific Railway at the latter station. We are prepared, in the House and out of the House, in any constituency of the Province, to contend, as representatives from the Province of Ontario, that we have got as much money, as much fair play, as much justice, as any other Province in the Dominion of Canada. The hon. gentleman says that the Act of last Session took away rights from the different municipalities granting aid to the various railways throughout the country. I ask him have these railways been removed? Are they not still in those counties which gave them aid, for all purposes, for the use and benefit of the parties who granted the bonuses? Is there any hon. gentleman who will deny that? Now, I want to give the hon. gentleman a few little facts concerning some railways of which I know something. The city of Toronto gave a large sum of money to build the Nipissing Railway. The towns of Port Perry, Whitby and Port Hope, the towns of Peterborough, Lindsay and others, as well as the counties interested, gave large sums, including the city of Belleville, the county of Hastings. The townships of Rawdon and Madoc gave large sums to build a line of railway through the different counties. The county of Hastings took \$50,000 stock in this road, the Grand Junction, and they had six directors on the board. This county, the city of Belleville, the town of Port Hope, and the town of Lindsay applied to Mr. Mowat, at the time the Grand Trunk got control of something like 500 miles belonging to the Midland system, for justice. What did Mr. Mowat do? I ask any hon. gentleman, either on the Conservative or Reform side, what did he do? He passed a law handing over that 500 miles of railway to the Grand Trunk. They asked him to give them a representative on the board—by the Bill handing over the railway—to give them justice according to the by-laws of the different municipalities, and the arrangements made with the companies building the road. Mr. Mowat said: It is in the interest of your counties and towns and localities that these roads should be handed over to the Grand Trunk, and they were handed over accordingly. We have no benefit—only the benefits that may be derived from the Grand Trunk running a road through the different sections of the country. As one who has to pay some taxes, and who knows a little about the different municipalities—in my own county, at least—I say it is a benefit to that county

and those sections of the country that the Grand Trunk took the control and management and bought those railways. They are now, Sir, in a better shape; they are better served; freights are cheaper than under the old system, when the charters were given to the different railways. Now, what is this motion for? It is brought up in order to encourage the delegates, who are here from Ontario to look forward and expect the Government to pay back to the different municipalities the amount of money they paid to help in the construction of these railways. Well, where is this going to stop? Let us ask the question honestly and fairly. Will not all the other Provinces come in and get a portion of this money? I ask how, in the name of common sense, can the Government meet these demands? It is utterly impossible. These delegations should be told honestly and frankly and candidly that it cannot be done—that it is not fair or right or reasonable. It has been said by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) that the Bill passed last Session is not legal and constitutional according to the Act of Confederation. If it is not constitutional, what is the use of saying that these parties have taken the railways from the different counties? I say it is the duty of the Government to set that matter right and pass a bill giving back—if they have taken it away—the power to the Provinces and the municipalities, and any power which they took from them. Let us settle this matter finally and forever.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Of course that meets the views of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and I am glad to see that it does, as there is so little that comes from the representatives on this side of the House that seems to please him.

Mr. BLAKE. I like to hear a confession of error.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Well, I am open-hearted enough if I do wrong to acknowledge it, but the hon. gentleman is so wise and knows so much, and is so self-willed and determined, that he never acknowledges a wrong because he never thinks he is wrong. Then I say that we should tell the people throughout the length and breadth of this country that this Dominion of Canada is not going to refund any of the bonuses granted by the different municipalities; but let us say to these people that if there is any authority taken from them, it shall be handed back, and I say the sooner the better. Would it not be better for us, as Reformers and Conservatives, to be honest with these people? Are they not coaxed to come here? Are they not sent here by Mr. Mowat whenever they apply to him for aid? Are we not told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we are plunging this country into debt that will not be paid in this generation? And yet they want us to refund moneys to these municipalities. Why does not Mr. Mowat do as an honest man, as the Province of Quebec, the Province of New Brunswick, and the Province of Nova Scotia have done—why does he not take the \$6,000,000 of paper surplus which he says he has, and hand it back to these municipalities? He cannot do it, because he has not got it. He says he has \$6,000,000 or \$7,000,000 of surplus on paper, in the shape of a debt due by the Dominion of Canada. When he comes to refund to this Dominion the amount that he owes it for wholesale licenses, decided by the Supreme Court to belong to the Dominion, and other debts, he will find that the surplus claimed to be \$6,000,000 will dwindle down to \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 or \$3,000,000 below the amount left by the late Sandfield Macdonald.

Motion agreed to.

THE GOVERNMENT GOLD RESERVE.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read a statement which I have

received from Mr. Courtney, in reference to the question of the leader of the Opposition in regard to the 4 per cent. bonds: He says:

"We were certainly advised by cablegram that the guaranteed 4 per cents. were to be sold for certain dates, but not until after the publication of the return did we get the accounts from England. The transactions, in fact, were not completed at the time when the return of the circulation was published in the *Gazette*."

Then, later on, he says:

"I wrote hurriedly, and I have since looked at the brokers' sale notes. The bonds were sold in January, but delivery was not completed until the 9th of February. The last circulation statement published was for January."

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

After Recess.

FACTORY BILL.

Mr. BERGIN moved that the order for second reading of Bill (No. 2) to regulate the employment of children and young persons and women in the workshops, mills and factories of the Dominion of Canada, be discharged. He said: I may say, in explanation, that I ask this because I have found that many clauses of the Bill conflict—so I am advised by counsel—with the powers of the Local Legislatures. I have caused the Bill to be remodelled, and I think it is now in a shape which will entirely avoid any conflict between the powers of the Local and Federal Legislatures. It will be impossible for us to go on with this Bill without very serious objections being made to it in its present form; and if I were to propose to have it printed and submitted to the House as I desire to have it amended in committee, the objections made might be so serious as to interfere with the success of the Bill. I am very anxious that this Bill should be passed this Session, and for that reason I hope the House will not offer any opposition to the proposition I make. The new Bill, as I propose to submit it to the House, is ready, and there will be no delay, beyond the delay required for the notice. I move therefore that this order be discharged.

Mr. BLAKE. I am afraid the result of this course will be to render impossible the accomplishment of that which the hon. gentleman desires, because if he proposes to give notice of the introduction of a new Bill, the delay in getting that Bill printed in English and French will be such that by the time it comes up for its second reading and reference to the committee, the time for Private Bills will have elapsed, and this, with other infants, will be slaughtered.

Mr. BERGIN. I would prefer to go on with the Bill and have it amended in committee to save time, but advantage might be taken of the rules of the House to prevent my going on with it, and I think there is still plenty of time.

Motion agreed to, and order discharged.

REPRESENTATION OF THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 45) respecting the representation of the Territories in the House of Commons.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is scarcely worth while that the hon. gentleman should make a speech on a subject of this importance to such a thin House. I will take care that he will have every opportunity of discussing the Bill.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I will have to be absent from Parliament after next week, for a couple of weeks, and if I allow the Bill to stand to-night, I will not be able to reach it during the week, and it will be too late, after I return, to reach it during the Session. If the hon. gentleman would consent to have it put on the Order Paper, so that it will

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

come up the first thing on Wednesday next, I will have no objection to let it stand.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I see no objection to that.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I move that this Bill be the first order of the day amongst Public Bills and Orders.

Motion agreed to; and order for second reading discharged.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 8:25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 5th March, 1885

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 85) respecting factories.—(Mr. Bergin.)

Bill (No. 87) to amend the Act 40 Victoria, chapter 36, intituled: An Act to provide for the employment, without the walls of common gaols, of prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein.—(Mr. Sutherland, Oxford.)

Bill (No. 88) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.—(Mr. Townshend.)

Bill (No. 89) further to amend the Patent Act of 1872.—(Mr. Hay.)

SALE OF RAILWAY PASSENGER TICKETS.

Mr. McCARTHY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 86) to amend the Act respecting the sale of railway passenger tickets. He said: The Bill is a short one, and its purpose is to compel railway companies to post a notice in stations where their tickets are to be redeemed. The law, at present, requires them to redeem tickets, but in practice that provision is of very little use, as the companies insist on the tickets being delivered or sent to the head office, which is, of course, quite contrary to the intention of the Legislature, and almost useless to the traveller.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LIEUT.-GOVERNORSHIP OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any understanding has been reached between the Government and the Lieut.-Governor of New Brunswick as to his continuing to fill the office for any, and if so, for what time?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No understanding has been reached on that subject.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—AMENDED PLANS AND PROFILES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government has received the amended plans and profiles of that part of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia of which the plans and profiles were returned for amendment? If so, when? Whether the location shown by such amended plans and profiles has been approved? If so, when? Whether the road is being constructed in this part? Whether further papers will be laid on the Table?

Mr. POPE. These returns were received on the 7th of January, 1885, and approved by Order in Council, dated the 16th of January, 1885. The work is in progress there.

It is not the intention of the Government to lay any further papers on the Table.

CATHOLIC POPULATION OF THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to request the Catholic clergy of the Province of Quebec to supply Government with such information as they possess, in detail, showing the number of the actual resident Catholic population of the Province of Quebec, in the years 1883 and 1884, respectively, for the purpose of testing the accuracy of the statements made to this House and elsewhere touching the large emigration from the Province of Quebec in recent years?

Mr. POPE. It is not the intention of the Government.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill amending the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, in the direction asked for by the delegation of temperance men that waited upon the Premier recently?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government as yet has come to no conclusion on that subject.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to enquire whether the statement required by Statute to be laid on the Table touching the affairs of the late Bank of Upper Canada has yet been prepared.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I asked the Deputy Minister to have it prepared some days ago. I do not know whether it is ready yet; I will send at once and see.

Mr. CASGRAIN. May I enquire if there is any prospect of soon seeing the plans and reports concerning the Short Line Railway?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I think the hon. gentleman has already given notice of that question, and it will come up to-morrow or on Monday.

EXCHANGE BANK—GOVERNMENT ADVANCES.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed resolutions (p. 295) of Sir Richard Cartwright on the subject of advances made by the Government to the Exchange Bank.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It is to be regretted, I think, Sir, that the papers in connection with this question, which were brought down in answer to a motion of mine last year, have not been printed. They are of some importance; they involve questions of importance; and as they have been the subject of two motions in this House I trust that the members of the Printing Committee will see their way clear to order them to be printed even at this somewhat late period. As they have not been printed the necessity will devolve on me of reciting the facts which have been already established from those papers for the information of those hon. members who either were not present when this subject was under discussion before, or who may not entirely recollect the facts. Now, Sir, the fact with respect to these advances to the Exchange Bank are briefly as follows: First of all, about two years ago, on the 12th or 14th of April, I think, \$200,000 was advanced by the Minister of Finance to be placed on deposit in the Exchange Bank. It is shown by these papers that that advance was made for the purpose of strengthening the bank—not in the ordinary course of business, but for the special purpose of enabling the bank to keep its doors open

a little while longer. It further appears that another advance, amounting to \$100,000, was made a month afterwards under peculiar circumstances. It was made on the personal guarantee of a member of the other branch of the Legislature, Mr. Senator Ogilvie; and as the document has not yet been printed, I will read his letter on the strength of which the advance of \$100,000 was made. The letter is addressed to Mr. Courtney in his capacity as Deputy Minister of Finance, and is as follows:—

“OTTAWA, 11th May, 1883.

“MY DEAR SIR,—I beg that the Government will place a further sum of \$100,000 at deposit with the Exchange Bank on the same terms as the former deposit of \$200,000, and on the Government agreeing to comply with the request, I hereby undertake to hold myself personally responsible for the further deposit of \$100,000.

“Yours very truly,
“A. W. OGILVIE.”

It also appears from these documents that this advance was made without any enquiry being made as to the solvency of the bank, or any precautions apparently being taken to ascertain what would be the result of refusing the advance. Now, Sir, I do not want the House to judge of the circumstances under which advances of this kind should be made by the Finance Minister to banks in this Dominion entirely on my *ipse dixit*. I happen fortunately to have found a very excellent *résumé* of the conditions under which alone advances of this kind ought to be made by the Government of the Dominion; and as it has been very rare of late years for me to be able to do myself the pleasure of concurring with the hon. First Minister, I take especial pleasure in calling the attention of the House to the very excellent *résumé* of those conditions very recently given by the First Minister. Speaking on this subject, he declares:

“It has been, in my experience, looking back, found requisite or expedient by several Governments, in times of great depression, to prevent universal ruin, universal panic, to come to the help of some of the banking institutions. Those hon. gentlemen who have lived as long as I have, will, if they look back, find that Governments have, on occasion, prevented universal panic by acting in concert with strong banking institutions, in helping to sustain banks which were not quite so strong. That has happened and will happen everywhere.”

Now, Sir, on the whole I think that is a very admirable statement, made by a gentleman eminently well qualified to make it, of the conditions under which in times of great difficulty, to prevent universal panic, Governments may, in concert with strong banking institutions, come to the rescue of some of the weaker banks. As the First Minister has lately developed a taste for Shakespeare, I may observe that it occurs to me that this is an excellent illustration of the well known passage in Shakespeare which says it is much easier to teach twenty men what to do than to be one of the twenty to follow one's own showing. Perhaps, Sir, I may be pardoned for saying that I could quote other instances in which the hon. First Minister has laid down in admirable fashion the conditions under which Governments should act in dealing with questions relating to the rights of the Local Legislatures—for instance, in a very admirable speech of his on the New Brunswick School Act, in which he pointed out that if the Acts of the Local Legislatures were disallowed, there was practically an end to this Confederation. Now, I turn to the defence made of this transaction by the hon. Minister of Finance. That hon. gentleman pleaded in the following fashion. First of all, following a little in the track of the Finance Minister, he stated that it was a case of extreme urgency in which this advance of the 12th of April, 1883, was made; and this is what he said:

“I think, however, that the House and the country will sustain the Government when, under such extreme circumstances and for the purpose of preventing a run on the bank, we took this step; because we all know, by looking at the returns, that if to-day two-thirds of the banks in the Dominion were suddenly called upon to redeem their circulation, where those banks would be and where the business of the country would be. Under the circumstances we feel that we were perfectly justified—and feeling at the same time that we were safe in doing so—in endeavoring to save the country from the consequences which would follow from the breaking down, it might be, of two, or three, or four, or five of the banks.”

On that, at present, I will only say that if these remarks had been made by any unpatriotic gentleman on this side, many and many a day would have elapsed before we had heard the last of such an attempt to cry down the credit of the banks of the Dominion. But the hon. gentleman, besides extreme urgency, pleaded also previous practice; he pleaded that he had been in the habit of interfering for the protection of banks in the Dominion. And for the third plea, he stated that there would be no loss. Now I desire to examine these several pleas successively and in detail. First of all, let us take up the plea of extreme urgency. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that the hon. gentleman's advances to this bank were made on the 14th of April, 1883. Fourteen days before that, on Friday, the 30th March, 1883, the Finance Minister delivered his Budget speech. Now the Budget speech is a very important speech indeed. We publish it at the public expense; we circulate it far and wide; it stands almost on the same footing as a State paper. Every word contained in the Budget speech is expected to be carefully weighed, all the information which his office can give him is at the disposal of the Finance Minister, and the Budget speech is looked to as being a particularly accurate statement of the then condition of the country. Now I find that on the 30th March, 1883, the hon. gentleman, the Finance Minister, spoke as follows:—

"I believe, from the fact that we are spending annually a large amount of money in opening up and developing the great North-West country, from the fact that the population coming into the country at the present time are bringing in a large amount of money for investment, from the fact that, last year, we had of the value of imports over \$1,000,000 of settlers' effects, and which will be increasing, and which of course, does not create any difficulty financially, I hold that the return of the pendulum, which always does come back, will be deferred, and that we have seven years of prosperity before the country."

Now, not only in the passage I have quoted, but all through this speech, the Finance Minister, speaking with full knowledge and speaking under these peculiar circumstances, pointed out to us that the policy which he had inaugurated, besides producing temporary prosperity, had laid the foundation of a general, a universal prosperity so firmly established on such stable ground that the greatest law known as yet to us, the law of gravitation, was suspended in favor of the National Policy, and that the pendulum was going to cease its oscillations and return, not for a paltry week or fortnight, but for seven long years. You will observe we have here the definition of the First Minister as to the circumstances under which alone the Government is justified in coming to the rescue of the banks; we have here a statement made a fortnight before these events took place by the Minister of Finance showing that this country was in an unprecedented condition of prosperity and stability. Now, putting these two things together, the alternatives which present themselves to my mind are three in number. Either, when the Finance Minister pointed out to us that we were in such a stable condition of prosperity, he knew better, and for political exigencies he was not accurately representing the condition of the country; of course, I cannot suppose that was the case, but that is a possible alternative. There is a second alternative and that is this, that the Finance Minister, in declaring that the country was in a condition of stability and prosperity, was utterly and completely in error, and that, I regret to say, he not only deceived himself but he also deceived us, and that a fortnight later he woke up to the conviction that the country was in a condition such as would warrant him in taking the very extreme measure which the right hon. gentleman the First Minister, so well described in the passage I have just read. Well, there is a third alternative, namely, that the country was really in a condition of stability and prosperity, in which case the Finance Minister will see that his conduct in interfering for the preservation of a trumpery bank like the Exchange

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT,

Bank was, as held, and correctly held, by the First Minister, utterly and entirely unwarranted. Which of these three alternatives the hon. gentleman will choose, I will leave entirely to his discretion. Then we come to his second plea, the plea of previous practice. The hon. gentleman the Finance Minister, tells us this was not the first nor the second, nor apparently the third, nor the fourth time that he had come to the rescue of banks in difficulties, and he says that up to the present time no harm had arisen. If that be so, all that I can say is that the hon. gentleman had indulged in a very bad practice. It is not possible for him or any man in his position to do these things in a corner; other banks soon get to know that the Government have assisted banks in difficulties; and when they get into difficulty it is but natural and reasonable on their part that they should come to the same beneficent power which had helped their comrades out of difficulty and danger, and sooner or later, just as happened in this case, these little difficulties occur. The worst possible thing the Finance Minister, or any other Finance Minister can do, in the interest of the banks, is to lead them to believe that they have only to get into a scrape in order to come to the Government and to obtain an advance of $\frac{1}{2}$, $\frac{2}{3}$, or perhaps $\frac{3}{4}$ of their whole paid up capital. That does not consort in the least with the admirable definition laid down by the First Minister, who lays down the rule, the Finance Minister will observe, that these things, although they may be done, are to be done with great care and only in times of extreme depression, for the purpose of averting great national injury leading to universal panic. I have quoted the Finance Minister and may perhaps be pardoned for quoting myself. I recollect a good many years ago, as far back as 1873, under circumstances closely analogous to those which now exist, I had occasion to discuss the policy then pursued by the hon. gentleman, and I take the opportunity of reading to the House what I then said. I said my chief objections to that policy are these:

"(1) That it is an error on the part of the Government in a country like this which wants all its available capital for its own internal need, to borrow in the home market at all except under very peculiar circumstances, or from absolute necessity.

"(2) That it is a further error to borrow any considerable sums repayable at call at short notice which is just what my hon. friends are doing; and lastly that the practical working of this system is such as to risk intermixing the public credit with that of various trading and banking corporations to the great injury of both. In connection with this last charge I may remark that the policy of the Government has a direct tendency to aggravate any inflation on the one hand and every turn of depression on the other, and though I will not say that the present stringency results solely from the action of the Government, I do assert that it has contributed direct and powerfully towards bringing it about, and that it will be a fortunate day for the Dominion when the Finance Minister discovers, as I believe he very soon will, that it is no part of his proper duty to charge himself with the task of carrying on the banking business of the country or any part of it."

Now the hon. gentleman's third plea is, I observe, that there would be no loss. Well, that is possible, if possible at all, only I am sorry to say, on one condition, and that is that the Government should use or should abuse their legal power by sweeping away the last crumbs which the extravagance and mismanagement of their directors have left the unfortunate shareholders or rather the unfortunate depositors in the Exchange Bank. Since the hon. gentleman made that statement, many new and very startling facts have been disclosed. In all my experience—and I include in that not only my experience as to affairs in Canada, but I include likewise the evidence I have perused as to the dealing with banks and bank estates in England and Scotland—I do not remember to have read or heard of such shameful malversation or such shameful disregard of their duties on the part of any body of directors as has been shown to have existed in the directorate of the Exchange Bank. Some of them no doubt were innocent of guilty intention; but all of them have been guilty evidently of the greatest laches and of neglect of the duties which they were appoint-

ed to discharge. If the Government rank, as, for reasons I shall give later on, I think they ought to rank, as ordinary creditors, there is scarcely any possibility but that a very serious loss indeed must be endured by the Government, and then the hon. gentleman's third plea falls entirely and wholly to the ground, unless on the condition that the Government choose to take an extreme view of their legal right and to sweep away all that remains for the unfortunate depositors in the Exchange Bank. I am advised that an enormous sum has been lost by this bank after this advance was made. I am advised that on a single account something like \$170,000 was lost by the bank after the advance was made. I am advised that the account of the president, or chief manager, or whatever he was, shows that, on an overdrawn account of the chief officer of that bank, one-third or thereabouts of the whole paid-up capital of the bank was advanced. I am not of my own knowledge acquainted with those facts, but I believe there are gentlemen in this House who are prepared to testify to them. It must have been known to the Finance Minister that, when you interfere with the affairs of an insolvent institution, there is always great reason to expect that the managers, from the desire to play double or quits, or from some more guilty motive, are very apt to plunge into more extravagant or adventurous transactions; and precisely that, as I am informed, has been the case in this bank. There were special grounds why the hon. the Minister should have been careful in this case. It was not a bank of unstained reputation. It had prior to the advance once suspended specie payments and reduced its capital, and the sum which was asked for should have called the attention of the Government to its very dangerous condition. We have been so accustomed to deal with hundreds of millions of dollars that an advance of \$300,000 may appear to be a mere bagatelle, but that was three fifths of the whole of the paid-up capital of the Exchange Bank, and was just as great in proportion as if \$7,000,000 had been advanced to the Bank of Montreal with its paid up capital of \$12,000,000. The hon. gentleman knows, and in fact he makes it an excuse for his proceeding, that the board of the Exchange Bank had upon it a number of men of great wealth. The House will not have forgotten, nor will my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) have forgotten, the contemptuous manner in which the suggestion was met last Session, that before an amount of \$100,000 was advanced on the guarantee of Senator Ogilvie, he should have made himself acquainted with that gentleman's position. But the hon. gentleman thought it an insult. He knew that the members of the board of directors were wealthy men. Did it occur to him that, dealing with a board of directors of such wealth and standing, he should have said to them: You want \$300,000 to save a bank in which you are interested; pledge your security to other banks, and do not come craving aid from the Government. That is the line which should have been adopted. That is the line which common sense would have suggested. Mr. Buntin and Mr. Ogilvie and others of them had no right to come to the Government of Canada for \$100,000, but they should have gone to the Bank of Montreal and pledged their credit, and I venture to say that they would have got the money without the slightest objection. Another gross impropriety to which I have to call attention is the action of the hon. the Minister with regard to Senator Ogilvie. What is the use of an Act of Independence of Parliament if Ministers can allow members of this Chamber or the other Chamber to take such advantages as this? We can all see the mischievous results; we are confronted with the difficulty arising from mixing up dealings with political supporters and with bank directors. It is true that the Government may prefer the claim which I understand they have already advanced, that, because they are the Government of Canada, they are entitled to claim everything which

the bank possesses in discharge of their debt. But, if the action of the Government did, as I am informed it did, a great damage and no good to the shareholders and depositors in the Exchange Bank, what an inequitable thing it is for Government to avail itself of this claim, not so much for the purpose of recovering public money as for the purpose of avoiding enforcing the letter of guarantee given by Senator Ogilvie which I have just read. Although I speak under correction in regard to this, I am informed that they have a distinct legal remedy against Senator Ogilvie, and that, under that, they could have recovered this amount from him, but they refused to do so, and they enforced, or tried to enforce, their inequitable remedy against the unfortunate shareholders of the Exchange Bank. As regards Senator Ogilvie, no doubt he is entitled to the benefit of the law, but let the Government and the House know this important fact as between the directors and the country. Senator Ogilvie may be comparatively an innocent man, he may be, or he may not be. I do not know sufficiently the way in which the affairs of the bank were conducted to pronounce an opinion, but, regarding the great bulk of his own shareholders, and, still more, the great bulk of his own depositors in that bank, he has no right. He was one of those directors. It was largely due to his laches and to his ignorance that this misfortune came about, and the Government should never have shown any preference whatever to a man who, having been a director of the Exchange Bank, had acted in this way. Sir, the whole of this business, I must say, reflects serious discredit on the administration of the Department. There may be occult reasons for it. No doubt, under certain circumstances, these banks are very useful institutions. I am informed, Sir, that among the assets of this bank there is one sum of several thousands of dollars which was advanced on the security of a member of this House, whom I am sorry not to see in his place—the member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault)—and that this represents a part of the cost of his election, and has never been paid—for what reason I do not know. Now, Sir, if that be the case I am very sorry for it. When that hon. gentleman returns it will be for him, I think, to explain to the House, if there be any explanation possible, how it comes that he, a former president of the Exchange Bank, drew, or caused to be drawn, several thousands of dollars from the bank for the purpose of defraying his election expenses. Now, I hope the hon. Minister of Finance did not know of that transaction—I think it probable he did not know of it, I am bound to say. But I must point out to him that this sort of thing is really very awkward, and his position, in some respects—as I recollect explaining to him some half dozen years ago at the City of St. John—is one rather peculiar. Sir, it is possible that very charitable persons like myself, very charitable minded persons, who know the hon. Minister well, may take a very lenient view of this matter. When the hon. gentleman made this speech of his on the 30th March, 1883, and when he declared as I have pointed out, that so firm and stable were the foundations on which he had laid the prosperity of this country that the greatest of all natural laws was going to be suspended for seven years in his interest; Sir, we may be willing to admit, for the sake of argument, that the hon. gentleman on that occasion really did not know what he was talking about, and, Sir, in like manner when, on the 12th and 14th of April, he chose to make an advance which he ought only to have made for the purpose, the First Minister says of averting a universal panic, and in time of extreme depression—then, Sir, we may also charitably believe that the Finance Minister really did not know what he was doing. But, Mr. Speaker, however charitable the view we may wish to take, I want to point out to the Finance Minister that everybody will not be so charitable. This is a censorious world as he knows. People will look at facts. They will say:

Here is an old experienced parliamentarian and administrator, an hon. gentleman who has been Finance Minister for many years, and a financial colossus at that; we find that he neglects the commonest precautions; he walks straight blindfolded into the snare; he violates all kinds of parliamentary rule and etiquette in dealing with Senator Ogilvie, and he puts \$300,000 of the public money in a bank which turns out to be the rottenest of all rotten eggs. Now, Sir, they may require an explanation. For myself, I know that the hon. gentleman, probably erred from over good nature. I know that the hon. gentleman has made great sacrifices for his party. The hon. gentleman is, if he will pardon me for saying so, a good Pharisee, and a man who makes broad his phylacteries occasionally, and yet the hon. gentleman, in view of party exigencies, and in his zeal for the public service, has not consented to be a consort with, but actually a colleague of publicans and sinners for this many a day. Now, Sir, it will be a very sad thing indeed if the Minister of Finance's usefulness should be gone. It would be presumptuous on my part to advise the First Minister what he ought to do in such circumstances, and I am very sure that he would not take my advice if I gave it. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I am quite well aware that the same causes do not always produce the same results with different persons. I know as well as anybody that sauce for the Grit goose is not always sauce for the Tory gander.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh! oh!

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman dispute the proposition? There are too many proofs that I could bring. We know very well what, in a somewhat similar case, the First Minister did. We all recollect when the usefulness of my lamented friend, Mr. Letellier, was gone, and what followed? Mr. Letellier lost his Lieutenant-Governorship. Now it would not surprise me, in case the Finance Minister's usefulness should be gone, that a directly opposite result would happen, and that he would get a Lieutenant-Governorship, and as the thing seems to be in fashion, perhaps a testimonial also. Or, Sir, we might follow the precedent set in your case, and appoint a Deputy or Assistant Finance Minister specially charged to look after banks, and pay them out of the surplus which the hon. gentleman expects to get but which I fear he will not get. Now, Sir, to speak of the matter more seriously, let me recapitulate the facts as they appear. First of all I call attention to this: That in 1853 when this advance was made, the Minister of Finance was perfectly well aware that the bank was in difficulties; he was perfectly well aware why this advance was sought; it was not disguised or concealed for the purpose of enabling this bank to keep its doors open. Now, Sir, if he had perfect knowledge that that bank had been in difficulties he ought to have taken extra precautions. But he took no precautions; he did not consult these experienced bank managers whom he might have consulted; he did not consult them, either, as to the real position of the Exchange Bank, or as to the results which would follow if it was obliged to close. He must have taken an *ex parte* statement from two or three gentlemen who had the strongest imaginable personal interests for keeping the bank's doors open for a short time longer. The result, as I have said, has been that an enormous loss has accrued to its depositors; the result has been that a further unfortunate loss has taken place, and that the public at large are likely to say that the Finance Minister and the Government favored Senator Ogilvie at the expense of several hundreds of unfortunate people whom they themselves had misled, whom they themselves had deluded into leaving their money in this bank, and in whose case great injury had arisen from the action of the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has not merely committed, I think, a grave error of judgment, he has not merely neglected

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

ordinary precautions, but he has committed a very serious fault indeed in refusing to proceed against Senator Ogilvie, against whom he ought to have proceeded—or, if it is not the hon. gentleman's personal affair, I say the Government ought to have taken every legal remedy against Senator Ogilvie and ought not to have advanced the inequitable and, I think, unreasonable claim against those unfortunate people that are concerned as depositors in the Exchange Bank. Sir, in my judgment the whole business shows what indescribable mischief results from his having departed from sound and well established custom. Here we have Ministers acting as if the public money was their own, or rather as if the public money was nobody's. Now, Sir, it is very easy, no doubt, to grow popular by being generous with other people's money, the hon. gentleman understands that too. I recollect very well, a similar transaction which occurred in 1879 when the Finance Minister, sitting in that place, confessed, in answer to a question of mine, that he—and he is the only Finance Minister who ever did it, that I have heard of—had aided and abetted the banks to advance money to the merchants of Canada to enable them to anticipate the effects of his own tariff whereby, as I explained to him he was practically in the position of a gentleman who was assisting to rob his own till,—in this case the public till; and whereby many hundreds of thousands of dollars were distributed among a certain class of men at the expense of the whole community. Now, Sir, this is a case somewhat similar. The hon. gentleman has been very good to two or three persons; he has been very good to a number of gentlemen who came and asked for assistance, but he did not sufficiently recognise the consequences which would result from his action to many innocent persons, who I am quite sure he never desired to hurt, but whom he, in fact, desired to aid and assist. The true position of the Finance Minister on this as on other matters is very clear: he is in the highest degree, by right of his office, the official guardian of the public chest. He is bound, as far as he can, to check the lavishness of his colleagues, if by any extraordinary accident they should be lavish in their expenditure of the public money. He is bound to foresee danger; he is bound to warn us and the Government as to future contingencies, and he is especially bound to guard against the establishment of dangerous precedents from which much mischief, as in this case, might flow. I am very sorry this should have occurred—very sorry. The present case is perhaps a comparatively insignificant sample of the results which flow from this lavish dealing with the public money. And yet mischief enough has been done. I am told there are probably nearly one thousand depositors of small amounts of money with the Exchange Bank who, if the hon. gentleman and the Government persist in their course, will lose all except a most insignificant dividend on their deposits. And the thing has been made much worse by the obstinacy of the Finance Minister. If he had only manifested a quarter as firm resolution not to advance money as he has displayed in insisting on and pressing the Government claim, it would have been better for the depositors, better for himself, better for the Government and better for all of us. I cannot truthfully say that I have any great hope that this motion will carry. I am tolerably well aware of the tenacity and strength of the ties which bind hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to the present Government. And it is my present impression that if an angel descended from heaven and appeared visibly before us with conclusive proof that the hon. gentleman opposite has violated every law of the Decalogue and every law on the Statute-book, those hon. gentlemen would only see in it another opportunity of doing as the First Minister says he wishes his supporters always to do, vote for the Government once when they are right and twice when they are wrong,—and this is the second time; unless, peradventure,

the angel hailed from No. 8, in which case there is no saying what the result would be. But I say that a very considerable public benefit will, in all probability, result from our action. I feel tolerably certain of this, that this most vicious and mischievous practice which the correspondence shows to have been creeping into the management of the banks all through this country, that when they get into scrapes they come to the Finance Minister to be assisted, is likely to be considerably checked by the two debates which have taken place on this subject. I think in future both the banks and the Finance Minister will take to heart the wise remarks of the First Minister, and say that assistance from Governments to banks is only to be given, as the First Minister justly said, for the purpose of averting a universal panic in times of extreme depression; and then, as he also wisely said, in concert with other and larger banking institutions which have unusual facilities for ascertaining the real condition of the chartered banks. I beg to move the resolution.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I desire to say a few words in reply to the speech made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. But before doing so I would state to this House that during the eleven or twelve Sessions I have had the honor of a seat in Parliament I have received during that period every respect and consideration from all hon. members on both sides of the House, except the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. I might call attention to two or three occasions on which, as on the present occasion, he has used language perhaps less parliamentary than that which he has used on this occasion. On the present occasion, in a satirical manner, he has been disposed rather to reflect upon my honor and integrity, and upon the honor and integrity of the gentlemen with whom I am associated in the Government. He has on more than one occasion, in, I think, an unparliamentary manner, I may say in an ungentlemanly manner, referred to the construction of my sentences as being ungrammatical; and he has sat in his place as a critic upon the moral character and the educational standing of members of this House. I am reminded by his conduct and statements of a circumstance that took place not long since in the south of England at a meeting held for the purpose of discussing and considering some important question with respect to the locality. There were present on that occasion a country gentleman, whose organ of self-esteem was very large indeed, and whose organ of benevolence was as small as the other organ was large, and who imagined that he knew everything and that few other people knew anything at all. At that meeting a humble farmer was also present, and he had the audacity to differ in opinion with the country squire. The squire took him to task for it, saying: You are an illiterate man, but I have been educated in two universities. He did not say whether he had ever taken a degree or not. The farmer, looking at the country squire, replied: What of that? I had once a calf that sucked the milk of two cows, and the more milk it sucked the greater the calf grew. That is the spirit in which the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat treats members on this side of the House, whether they are educated or uneducated. It is true I had not the advantage of a university education; but I trust I have had sufficient education to enable me to make my statements to the House in such a manner that members can understand them, and I trust with such clearness that they are prepared to believe them. The hon. gentleman has intimated that in the action of the Government, or, if he will, in the action of the Finance Minister—though it was not the action of the Finance Minister alone—there were party or political considerations with reference to it. He says I am very kind and considerate and generous to these banking institutions, that for political considerations I am anxious to give them certain

advantages. Sir, if he will find a parallel, during all the time I have been Finance Minister, to the consideration which he himself gave when he was Finance Minister to the only political bank in the Dominion of Canada, I will retire from my office. In that bank they mesmerized people by the score; and collections were taken in it to carry the elections and help gentlemen who now sit on that side of the House. Yes, Sir, I repeat, that if he can point to a parallel in my career as Finance Minister, if he can find a case equal to that in the way of advantages given and advances made to banks, I will retire from my position. When that very bank came to us three or four years ago, along with the Consolidated Bank, and said: There is a feeling of distrust in the country, in the minds of certain people who are depositors in the bank and people who hold its paper, which is leading and has led to a demand for gold for our notes. They said: we are sound; we have ample assets to pay our liabilities, but if this drain on us continues, if this demand continues, we will have to shut our doors and there will be considerable loss to the country; our stockholders will suffer, the business of the country will suffer, everybody will suffer, if this run is allowed to continue and the bank is allowed to go down. The banks I refer to are the Consolidated and the Ontario, and the gentleman who came from the Ontario Bank was Sir William Howland. Now, if we had been influenced by political considerations we might have turned to them and said: No, we know your bank, and we know its political influence; we know that its political influence was used to defeat our candidates in years past. But we did not do that; we felt that it was in the interests of the whole banking institutions of the country that we should at that time prevent a run on these banks—prevent them from closing their doors. Every man will understand the effect of a disaster of that kind. The moment there is distrust with reference to one or two banks, no matter how strong they may be, there is a general fear on the part of those having deposits or holding notes, and they go to the banks and say: I want our money. The effect of this would be that the managers and directors would say in a day or two afterwards to their customers: You will have to pay up in full. They may offer to renew for 50 per cent., but the answer will be: No, the drain is going on; a demand for specie is made, and you must pay. The result would have been disastrous, and a loss to the public generally apart from the loss sustained by the holders of notes or stock.

Mr. CASGRAIN. And the National Policy, too.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, the National Policy, and that is to protect the masses of the people. There was no political consideration in making the advance. If that bank and its stockholders and managers had been as warm supporters of the present Government as they were of hon. gentlemen opposite, I have no doubt that we would have heard of that advance when it was made, and we would have been censured for making it on the ground that the manager and stockholders were political friends. The Government considered the proposal; they felt it was safe, and they made advances of \$300,000, I think, to each bank, and the result was that it was soon known that the Government had given them sufficient money to pay their demands, and the drain was stopped. The Consolidated Bank, it is true, subsequently closed its business, but they paid us our money in full and 5 per cent. interest, and the Ontario Bank is, I am happy to say, alive and doing a good business, whereas it would have been closed, or at least suspended for a time, if the Government had not stepped in to their relief, not alone in the interests of the bank, but in the public interest. But we heard no complaints then; there was no motion made by the hon. gentleman censuring us now; no question by the hon. gentleman who has moved in this matter to know why we did so. There was no violation of the law; no violation of duty on

our part; we were not censured in the least at that time. Well, Sir, what happened? Two years later the Exchange Bank found from circumstances that transpired—some little distrust or something of the kind, I suppose—that there was a pressure on them and a demand, and the people were withdrawing their deposits and asking specie for them. The directors came to Ottawa; I happened to be at the time confined to my house. I said to them: This is a serious and important matter, and I cannot take the responsibility on myself. In the first place, I will confer with my Deputy Minister, who has the returns from the banks, and has a more thorough knowledge of the state of the banking institutions from the fact that all these returns and documents come to his hands. I sent for him and told him exactly the nature of the application, and asked him what he thought about it—whether the Government could advance the money with sufficient safety. He gave me his views on the subject. As I was not able to leave my house, I said to him: Confer with the leader of the Government and my colleagues. It was, I think, in April, before navigation opened—before the produce of the country was going forward; the banks were not in a position to draw exchange and were unable to meet extra demands of this kind. It strikes me that it is one of the cases like that of the Ontario Bank, and the Consolidated Bank, in which the public interest may require something to be done. If the public interests would warrant us in doing it, it would be better to come to the help of these banks rather than have other banks involved; because everybody knows that when one bank comes to grief, it creates distrust with reference to the strongest banks in the country. I said, therefore, that if it was found to be perfectly safe, it was desirable to avoid any such calamity as that. I may say that my Deputy did communicate with a person in Montreal with whom he had the utmost confidence, and the answer was that it was perfectly safe to do it. I may add that the communication was confidential, but I say that if I was to give the name to the hon. gentleman, or to any hon. member on the other side of the House, he would say that he was in a position, and should be in a position, to be a good judge. Accordingly an arrangement was made for \$200,000—half of that sum at first, and another \$100,000 if it was found absolutely necessary to carry them through. Well \$100,000 was advanced, and subsequently a report was made that additional claims had come in, and another \$100,000 was necessary. Subsequently Senator Ogilvie and Mr. Buntin, I think, came here, and put themselves in communication with myself and other members of the Government, and in addition to the assurances we had already received they said they were so certain as to the position of the bank that they were willing to give their security. They said we know all the affairs of the bank—though it turned out they did not know them, because there were some wonderful developments afterwards—developments which I think were perhaps unprecedented in Canada. But these facts were not known to the public, they had not transpired when these communications were made by the party in Montreal, and the result was that this step was taken. These parties were so satisfied that they said: We are willing to give for this \$100,000 our personal security. The money was advanced on that understanding, but they were distinctly told that not another dollar would be advanced beyond that. Now, it may be that the Government were wrong. It may be possible that there will be some loss, although I think there is not any reason for anticipating that. But I will say this: It may be an error of judgment; but, I say, even if there had been some little risk at that time in preventing what the Government felt would have been a disaster among the business men of the country, by men engaged in business having their operations in the banks limited, it was a justification on the part of the Government even to run a little

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

risk, and save them if it were possible to do it. I quite agree that these things should be done cautiously; and I may say here that at that very time we had a large surplus, and perhaps the hon. gentleman will say that it is one of the faults of having a great surplus that we had money to deposit with the Exchange Bank. The surplus was large, and the hon. gentleman opposite would have been the first member in this House to attack the Government if those portions of the surplus had not been drawing interest. And what arrangement did we make with the different banks at that time? I will give a statement of the deposits at 4 per cent. interest: Bank of Montreal, \$1,500,000; Commerce, \$600,000; Imperial Bank, \$120,000; Merchants', \$300,000; Molson's, \$140,000; Nationale, \$140,000; Ontario, \$200,000; Quebec, \$200,000; Union, \$200,000; Standard, \$50,000; St. John, \$15,000; Ville Marie, \$25,000; and Nova Scotia, \$100,000. These sums, amounting to over \$3,500,000, were deposited at the time, bearing interest of 4 per cent., instead of being left without interest. Therefore, there would be some responsibility assumed in making these arrangements, and it was considered safe when they were made. With regard to political considerations, I see that the leader of the Opposition has said something about \$300,000 for election purposes. I am glad to say that in this transaction there were no political considerations whatever, and the fact of these gentlemen supporting the Government had nothing whatever to do with the matter. It was purely and solely done in the public interest. The hon. gentleman might have liked to see at that time a suspension of the banks all over the country; perhaps he might; it would have suited his purpose probably. But then we had \$3,600,000 on deposit, and we had not to borrow money to put into this bank. It was just a question whether we would add to the deposit in the Bank of Montreal without interest \$200,000 or \$300,000, or deposit it at 5 per cent. interest in the Exchange. When they came asking for the money, we asked 5 per cent., as in the case of the Consolidated Bank and the Bank of Upper Canada. Whatever may be the result, I do not anticipate any loss in the matter. It was done by the Government with the best intentions, feeling our responsibility, and feeling that what we did was safe, and was in the interest of the country. This is the second time that this question has been brought up as a vote of want of confidence, but I believe this House has sufficient confidence in the honesty and integrity and good intentions of this Government to vote down a proposition which has been brought against them as a direct vote of want of confidence.

Mr. HOLTON. I desire to add a few words to the discussion upon the resolutions now under the consideration of this House. I have listened with attention to the explanations of the hon. Minister of Finance and I must say that in my humble opinion that hon. gentleman has utterly failed to answer or to meet satisfactorily the charges laid at his door by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). These charges I do not propose now repeating at length; but from my personal knowledge of the affairs of this unfortunate Exchange Bank, and upon my responsibility as a member of this House, I assert emphatically, that the facts as alleged by my hon. friend from South Huron are absolutely correct in every particular. We on this side of the House complain of the extraordinary action of the Minister of Finance in advancing enormous sums from the public treasury to an institution, which, at the time this loan was sought, and upon the voluntary admission and statements of those seeking assistance, was in a condition of serious difficulty and embarrassment. We moreover complain that the hon. gentleman should have done this without taking the most ordinary precautions to ascertain the extent of the risk he was assuming, or the nature of the investment he proposed making on behalf of the people of

Canada. Had he taken such precautions, he would, upon the very threshold of his enquiry, have been made aware of many facts bearing upon the gross mismanagement—I may say truthfully the criminal and fraudulent mismanagement—of this bank, which must certainly have deterred him from placing any portion of the public funds in such serious peril. He would, for example, have been informed that but a few days before the demand was made on the Government for these loans, his friend and supporter in this House, the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault), had disposed of a large lot of his shares in the stock of the concern to the manager and cashier of the bank, who paid for those shares by a draft upon his personal account in the bank, already overdrawn to an amount largely in excess of \$100,000. It would doubtless have been hinted to him that this same cashier and manager was living in princely fashion, in a mansion recently erected and luxuriously furnished at a cost to the bank of \$50,000 and upwards. He would have ascertained that a block of 1,000 or 1,200 shares of the bank, out of a total of 5,000 shares, had been and was being manipulated by the manager and cashier of the bank with some of his co-directors, very largely with the funds of the bank, in such a manner that an enormous loss has accrued to the bank, and it has since been found well nigh impossible to establish the ownership of these shares. He would, upon enquiry of almost any bootblack or newsboy in the city of Montreal, have been informed that the bank was at the time regarded with extreme suspicion by the commercial community of the city; and that with the management of this precious concern the surest passport to unlimited credit and favor that a proposing customer could present, was that he had neither credit nor reputation elsewhere. And if the hon. gentleman had but prosecuted his enquiry a little further, he would, in all probability, and without incurring the risk of being considered too inquisitive, or curious, have been informed of the fact that two accounts, standing in the names of the West End Committee and the Montreal Conservative Association respectively, were, as they now are, indebted to the bank in the sum of \$3,400 for advances made in September, 1878, to Thomas Craig, then election agent and manager for the present member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault), at that time president of the bank and Conservative candidate for Montreal West, for the purposes of whose election these advances were made. In fine, he would have discovered that, as the result of such fraudulent and criminal practices, as those to which I have alluded, the bank was, at the time the loan was made, hopelessly and irretrievably bankrupt. These are but a few of the facts, the corroboration of which is to be found among the records in the Superior Court in Montreal, which would have met the enquiry of the Finance Minister had he but thought it wise and prudent in the interests of the people, whose trustee he unfortunately is, to investigate matters a little. I mention them merely to show the hon. gentleman the utter rottenness of the institution which he so eagerly entrusted with large sums of public money. There is, however, another and in some senses perhaps a more serious consideration, which ought to have much weight with members of this House, as it certainly will have with the country. It was bad enough to place a large sum of the public money in the serious peril in which it now is; but, worse than that, the result of the action of the Government in this matter has proved disastrous to all interested in the bank and absolutely ruinous to many. My statement in this respect is fully borne out by the numerous facts which have been brought to light during the process of the liquidation of the bank now going on, and I have no hesitation in declaring, and I do now declare most emphatically, that had the bank closed its doors in April, 1883, as it must certainly have done had the Government not come to its rescue at that time, the creditors and shareholders would be to-day many times better off than they

now are. The former would, beyond question, have been paid their claims in full, while the shareholders would have saved the amount of their double liability, at least, and possibly have received something on account of their shares. The effect of the action of the Government however was to re-establish the concern in the public confidence, in a measure at least; in the course of the four and a-half months which intervened between the granting of these loans and the final suspension of the bank, large additional amounts were received on deposit, large amounts were borrowed wherever they could be had, and at any cost; these sums, with the advances so kindly provided by the Government, were squandered in the wildest and most extravagant manner; and many of the accounts which ultimately proved so disastrous to the bank were fearfully augmented on the wrong side. To-day, therefore, as the direct consequence and immediate result of the Finance Minister's stupendous blunder in bolstering up this rotten institution, as and when he did, the shareholders lose everything, and will have in addition to pay to the full amount their double liability, while the creditors may consider themselves exceedingly fortunate if they receive 50 cents on the dollar on the amount of their claims. For these losses, amounting to at least \$1,500,000, and for all the unhappy circumstances attending this unfortunate loan to the Exchange Bank, the Finance Minister and the Government must and will be held responsible by the people of this country, and they certainly ought to be condemned by this House. I shall support the resolution of my hon. friend.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I am very glad to have the approval of my hon. friend from the Province of Quebec whenever I take any part in the debates of this House. They remind me of the geese in the capitol who gave warning of the approach of the enemy, and as they are very often rather mute when the interests of their Province are concerned, perhaps they will make their voice heard in the proper time. After this short digression I will come to the point. The point is this: I understand that the Finance Minister said last Session that no action would be taken against Mr. Ogilvie for the reimbursement of the loan.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not say we would not. The question was asked if any action had been taken. I said no.

Mr. CASGRAIN. The question was whether action would be taken or not, and the Finance Minister's answer was that, in the meantime, while proceedings were going on in the courts, no action would be taken. I desire to call the attention of the Government to this fact, that a judgment has been rendered in the court of Montreal by which the pretended privilege claimed by the Government as a depositor is declared not to be a privileged claim, and the Government to-day are appealing from that decision to a higher tribunal. The consequence is that whether this judgment be right or wrong, the public are the sufferers by this delay on the part of the Government. The mere effect of the appeal is that while it is going on the assets of the bank are being eaten up; moreover, the distribution of the small portion, about 20 per cent, which is to be distributed to the poor depositors, will be delayed. Mr. Ogilvie ought to be put in the position he occupies; he ought to be made to pay up, and the consequence of his paying up would be that Mr. Ogilvie, presenting himself before the bank, would not be regarded there as a privileged creditor in using the name of the Crown, and he would not be saved, as he is by the action of this Government to-day, from the debt. He owes the money and should be forced to pay it. If Mr. Ogilvie be made to pay, it will be so much money into the general fund in order to secure some dividend to the poor shareholders. On the contrary, while this appeal is going on, all the costs are

taken from the assets of the bank to the detriment of the depositors, and to this fact I desire to call the attention of the House and the Government. The hon. gentleman may say he has great confidence in the leader of the Government. I am not bound to share his confidence. Though I heard the Prime Minister when he said, speaking of his own hands: "These hands are clean," I am not of that opinion. He may believe it, but he cannot force me to believe it, because I know too much about his antecedents. I will say this on the floor of the House and through the country, for I am not ashamed to say it. The hon. gentleman sitting on my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) has quoted Shakespeare. I would, if my memory serves me right, apply another quotation from Macbeth:

"All great Neptune's ocean will not wash this spot clean from my hand."

Mr. MULOCK. It frequently happens that we have some difficulty in getting at the fact on which we are to pronounce. In this case, however, everything appears to be admitted. I will not take the liberty of saying that in either the speech of my hon. friend the member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) or that of the Finance Minister, matters irrelevant to the subject under debate were introduced, although it did appear to me that they travelled somewhat out of the record. I take the matter as I find the facts to justify it. I take the question in its relation to the public interest, and I try to find whether the act that is complained of was one which, under the circumstances, it was in the public interest that the Government should have taken the responsibility of. Now, it will not do for the Government, or for the Finance Minister on this occasion to take shelter behind any alleged ignorance of the fact, because the Minister could have informed himself of both the law and the circumstances under which this misfortune occurred, and of the circumstances which have been subsequently revealed, if he had chosen to do so. The Minister of Finance resented with some degree of warmth the accusation that the advances were made by the Government to the Exchange Bank for political purposes. He denied that statement, and stated that they were made in the public interest after he and his colleagues had come to the conclusion that it was a safe investment to make. I accept that position. I take him on ground on which he places himself. He, as the Finance Minister, of all others most responsible for the financial position of this country to-day, declares that he came to the conclusion, from a knowledge of all the facts, that this was an investment in the public interest and was safe. He stated so a year ago, as well as to-day, so that I need not cite evidence to prove the position which he takes. But he must see that the facts with which he was familiar would not have justified a prudent man in coming to the conclusion which he came to. This bank was incorporated by the Parliament of Canada in 1872. When it came actively into operation I do not know, but the next fact in order of time is that, in 1880, the bank suspended payment. It had an original capital of \$1,000,000. In 1880, it failed. In 1881, the bank appeared before a committee of this House, when the Finance Minister was in his present position, two years before the advance in question was made, and he, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Commerce in 1881, investigated the affairs of this bank. An Act of Parliament was then passed, reducing the capital of the bank to \$500,000. The Finance Minister in 1881 knew the whole affair. He knew the assets, the liabilities, the system of management which prevailed, and, if he did his duty as a member of the committee at that time in advising the House to recognise the statements presented as true statements, what did he find out? He found out all these accounts which have been complained of. He found out that money had been withdrawn from the coffers of the bank for political purposes, for the return of a

Mr. CASGRAIN.

member of his own party. He found out that the cashier of this bank was a man absolutely unacquainted with the banking business. Mr. Craig, I am told, was not a banker; he had no banking experience whatever, and he succeeded in 1880, or thereabouts, the former cashier who had absconded. The hon. gentleman found out that the Banking Act had been violated; that Mr. Craig, in addition to his position as cashier, had been placed upon the board of this bank. As a framer of Bank Acts and of the Acts amending those Statutes, he knew that Mr. Craig was acting in an illegal position as master and servant, and that, as managing director, he was set to watch himself. The president, on the eve of this application for aid, as was stated by my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), had seen fit to wash his hands of the concern, had seen fit, after being president for ten years, to withdraw from the management, to slip out of the concern; and who was installed in his place but the managing director, the last man in the world who should have been placed there, not only from want of qualification, but by reason of the fact that there was an Act on the Statute Book which is altogether opposed to such dual offices. I think the country must hold the hon. gentleman responsible as knowing the true position of affairs when he made the advance in question. He must also have known—he says he knew—the financial position of this bank. He says that these gentlemen came to him in April, 1883, and applied for a loan. Why did they apply for a loan? They told him they were in difficulties. Had he not therefore notice at once that there was trouble? They told him they feared a run, that the depositors had been withdrawing large sums of money, but they said they were solvent. The interested parties came before him and asked him to loan not his own money but the money of the country, and he, instead of making enquiry, took the statement of the borrowers as conclusive. If he had chosen to make enquiry—he says he did—he would have found the true state of the bank, he would have found that, on 1st March, 1883, the liabilities of the bank to the public amounted to \$2,980,000—of course liabilities amount to nothing if there are plenty of assets to meet them—but on the asset side he would have found that the gross amount of specie and legal tenders immediately available to meet the liabilities was \$78,052.58. So that, if creditors to the amount of \$78,052.58 had applied for payment in gold, they would, if they were paid, have withdrawn from the coffers of the bank every dollar available for payment of debts of the bank, and would have left the bank without a dollar to meet the amount of \$2,912,947.42 due to the public. The Finance Minister may say that I have given all the liabilities of the bank to the public. I have. Well, I will give him the benefit of the classification, and take the overdue liabilities, for which the creditors could at any moment have demanded payment. The gross liabilities on the 1st March, 1883, amounted to \$2,980,000. Now, if we take its gross liability on the 31st of March the bank only had at that time, with which to meet its liability, a sum equal to a little less than 3 cents on the dollar; or if we give the benefit of the classification and say that the bank could not have been called upon to pay on demand more than \$1,700,000, then I say that the available assets at that moment would only have paid 5 cents on the whole amount of debts immediately payable. That was a transaction which the Minister of Finance investigated. He saw these bank returns, he examined every one of them before he made this loan. He took that bank return and analysed it thoroughly. He is reported in *Hansard* to have said that he had the bank returns before him. Mr. Courtney brought them to him. He knew all about it, and he examined thoroughly into the affairs of the bank and pronounced it a safe transaction. Well, if it was a safe transaction let me mention some of the liabilities. Amongst those liabilities immediately payable was that under the head of

circulation, \$441,529, or a fraction less than half a million dollars. There were creditors of this bank to the extent of nearly half a million dollars who were the first mortgagees of every asset of the bank. Under the Banking Act introduced by the hon. Minister himself, the provisions of which were, no doubt, present to his mind at that time, he knew that this bank had then in circulation this sum of \$441,529 which was a first mortgage on everything the bank owned—and yet, Mr. Speaker, he thought the bank was in a sound condition. Why, there was not a banker in Canada, with the exception of the hon. Finance Minister, who believed it in a sound condition. A bank which he sought to prop up—nominally in the interests of the public as he, I believe, honestly thought he was doing—the bank, instead of being one that ought to be maintained in the interests of the public, was one that ought to have been crushed out in the interests of the solvent banks of Canada. And when he decided that it was in the interest of Canada that this advance should be made, what was the course open to a prudent man under the circumstance? Should he not have investigated the condition, and not have taken the mere statements of those interested? Yes, Mr. Speaker, he should. Why did he not first of all say to these gentlemen, who appeared asking for aid: There are many of your sister institutions in Montreal who have plenty of money; I have the bank returns before me for the 31st of March, and they show that these banks have millions of money in their coffers at this moment. Why not go to them, if you have so much available security? If you have got two or three million dollars of bills under discount, take them to the banks in Montreal and they will give you any amount you require, if the security is good. It is their business and their interest alike to aid you on this occasion, if you have got the security which you say you have; and if you have not got that security, then you should not come to this Government and ask for aid. Well, Mr. Speaker, did he take that precaution? He does not appear to have taken that precaution. He took no precaution whatever at that stage, that I can see, to secure the country in respect to this matter. Now, if the Finance Minister had candidly told us what strikes me is the real fact, that he was deceived under the circumstances and that he had made a mistake, I believe—I will not say for the good he has done in the past—but I believe from a sense of generosity, the public of Canada would say no more about it. But when he pledges his financial credit in support of that transaction I think that his action is properly open to criticism. Well, he made the first loan of \$200,000, part one day and part another, and he was assured when he made that loan that it was going to restore credit and that everything would be smooth. I am not discussing the morality of that transaction, I am not discussing the effects on third parties, the disasters that have fallen upon others; I am looking at the transaction simply as one between the people of Canada and the Government of Canada. Well, a few days elapsed and the promise they made to him was found to be fallacious. He was told that this advance of \$200,000 was going to put the bank in a sound position and restore confidence, and that no more would be wanted. In a short time, however, another demand was made. And here, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I have not yet been able to observe from the Finance Minister's own statement any satisfactory explanation with reference to the security, and I would now directly draw his attention to this point, for I believe that it is due to the people of Canada that he should explain it to us. He was offered as security for that third loan of \$100,000 two persons as sureties, the Hon. Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Buntin, of Montreal. He tells us himself in Parliament that these two gentlemen came forward and volunteered to become security. Now, as a trusted Minister of this country, when he was offered the security of the endorsement of two men for a

loan which he had decided to make, and which he contemplated recommending, I say, Mr. Speaker, he had no right to refuse to take all the personal security that was offered to him. It has never yet been explained why the second surety was not accepted, and I think it is due to the people and to this House, which represents them, that we should have that point cleared up. Well, that was the way the security was taken. First of all, this rotten concern was aided in this way; secondly, the country is not put in the best position that the hon. Finance Minister could have put it in. Well, a few months rolled by. The 17th of September—I believe that is the date—arrives, the bank closes, and goes down with ignominy and disgrace, a wretched sham, alike disastrous to private and public interests. That is the culmination of the interference of the Government in this transaction. Now, the Minister of Finance tells us that he did this in the public interest. Whom did he consult as to the course he should take? He himself had his misgivings as to the wisdom and propriety of this course, because when he called in the Deputy Minister of Finance to consult with him as to whether he should make the loan, what question did he put to the Deputy? He asked him: Is this proposed aid a proper policy? The Finance Minister shakes his head.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I asked, is it safe?

Mr. MULLOCK. I will read from the *Hansard*, page 154, 7th February, 1884, what the hon. Minister said:

"I sent at once to the Deputy Minister and conferred with him upon the subject. I asked him, is this a proper policy? Is it quite safe? At least, is there any doubt about this money being repaid?"

Now, I see that the relations between the Minister of Finance and his Deputy are most extraordinary. It is the first time, I think, we have had it publicly placed on record that the policy of a Government in dealing with public money should be decided by an irresponsible man not occupying a seat on the floor of this House.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. That is an error. It was not with respect to the policy, but with respect to the security.

Mr. MULLOCK. I will not press the argument further. I will not press it because the Minister of Finance intimates that he has been incorrectly reported.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, I think I was not reported correctly. I know I did not ask him as to the question of policy, and therefore it was not likely I would make that statement, because the policy had been settled on a previous occasion and it was a question of security.

Mr. MULLOCK. The hon. gentleman will admit that I am reading correctly from the Debates.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I do not doubt that.

Mr. MULLOCK. The Minister of Finance did not then, he alleges, take into the Government the Deputy Minister of Finance, nor did he ask that question. But he made the loan, having decided that it was safe; and having made the loan, and the bank having failed, I will ask, what was the duty of the Minister as trustee of the public money in respect to that transaction? It was an overdue debt. He had collateral security; he had the security of one man at least. From the time of the loan to the present moment we do not hear of any effort having been made to call on the surety to make good his bond. Why has that apparent negligence been permitted? If an unwise transaction were entered upon, that did not justify negligence afterwards in trying as far as possible to correct the error, to restore to the public money which has been unwisely taken from them. From the beginning to the end, therefore, it appears to me that this transaction has been characterised on the part of the hon. gentleman by errors of judgment, mistakes and, last of all, by negligence. The Minister of Finance, however,

defends his course on public grounds. His argument amounts to this, although he does not use so many words: Perhaps I have imperilled a large sum of public money. But even if not a cent comes back to the treasury, the good result which was achieved in averting danger is full compensation to the public for the risk or loss, as the case may be. Let us see whether his prophecies as to the consequence of the failure of such an institution were sound ones. He says that when he made the loan in the month of April, 1883, he was told by those gentlemen who came to him: unless you make this advance there may be universal ruin. And the Minister of Finance intimated that nothing would have been more pleasant and acceptable to the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) than universal ruin, and in fact he makes out that he and his friends are no better than the conspirators of Catalina as regards their country. But we do not hear so much in regard to patriotism just now; I suppose an instalment of that will come up later. But the Finance Minister says he was carried away with the arguments of those gentlemen, that a bank panic would take place, that a business calamity would be the outcome unless this advance was made. The advance was made then for two reasons. The hon. gentleman says the difficulty occurred in April, when navigation was not open, and it was difficult for the banks to dispose of the produce of the country and draw bills of exchange against it. Does he mean to say that he deliberately postponed the evil day, knowing that it must come sooner or later; that he transferred it from April to September? Does he claim prescience, and was he able to foresee that it would happen in three or four months; or did he do it to prevent the evil extending beyond one banking institution; does he say that it was any more difficult in April for the banks to take care of themselves than it was in September? Does he put it that way? If he does, I will not venture to place my opinion as an authority against his opinion under those circumstances. But, whatever it may be worth, I will venture the opinion that of all months in the year the middle of April or May, when he says he concluded his arrangements, is the time when the banks are strongest. That is the time when business is closed up and the new spring trade has not begun. The wool trade has not begun, the produce of the former year has been marketed, the money is back in the country and is lying idle in the banks. I have not made a comparison, but I am satisfied that the public returns will show if you examine them, that the amount of cash and of legal tenders in the country and in the banks during the spring of the year, taking any average year, is far larger than at any other period. I may be wrong in regard to that matter: the Finance Minister, of course, knows exactly how that is. The only argument left to him is, that it was desirable to let this bank down easy. That by this process of financing and keeping its doors open for a certain time, and by having a gradual process of liquidation going on when the end arrived the banks would be so reduced that practically there would be no creditors to make demands, and practically, therefore, no persons to create alarm, trouble and ruin. The Finance Minister says that when he decided to go into that transaction he felt that unless he did so there would be trouble not only in the bank itself but outside of it. From what source would the trouble come? From the volume of creditors, from the persons likely to be prejudiced by the suspension of the bank. What was the state of the bank at the time? I have already mentioned that at the time of the advance the bank owed to creditors \$2,980,324.24. If at that time, the Finance Minister tells us in so many words, the bank had been allowed to close its doors owing that sum, nothing short of a commercial crisis would have taken place; but claims were tidied over until the process of liquidation has gone on so far that when the bank's doors were closed there were practically no creditors. What was the change that occur-

Mr. MULOCK.

red in the gross amount of the liabilities at the time of the advance and at the time of the final failure respectively? I find by the bank returns that the bank owed when it failed on the 17th September, 1883, the sum of \$2,668,884.64, or only \$111,439.60 less than the sum it owed at the time of the advance. The condition of the bank was practically the same at the time of the failure in September, as it was at the time the advance was made in April or May. Did the failure in September produce a bank panic? Did it produce a single ripple except among the unfortunate creditors? Did it affect the stock markets? If the Finance Minister will examine the reports of bank stocks as they are to be found in the Library, he will find that the failure of the Exchange Bank in September, did not depress the market one iota. I have examined the quotations appearing in leading monetary journals published in Montreal and there I find that the bank stocks, the most sensitive of all stocks, did not recede in the slightest degree in the city of Montreal where this institution was best known, at the time the bank closed and immediately following it. What therefore becomes of the prophecy about the suspension of this bank producing trouble with other banks? How is it that the facts did not verify that prophecy? I fear that the people of Canada will come to the conclusion that their prophet is a false prophet, one who is good at prophesying, but one unfortunately whose predictions are not sustained by the logic of after events. For all these reasons I think I am justified in saying that I concur in the conclusions arrived at by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), as set forth in his resolution. I listened to his arguments and considered the facts presented by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), and they lead me to but one conclusion, and that is, that a great mistake was made, that the transaction was not justifiable, that it was not entered into with proper skill, that it was a breach of trust of the public moneys, that when the advance was once made efforts were not made to recover it, as they should have been made—in fact, that the people's interests in this case have not been, as they should have been, properly considered by this Government and by the Finance Minister, a member of that Government.

Mr. IVES. It is not often that the members of the House have the opportunity and the honor of sitting in judgment on such a distinguished body of men as the present Administration. Our friends who sit on this side of the House have not often had the temerity to arraign the Administration and call on the House to pass upon their executive and other acts. But on the present occasion the Administration have been arraigned, and, as we might have expected, the arraignment has been drawn and presented by that hon. member whom we would naturally expect to be the boldest in making charges of this description, or any other description. In this matter I address those hon. members with whom I generally act, and as we are to sit in judgment on the Administration, it strikes me there are three questions which we must consider; and I think it will not take us very long to consider them and to arrive at a fair conclusion with reference to the matter. The first question is, as to whether the Government, in making these advances to the Exchange Bank, took reasonable precautions before making them; secondly, whether they were in good faith in making the advances—whether their intentions were laudable in so doing; thirdly, whether they have pursued all the remedies they ought to have pursued in the matter since the failure of the bank took place. It is very easy to be wise after the fact in this as in many other matters. It is not everybody that can look long years ahead and predict a storm, but there is a Wiggins who can do so, and possibly there may be some one on the Opposition side who could look through the bank returns, look into

futurity, and know that the Exchange Bank returns were not trustworthy, that their assets did not exist, that the liabilities were understated, and that the internal management of the bank was rotten from beginning to end. Possibly there may be some hon. gentleman with that presence on this side of the House, but I undertake to say that the business community of Montreal, and through the townships—and I know something of their views in my Province—had not lost confidence in a great degree in the Exchange Bank at the time the advance was made by the Government of the country. I do not mean to say that it was considered to be the safest bank in the Province of Quebec; I do not mean to say that business men considered that its management was the safest management in the world. It had the reputation of being a speculative bank—of desiring to make large dividends, but while I admit that, I claim the advantage of the statement I make in favor of the Government, that the general public thought at that time, it was solvent and worthy of credit. That was the general impression, and I have no doubt that if it had not been the general impression the gentleman in Montreal to whom application was made by the Finance Minister would have given him, on that occasion, a very different answer from the one he did return. But it turns out that the affairs of the bank were considerably worse than anybody expected, and as my hon. friend who last took his seat has stated, the crash came, and the public knew all about it. The hon. gentleman tells the truth exactly—I presume unintentionally—when, he says, when the crash came the public knew all about it. The Government knew no more about this bank than what the returns showed; the public knew all the Government knew about it. The public were trusting this bank every day; they were making advances to it, and the directors of that bank were so satisfied that it was solvent that two or three of them came up here on an express train to say that they were so confident of the safety of the bank that they would become responsible for the last \$100,000 advanced. On the first point, as to whether the Government used reasonable care in regard to this matter, I think the Government ought to be excused, and that we, the jury sitting on this case, are bound to find them not guilty on the first count. On the second, the question of good faith, there can be no question that the intention of the Government in making this advance was a good intention. Some effort has been made by the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) to show or to insinuate that it was made for political reasons or on account of friendliness to Mr. Ogilvie. That matter has been entirely and satisfactorily disposed of by the Finance Minister, and I do not believe that there is a man in the House or out of it who supposes that anything but the interest of the country, generally, actuated the Government in making this advance. And there is one point on which the hon. member who last spoke thinks he has entirely got the Government—the point that they did not use proper diligence. He asks, why have the Government sought repayment of the loan rather than sue the sureties? The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) must know, as a lawyer, that if the Government had instituted proceedings against the Hon. Mr. Ogilvie for the recovery of this loan, for which he was merely a surety, until they had obtained all they could get out of a discussion of the assets of the bank, they would have been taking an entirely useless course. I undertake to say that under the contract of suretyship Mr. Ogilvie was entitled to the exception of discussion, and that he could not have been made to pay this amount under the obligation that was made, until the assets of the bank had been discussed. I do not propose to occupy the time of the House any further. It is quite apparent, upon the three points which have been raised in this matter by the hon. mover of the resolution and the other gentlemen who are supporting it, that the Government are

entirely blameless and are entitled to the support of this House. But I will venture a prophecy, and that is, that every Conservative member in this House will support the Government, and every Liberal member in this House will vote for the resolution; and I will tell you why. It will be perfectly consistent with our policy to vote against the resolution, and it will be perfectly consistent with their policy for hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House to support the resolution. Why? Because the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to do nothing; their motto is, do nothing though the heavens fall. They believe, as flies on the wheel, that nothing can be done; if a bank is in difficulty, if there is likely to be a run on it, if there is likely to be a public calamity for the want of something being done by the Government, they believe the last thing to be done is for the Government to alleviate the difficulty and prevent a catastrophe. That was the policy of the hon. gentlemen from first to last; it is their policy, not only with reference to this, but every other matter; but our theory is, that it is possible, by executive as well as parliamentary action, to assist the country and develop the resources of the country. The Government have been endeavoring in this case, by a deposit in the Exchange Bank, to steady the confidence of the public in the resources of that bank. They were carrying out their legitimate policy, and I hope their action will result in no loss. But even if it should, the country has already many times declared in their favor, and it will not now pronounce against them for endeavoring to avert a calamity.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has said that he is quite sure that the Conservative members will sustain the Government and that the Liberal members will vote against them, and he is quite sure of that because that course is quite consistent with the policy of the two parties respectively. He says we are the do-nothing party, whereas they are the active party. Sir, is there a man in this House today who, if he felt himself quite free to act, would not say that he was sorry on this occasion that the Government had not done nothing? Is there a man in this House today who, if he felt free to act precisely as he believes, would not say that he did, as this resolution asks us all to do, regret what the Government had done? Does the hon. gentleman himself, who spoke just now, rejoice that they did what they did? Of course there is a sense in which he rejoices, because as a Conservative and a supporter of the Administration, he says hon. gentlemen opposite are going to vote for the Administration, and therefore that is one of the things about which they have to make a hurrah. They have not merely to affirm the good conduct and the wisdom of the Government, but also to glorify the transaction. The hon. gentleman says the Government would have been wrong if they had done any other thing than what they did on this occasion—that they did what was just right. He does not say what the Finance Minister himself says, that he might have made a mistake. No; he did not make a mistake; he did the right thing, says the hon. member, whose, I won't say subserviency or servility, but whose unswerving support in this matter should fortify the claim he is making for a place in the councils of the country. I hope this vote and this speech will not be forgotten when the question comes up as to who is to be Minister of Railways, or who is to fill the vacant shoes if a member of the present Cabinet becomes Minister of Railways. Well, although the hon. gentlemen may feel that it is important always to act, I think the sober second thought and common sense of the people will agree that it is important sometimes to abstain from action—that there are occasions on which it would be wise not to act, and that upon all occasions action of this description, action incurring such a grave responsibility with reference to our public funds, of which the Government are the custodians,

not to lend them upon risky securities, not to invest them in speculative banks, but simply to hold them safe and account for them to us—action, I say, of so grave a character, should be preceded by careful and full enquiry and investigation. It is not simply because, as it now turns out, this money has been placed in jeopardy, that this motion is made. It is not simply because, a few months after the third of these advances, this bank closed its doors, that this motion is made. But it is made because the whole circumstances of the case demonstrate that the transaction was entered into and carried out by the Administration without due care and caution, without a due sense of their responsibility to the public and to Parliament, without a proper enquiry, and without the existence of those conditions which alone could render it proper for them to take the responsibility they did, which alone would justify them in asking Parliament to approve of their action, and which conditions were stated only a few days ago, as my hon. friend from Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) pointed out, by the First Minister himself, with reference to this very transaction. On that occasion he (Sir Richard Cartwright) charged the Finance Minister with having done wrong in connection with this matter, and, as my hon. friend from Huron said, the First Minister stated the circumstances under which a transaction of this kind might be entered into by a Government:

"It has been in my experience," he says, looking back, "found requisite or expedient by several Governments, in times of great depression—"

The first condition—

"to prevent universal ruin, universal panic, to come to the help of some of the banking institutions."

Now, let us pause. Was this or was it not a time of great depression? Was the month of April, 1883, and the month of May, 1883, a time of great depression? Is even the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) prepared to aver that? Will his fidelity to his friends and leaders enable him to agree that that first condition stated by the First Minister existed—that that was a period of great depression? Will he tell us, in the second place, that this was done to prevent, and that therefore the consequence of not doing it would have been to produce, "universal ruin, universal panic?" What! A little bank, which the hon. gentleman himself has described as a speculative bank, which had a few years ago a capital of \$1,000,000, which had lost half that capital, which had been obliged to come to Parliament to ask that its capital should be reduced by 50 per cent., and which, since that time, had been doing business speculatively—as the hon. gentleman tells us, and I thank him for the statement—doing business on speculative principles, with its diminished capital of half a million;—even if the condition of this country was not one of great depression, to use the hon. gentleman's words, was its condition such that even if this speculative bank, which was so handled that it had lost half a million dollars, had suspended, its suspension would have produced "universal ruin, universal panic?" Will my hon. friend's loyalty to his friends and leaders induce him to aver of the condition of things at that time, and with reference to this bank, that its suspension in the month of April or the month of May would have produced "universal ruin, universal panic?" If that be so, I want to know if at a time of year when, as my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) has pointed out, the business of the country is such that the banks contract their advances when they are necessarily relatively stronger—I do not speak of their condition at this particular time, because I have not looked at it, but in the general course of business they are relatively stronger than in the fall of the year, when the crops begin to move, and their circulation is large and there is a general expansion—if at the time of the year

Mr. BLAKE.

when the banks are so relatively stronger, the suspension of this little, speculative, and discredited bank, with its half million dollars capital, would have produced serious panic and ruin, I want to know why, when it did suspend on the 17th September, it did not create even a ripple of alarm in financial circles? But it did produce a sensation, and the sensation was a sensation of relief. For it was well known to the banking community, if not to the Minister of Finance, that the operations of that bank, for months and months before, had been operations of an unsound, a speculative, an unbusiness-like character. Now we will go on a little more; we will deal a little more with the speeches of the hon. gentleman. We have got the condition of things, and he repeats it again:

"Those hon. gentlemen who have lived as long as I have will, if they look back, find that Governments have, on occasion, prevented universal panic."

The hon. gentleman felt that that condition of things, which was to be avoided, had been so aptly expressed by himself that he repeated the phrase a moment afterwards, "prevented a universal panic." How? In what method?

"By acting in concert with strong banking institutions, in helping to sustain banks which were not quite so strong."

There is the second condition. How is it that universal panic and universal ruin, or, not to adopt these strong expressions, serious difficulty and disaster and embarrassment, may ensue under certain circumstances from a bank failure? And what institutions are first and most likely to be affected? The Finance Minister has answered that this afternoon. We all know the answer. It is by the loss of credit and the general effect, even upon sound and safe banks, of one banking concern, from mismanagement or misfortune, going down. That is the difficulty; the Finance Minister pointed out. The First Minister, on the occasion to which I referred, recognised it, for he said:

"In concert with leading banks, to help banks that are not so strong."

Who, then, have the chiefest and most immediate interest in preventing the suspension of any bank which is solvent, which possesses as yet the elements of vitality and stability? The banking institutions, its brothers. The other banking institutions of the country are those who, by the admission of both hon. gentlemen, will suffer most, and it is from the action and reaction upon them that the difficulty is to come, and therefore it was that the First Minister was perfectly correct when he stated the second condition, the condition of helping a corporation to be, that the Government would act in concert with the leading banks.

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

After Recess.

Mr. BLAKE. I was calling your attention to the conditions the First Minister had laid down. One of these conditions was the action of the Government should be action in concert, with strong banking institutions, to help the bank which might not be quite so strong. I had pointed out the fact that the banks were, of all the institutions and persons in the country, those most interested and most likely to be immediately affected. That was the condition which the hon. gentleman stated as what was not only natural and reasonable, but also likely; and that condition being stated, I want to apply it. Which is the bank—which are the banks—with whom the Government were concerting measures to assist the Exchange Bank on this occasion? Where are the banking institutions with which the First Minister and his colleagues consulted, and which they found anxious to assist the Government in their policy as to the Exchange Bank? Where are the other institutions in whose name, in whose interest, he said he was acting, and who felt it was the common interest of the Government, and themselves, that action should be taken,

and who showed their faith by their works? What were the relations of the Exchange Bank to the other banking institutions of the country at this time? I asked an hon. friend to look at the *Gazette* returns of this epoch, and from them it appears that at the time of the loan the Exchange Bank was actually a creditor of the other banks to the extent of \$10,000. That was the extent to which the banks on their operation, their ordinary cash operations, I presume, had allowed the Exchange Bank to take their paper, and so far from there being assistance rendered at that time or assistance proposed, so far as we know—we have heard something more to-day than we heard last year from the Finance Minister—but even to-day, with the amplified statement he has given us, we have no suggestion whatever that the condition, the reasonable, proper, and just condition which the First Minister announced, namely, that of acting in concert with leading banking institutions, was applied or attempted to be applied on this occasion. "By acting in concert with the other banks," the First Minister says, but the other banks would not and did not assist, they did not or would not act in concert with the Government, because they thought the methods of the Exchange Bank were unsound and that the bank itself was rotten. Compare the case of the Federal Bank with that of the bank which is before us just now. Look at what was done in the case of the Federal Bank. You find that they called the other banks into council; you find that they asked representatives of other banks to form a committee; you find that the latter did so, that they took up the affairs of the Federal Bank, and investigated them, and made arrangements whereby they might, acting in concert and upon proper terms, advance certain sums to assist the bank. That was the course taken then, and that is the course that has been taken, more or less formally, on other occasions. But on this occasion we did not hear of it. Of what bank did the Government make any enquiry? Did they ask of Mr. Greene? of Mr. Ogilvie? of Mr. Buntin? Did they say to them, which of your sister banks are helping? what are your relations with the Bank of Montreal, with which you keep your cash account? what are your relations with the other banks? have you asked them for assistance? have they refused you assistance? and, if they have refused you assistance, why? And if you did not ask them, why did you not ask them? These are the first questions that would be put, that ought to be put, that must have been put by the Government, if they did their duty, before they made a loan of this description and this amount to a bank with this amount of capital. Yet, upon that subject, we find nothing. We hear for the first time of some confidential enquiry having been made from some other unnamed individual in Montreal, to whom the Finance Minister gives a reputation which, I dare say, he deserves, but of which we have no means of judging. But these are the enquiries and these are the sources, the quarters of enquiry which ought to have been resorted to. Why, Sir, this is, no doubt, as the First Minister put it, a very grave affair. It is, as the Minister of Finance put it, a very grave affair. I do the Minister of Finance no injustice whatever when I say that Ministers more able, more powerful, more experienced than himself, have left Administrations before now because they found the Cabinet would not agree with them in transactions of this kind. Sir Alexander Galt, the Finance Minister in the first Cabinet of Confederation, left the Government because his views in regard to a loan to the Commercial Bank were not shared by his colleagues, and he would not agree in the views of his colleagues, and they declined, and I believe rightly declined, to advance money to the Commercial Bank. So that bank was permitted to go under, and in consequence the Finance Minister was lost to the Ministry of the day. Nor is that the only case in which applications have been refused. What about the Ville Marie Bank, a few years ago?

What about the Jacques Cartier Bank, a few years ago? What happened to them? What applications were made? What answer did they receive? I am not blaming the Government, for I have not the materials for praise or blame in reference to these applications, but I have reason to believe they were approached, and that those approaches were not favorably received. I think I have shown you that the second set of conditions that the First Minister has declared to be essential have not been complied with, that this was not an act of the Government, after consultation and in concert with the leading banks of the country, upon a common course of policy agreed to by them in a risk and in a course of action in which they were making common cause and taking a common part. After stating that condition, the First Minister returned to the occasion, he returned to the gravity of the case, and went on to say:

"That," that is to say, "that Governments have, on occasion, prevented universal panic by acting in concert with strong banking institutions, in helping to sustain banks which were not quite as strong." "That has happened and will happen everywhere. It has happened in England, where Governments have come to the rescue of the Bank of England, in times of panic, to prevent a run on the bank."

We all know how the Government have assisted the Bank of England, not by depositing their money there, for all their money is there already, but by allowing the bank to issue notes in excess of their chartered power, with reference to the specie held by them:

"Every Government must, of course, act on its own responsibility to the best of its judgment, in coming promptly to the protection of the commercial and financial world, and the people generally. If they make mistakes, they are liable to animadversion."

I call the attention of the hon. gentleman, the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) to this point—"If they make mistakes, they are liable to animadversion." But he says they are not liable to animadversion.

Mr. IVES. I say they did not make a mistake.

Mr. BLAKE. I was going on to say that, as they were not liable to animadversion, they could not, according to the hon. gentleman's view, have made a mistake. I say they have made a mistake, and I think the hon. gentleman is the only member in this House, who does not in his heart think they made a mistake on this occasion.

"If they make mistakes they are liable to animadversion, but no Government ought to deprive itself of the power of assuming that position in times."

And here we recur to the state of the circumstances. In what kind of times? In that kind of times which we have enjoyed since hon. gentlemen opposite resumed power in 1878? No—

"In times of great depression, great commercial distress and panic."

And there the hon. gentleman leaves the subject, and there for the time I leave him. If you read his statement from the beginning to the end, you will see that he lays down the conditions that it is "to prevent universal ruin, universal panic," that it is to be "by acting in concert with strong banking institutions" and in conclusion, that the power must be reserved to the Government to act in times of great depression, great commercial distress and panic." You find a condition of things described which, according to the description which we daily and nightly receive from those benches, could not have existed in April, 1883, or in May, 1883, or even in November, 1883. This description of the condition of affairs, and, therefore, of the consequences of the failure of the Exchange Bank at the time of this loan, was not the statement only of the First Minister—it was, probably, not rashly made—it was the statement of the Finance Minister, last Session, when dealing with the question. In the first place, he gave us the account of the intending borrower. Mr. Greene, one of the directors of the bank, called on him on the 10th or 11th of April, and saw him at his house,

and the hon. gentleman accepted the statement of Mr. Greene, apparently in good faith, apparently as if there could not be any doubt about Mr. Greene's judgment, apparently as if it was conclusive as to the general situation and not merely as to the situation of the bank. What did he say?

"He stated," said the Finance Minister, "that, owing to one or two circumstances that had taken place in Montreal, there was some distrust on the part of the depositors and noteholders, with reference to the condition of the bank; that it was expected there would be a run made upon the bank that day, and probably the next day, and he came up here to see if some arrangement could not be made with the Government by which their position would be strengthened, and by which the run would be prevented."

So much with reference to Mr. Greene's statement about his own bank and his own conduct. Now, he goes on, and enlightens the Finance Minister as to the consequences generally:

"He also stated that the run might reach half a dozen institutions of the same kind in the city of Montreal and in the Dominion of Canada, by which the public interests would be imperilled, by which the free trade, commerce and business of the country would be imperilled."

Mr. Greene, the director of this small bank, who had so mismanaged its affairs that he had to come to the Government and ask for relief, in order to prevent a run and to prevent the closing of its doors; Mr. Greene, who had failed to conduct successfully the bank, informs the Finance Minister, instructs, enlightens the Finance Minister of the Dominion of Canada, as to the probable consequences of that bank's doors being closed. He tells the Minister, and the Minister seems to have swallowed it as if it were gospel, "that the run might reach half a dozen other institutions of the same kind in the city of Montreal and in the Dominion of Canada," and that by that, "the public interests would be imperilled, and the trade, commerce and business of the country would be imperilled!" If I had been asked to say whether Mr. Greene, the well-known failure as a banker, whose experience as the director of a bank had been with the Exchange Bank, or the Finance Minister of the Dominion of Canada, who had undertaken the somewhat onerous task of regulating the trade and commerce and manufactures of this country, who had undertaken the somewhat onerous task of making all things prosperous by legislation—which of the two should instruct or enlighten the other upon the consequences of the Exchange Bank closing its doors, I should have thought that the Finance Minister would say to Mr. Greene: "I am a better judge of that than you are; I have had a wider experience of the effects of runs on banks than you can possibly have had; it is my business to act upon the information I may receive; it is your business to inform me as to the condition of your bank; that is your affair, but I beg you not to inform me, seeing the way in which you have conducted your business, seeing that there is a crisis impending in regard to your bank, whether or not this run will affect other institutions. You have managed to get your own nest fouled, do not foul the nests of others; I keep my eyes open and I know something about the position of other banks." No, Mr. Speaker, he seems not only to have received the statement of Mr. Greene as to his own bank, but also his statement as to other banks. I wish we knew what they were. I wish we knew which were the six other banks which were to close their doors if the Exchange Bank closed its doors. However, the Minister thought it was true. "Well," he says, "I must leave it to the Government." Then he despatched his Deputy to his colleagues, and of course I hold that, while in this transaction the hon. gentleman, as Minister of Finance, has a somewhat special responsibility, under the exceptional circumstances and in his condition at the time, it would be unfair, unjust and ungenerous to hold that he has any very special responsibility, because he happened to be ill. He affirmed a general opinion, and had to hand over the details to the Government generally, his colleagues; that is the

Mr. BLAKE.

position as he states it, he sends his deputy to his colleagues, and what is the message he sends?

"And you may say to the leader of the Government, and to my colleagues, that if they think it is in the interests of the banks of the country, in the public interest, and in the interest of the commerce and trade of the country, that this assistance should be given, they have my support with reference to it."

There is his message. Well, now, would it not have been a good thing to find out from the banks what they thought about it? Would it not have been a good thing, if it was to be in the interest of the other banks, to find out whether they were lending a hand? But the Government had determined this without having acquired that knowledge. Once again he says:

"When this advance was made to the Exchange Bank, it was felt, on the part of the Government, that it would sustain the institution and carry it through and prevent a crisis, and relieve the pressure on other banks in the Dominion; for we all know how sensitive public opinion is."

Then, Sir, he goes further, and he makes a statement of a very grave character. You find him, in the passage I have just referred to, declaring that it was to prevent a crisis, to carry the institution through, and to relieve the pressure on other banks—and once again, without having consulted the other banks at all. A little lower down he says:

"But I say that when you touch one of these banks, we know how sensitive all the other banks in matters of this kind are. I think, however, that the House and the country will sustain the Government when, under such extreme circumstances, and for the purpose of preventing a run on the bank, we took this step; because we all know, by looking at the returns, that if to-day two-thirds of the banks in the Dominion were suddenly called upon to redeem their circulation, where those banks would be, and where the business of the country would be. Under these circumstances, we felt that we were perfectly justified—feeling, at the same time, that we were safe in doing so—in endeavoring to save the country from the consequences which would follow the breaking down, it might be of two, or three, or four, or five, of the banks."

Now, Sir, this is a statement, the gravity of which cannot be over-estimated. You find a statement of the Finance Minister, that the breaking down of a small bank like the Exchange Bank would have resulted in a general panic, and in the breaking down of two, or three, or four, or five, of the banks, and you find him suggesting as a practical question "that we know if, two-thirds of the banks were suddenly called on to redeem their circulation, where those banks would be." I suppose the hon. gentleman was making a mere technical statement of what the effect would be if every dollar of circulation came suddenly in on the banks; but if he was, he ought to have said so. He was not speaking, we know, with reference to banks in a fair condition, but he was making a practical statement as to the practical results. In saying what he did, he was inflicting a much greater blow upon the stability of the banking institutions of this country than the failure of the Exchange Bank could do. He was suggesting what the consequences would be of a call upon two-thirds of the banks of the country for the redemption of all their circulation, and pointing out that they would have to close their doors. That was the practical statement of the hon. gentleman. Now, Sir, if that were so—and you will find other banks adverted to throughout this discussion, by the First Minister, and by the Minister of Finance as well—if it were so that the banks were so deeply interested in this, once again I ask, why were they not taken into counsel? Why was it not ascertained what their views were upon it? Why was not some concert, such as the First Minister suggests as proper and reasonable and the essential condition, engaged in on this occasion? None such was engaged in, and \$100,000 was loaned on the 12th of April. Oh! but I forgot; I ought to have placed to the credit of the hon. Minister that he secured 5 per cent. for it; he secured an extra rate of interest for it. He was so cautious that he was not going to incur risks without a reward. You do not find him loaning money to a speculative, shaky bank. Oh! no; he takes 5 per cent. as his security against risk.

He thinks: Well, I am loaning a certain sum, and there is a certain amount of risk, but I am going to make a profit out of it; why, I am going to make 1 per cent. more than I am making in the other banks, and this is my justification, or part of it. We find him taking, as a careful husbandman, some extra rate of interest, and this is an acknowledgment of the risk of the operation. We find it acknowledged on the 13th by Mr. Craig, the ex-president, when he says:

"Things are much quieter, and I think the worst is over, though we may be troubled for a few days yet."

Then, following on the 16th, they telegraphed for another \$100,000, and Mr. Craig, writing the same day, says:

"I think this will be all that we shall require, because there is a perceptible falling off in the demand."

Well, \$100,000 is sent on. In the meantime Mr. Ogilvie must have been up at Ottawa and must have seen the officials, because it is sent on in another way. The first \$100,000 was sent through the Bank of Montreal, but we find, on the 17th, that a cheque for \$100,000 was sent on the City and District Savings Bank. "Mr. Ogilvie told me" says the Deputy Minister, "that you preferred payment in this manner." They preferred to get the money through the City and District rather than through the Bank of Montreal. I suppose they did not want the Bank of Montreal to know that they were getting another \$100,000 from the Government, but for some reason or other, instead of there being concerted action, co-operation, on the part of these other banks so deeply interested, and whose stability was being sustained by the Administration, there appears to have been a desire to conceal the transaction that was going on, by taking the second \$100,000 through another bank. Well then, Mr. Craig says, on the 19th:

"The demand has about ceased. I do not think I shall require any more. If anything turns up I shall let you know."

It was not very long before something turned up. That was on the 18th, and on the 21st he wrote again:

"I find I shall require another sum of \$100,000 to place me in an independent position."

Well, now, what was to be done? The hon. gentleman had given him \$200,000 about the middle of the month. Mr. Craig says:

"I have paid \$356,000 in deposits since the first of the month, and have notices of withdrawal of \$60,000 more, besides a reduction in circulation of \$45,000."

There you get \$461,000 paid, or immediately payable, as against the first \$200,000. The position is worse by \$260,000. Now, where has the money gone? We find here some of the concert, of the action, of the understanding, of the feeling, of the larger banks. "Most of the money has gone into the Bank of Montreal—at least, two-thirds of it," says Mr. Craig. So the Bank of Montreal was receiving the money that the Government was paying in. The amounts were going out, and instead of the Bank of Montreal assisting to strengthen this institution—and I am not blaming the Bank of Montreal, because they had no understanding with the Government; the Government did not talk with them, and the Exchange Bank did not talk with them, I suppose—but the Government was paying money which was passing into the hands of their own bankers, the Bank of Montreal. Mr. Craig goes on to say:

"The drain on ordinary deposits has stopped, but I must meet the deposits of which I have received notice; therefore, I shall have to trespass on your kindness once more. The knowledge that the Government were assisting me as had a wonderful effect in quieting matters. I am reducing, as fast as I can, but when you have been so good—

He always was a good man—

"but when you have been so good, I do not want to force my customers into a corner, but all who can pay I am collecting from. I take the liberty of sending you in advance the third deposit receipt."

Now, there you see, Sir, what with the knowledge that the Government were assisting him had done for the gentleman. It "had a wonderful effect in quieting things." However, the Government declined this demand for the other hundred thousand, the demand made on the 21st. And then it would seem that about the 10th or 11th of May, Mr. Buntin and Mr. Ogilvie came up to Ottawa, and the account of that is found in the First Minister's speech:

"Its representative came to myself personally—Senator Ogilvie, who was a director of the bank—and Mr. Buntin, I think, came with him. They said they knew all about the bank, because they were directors—I am sorry to say they did not know all about it, and I mention this as evidencing that they thought they knew all about it—and they were prepared to give their personal security for \$100,000, over and above the security we had under the position we would occupy as having a claim on all assets under the double liability, which amount they said would carry the bank successfully through. Those gentlemen spoke in the most confident terms respecting the bank, and offered, as I have said, to give their personal security for \$100,000."

That was the statement. They over-persuaded the hon. gentleman. The Government had refused, on 21st April; matters had gone on from that date to 10th or 11th May. Then his friends, Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Buntin, came up and over-persuaded him. There was no further enquiry, no further ascertaining as to how the other banks were assisting, no question as to concerted action, nothing about that; but the statement of Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Buntin was accepted, and the loan was made. Was it made with the offered security? Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Buntin both offered security, but the Finance Minister took Mr. Ogilvie alone and let Mr. Buntin go. No explanation has been given up to this time. I have heard rumors as to what the reason was, but I will not state them. It is the business of the hon. gentleman to inform us how it was that when he had the offer of those two gentlemen of means to give security, he took the security of only one; how it was that he accepted half the security for which security went. I will not relate the story I heard, but it is for the hon. gentleman to make the explanation. The hon. gentleman said this was not a political bank and this was not a political transaction, and he fortified himself by referring to advances which had been made to the Ontario Bank and to the Consolidated Bank. And he declared that the Ontario Bank was a political bank. I deny the statement. The Ontario Bank was not then, and never has been, a political bank. It never was a political bank, and at the period to which the hon. gentleman refers, even the gentleman to whom he alluded obviously by other references, inaccurate as they were, as being the reason why the bank was political, had ceased to be its president, and its president was Sir William P. Howland. Among its directors was no less a political friend of hon. gentlemen opposite than Col. Gzowski, a personal friend of all who know him, and a well-known and consistent Conservative, and a supporter and personal friend of the hon. gentleman at the head of the Government. And yet the hon. gentleman said, in his closing remarks, that the Ontario Bank was a political bank, a Grit political bank, and he showed his liberality and broad feeling by saying it was a Grit political bank in which Col. Gzowski, a Conservative, was a director, and in which other Conservatives were directors, and in which as many shareholders were Conservatives as Reformers. If you talk about political banks, I ask what is the complexion of a bank in which Mr. Gault, the present member for Montreal West, was president, and of which at the time Mr. Bulmer, Mr. Greene, Mr. Ogilvie, Mr. Craig and Mr. Buntin, all of Montreal, formed the directors? We know their politics; we know they are all supporters of the Government. They were not merely the directors, the moving power of the bank, but they also held one-half or more than one-half of the whole capital stock. So if you want an instance of a political bank, give me the Exchange Bank; and if you want to show me what

the consequences of a bank being a political bank are, read me the history of the Exchange Bank. The hon. gentleman can strike no heavier blow at the banking institutions of the country than to declare they are political banks. It is upon no such principle that those institutions can be safely conducted. I deny the statement, so far as I know, as regards any one of our existing institutions. Well, then, the hon. gentleman says, What did you do? You made loans to the same amount: \$300,000 to the Ontario Bank and \$300,000 to the Consolidated Bank, and he contrasts those \$300,000 loans with the \$300,000 loan to the Exchange Bank. What was the capital of the Ontario Bank? \$3,000,000. What was the capital of the Consolidated bank? \$2,000,000. A loan of \$300,000 would be one tenth of the capital of the Ontario Bank, and one-tenth of the capital of the Consolidated. It would leave, in the case of the Ontario Bank, \$2,700,000 of capital, apart altogether from the double liability. If you were to loan in the same proportion to the Ontario Bank, as you loaned to the Exchange Bank, as regards capital, you would loan the former \$1,800,000. If you were to loan in the same proportion to the Consolidated the amount would reach \$1,200,000. And yet the hon. gentleman talks of those comparatively small loans, having regard to the capital of those institutions in question, as bearing a comparison with an advance of three-fifths of the capital of a bank, which was the case when a loan of \$300,000 was made to a bank with a capital of \$500,000. The same proportion as was loaned to the Consolidated and the Ontario Banks would have given \$50,000 or \$70,000 in the case of the Exchange Bank; but, instead of the Finance Minister loaning it \$50,000 or \$70,000, he loaned it \$300,000, or four times as much as the larger of those two sums. As to the general position of the banks in April, as compared with September, I find by the bank returns there were, in April, \$33,000,000 notes in circulation, and total liabilities, \$146,000,000; September, \$34,000,000 notes in circulation, total liabilities, \$156,000,000. But I do not consider that is of very much consequence. Why? Because I do not consider the hon. gentleman intended that the bank should fail in September. I do not understand the hon. gentleman's defence to be, that this was a bank which he knew was about to go down, and that by making advances he would be able to keep it afloat until some day when its failure would do less harm; and, therefore, it was not, I take it, with reference to such a contingency that the hon. gentleman acted. He was acting not to postpone an inevitable fall, but to prevent a fall which he thought could be avoided and the bank brought through. Now what happened? The president tells us. He says that the knowledge that the Government was assisting us had a wonderful effect. The public were made quiet. The demands on deposits ceased to a large extent; stock changed hands; depositors let their money remain in the bank, and some put their money in the bank; the shareholders changed. The double liability of many shareholders at that time, including the double liability of the member for Montreal West, for the shares which he had sold as the late president—his double liability, which continued for a period of three months from the time of the transfer, was wiped out by the bank being carried on, and somebody else—Mr. Craig, who ran away and is an absconding criminal, was the party whose double liability was secured to the public and the Government in lieu of that of the hon. member for Montreal West. Why did the knowledge that the Government was assisting the bank do good, as the president says it did? Why did it do that which the Finance Minister says he thought it would do? It inspired confidence. Why? It inspired confidence because the people said it cannot be that the Government of the country, having the funds of the country in its hands and authorised and instructed to

Mr. BLAKE,

deposit them safely in banks and keep them for the people, would deposit their funds in a breaking bank. But if they have done so we may well feel confidence. They would not risk the public moneys; they would not risk our moneys, and knowing that they put it in there, they hung out a flag to us; they said: there is no risk for you; and that is the reason that public confidence was restored to a certain extent, and that to a certain extent the drain ceased and the bank was kept along. But they were deceived. The people were deceived by the action of the Government. The bank was then an absolutely broken bank, and if any reasonable enquiry had been then made it would have been found by the Administration to have been an absolutely broken bank. It was obviously and palpably a broken bank. A change did take place in these few months, but it was a change for the worse. The condition of the bank got worse day by day, week by week, month by month. Very soon the Government itself became alarmed; they called for the money; they took \$50,000; they called for another \$50,000; they had piteous requests for delays; they agreed to take it by \$5,000 at a time, and then by \$10,000 every three days, and then a portion of that for which they called was overtaken by the common ruin of the 17th of September. Then we hear that those interested in these concerns were surprised. It is not so. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) acknowledged that in banking circles there was distrust of that bank at this time. The general public, he said, had some degree of confidence. Quite so, because the general public did not know much about it. But it was not from the general public that the Government were to take counsel; it was not the knowledge of the general public that they were to use; it was not that degree of knowledge which was derivable from bank returns, though these, if properly looked at, might have given an indication of unhealthy expansion. It was the other institutions, who knew the mode in which this bank was conducting business, who could have given information to the Government. What was said on the 18th of September by the Montreal correspondent of the *Toronto Mail*, with reference to the Exchange Bank. I will read this for two purposes—to show the opinion of the banking community, and to show what was the consequence of the failure of the bank:

"It is a gratifying feature of the soundness of trade and commerce in this great city to report that the failure of one of our banks, doing an extensive business, has passed over without the least excitement, or the bringing down of a single firm that was leaning upon it for support, as many have been doing. It would not have surprised certain croakers if many disasters had occurred under the circumstances. Although many of the clients of the defunct institution must suffer inconvenience, yet every consideration is being extended by the other banks to those who are so suddenly deprived of the accommodation they were receiving. It is a fact that public confidence in our financial institutions has not been weakened in the least, but rather strengthened, by the collapse of the doomed bank."

Now, why? Why had public confidence in our other institutions not been weakened in the least, but rather strengthened, by the failure of the doomed bank? Here it is:

"In banking circles the air has been purified by the suspension, for the unfortunate institution has been considered by leading bankers an evil in their midst."

There is what the leading bankers, in concert with whom the hon. gentleman was acting, thought about it. Leading bankers thought it an evil in their midst, and their banks were strengthened by its going down:

"This has been sufficiently demonstrated by the high rate of interest which it is proved the bank has been giving to depositors, who took their money out of other banks, where they had ample security, to place it where the absolute needs of the infirm concern had made its management promise a much larger rate. I am informed by the president of a local bank that a capitalist who had \$30,000 deposited at 4½ per cent. was induced, shortly before the failure, to remove it to the Exchange to get 6 per cent. Had the management been taking the conservative course of reducing loans whilst temporarily paying a high rate of interest, their policy might have been justified; but, on the contrary, the inflation was going on as brisk as ever. This kind of business could only have one result, and intelligent brokers anticipated what was

inevitable, and took advantage of the opening to make little fortunes at a stroke by selling short."

This is from the *Toronto Mail*. I read it, because I like to convict my adversary out of his own mouth. But I quote from another organ; I read from the *Montreal Gazette*—its leading editorial article of the 18th of September:

"The announcement of the suspension of the Exchange Bank created not the slightest distrust or uneasiness in business circles yesterday."

Collapse! Panic! Ruin! Distress!

"The cause of this suspension was so manifest from the statement of the affairs of the institution—too extended a business for the cash reserve carried—and so remote from any disturbance in the general condition of trade, that an entire absence of alarm was shown from the first inception of the news."

There you see, Sir, what even a newspaper knew about it. They saw, from the sources of information open to the ordinary public, from the general state of affairs, that there was, as my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) said, too extended a business for the cash reserve carried. Then the article goes on to say—though I am afraid he is not very accurate, judged by the result:

"Then the standing of the directors, their large interests in the concern, and the great surplus of assets held, at once relieved the anxiety of note holders and depositors, who will, at the most, suffer only a little inconvenience, or a loss of interest, if they prefer to cash their claims at once. No mercantile embarrassment has occurred from the suspension, and none of consequence is anticipated, as customers enjoying credit will easily be able to transfer their accounts. It may be added, that notes falling due in the bank yesterday were very promptly met."

Now it will be interesting to know—what the Government did not choose to find out, when making the loans, and in the course of their action in concert with leading bankers—what the leading bankers thought, and this convenient article goes on to tell us:

"As showing how unconcernedly the news of the suspension has been received, and how unconnected it is with the condition of the trade of the country, we quote the following opinions of eminent bankers:—

"Mr. Smithers, general manager of the Bank of Montreal, in answer to questions stated: 'I do not regard the suspension of the Exchange Bank as in any case or way an indication of general weakness in trade or commerce. It is not likely to cause much trouble. I have been looked for, and has, to a great extent, been prepared for, or in other words, its effects have been discounted.'"

At whose expense?

"Mr. Penfold, manager of the Montreal branch of the Bank of British North America, stated that the suspension was no indication whatever of any general weakness of trade. The Exchange Bank stood absolutely alone with regard to its position and its business. It is not likely to cause any general trouble."

"Mr. J. Wolferstan Thomas, Manager of the Molson's Bank, stated: 'that the suspension was not the slightest indication of any general weakness in trade. It was not likely to cause trouble. No people who had good assets to show will have any trouble to get all the accommodation they require.'"

The article goes on:

"The stock market was quite firm yesterday, indicating that the suspension was not regarded as any index of the real state of trade, and that no difficulties are expected to arise out of it."

Now, Sir, I dare say the hon. gentleman will take credit for all that—will claim that he did it all with his little \$300,000. Not at all, Sir. What he did was to make the position very much worse, for everybody, than it was in the month of April. In the meantime the banks had, to some extent, intervened on business principles. The Exchange Bank had offered them the cream of its notes. They had taken the cream of its gilt-edged notes secured by bonds—taken them secured by the collaterals of four or five of the directors. They made themselves perfectly safe, as far as they were concerned, and of course they did not improve the condition of the bank, which was literally stripped of everything worth having before its doors were closed; and these operations were assisted and forwarded by the action of the Government. Now, Sir, I fully expect that we shall not hear from the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) only on this occasion. I suggest to the hon. member

for Cardwell (Mr. White) that this is a fit occasion for him to speak. It won't do for the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe to stand up as the sole defender of the Government on this occasion, and I am afraid it will interfere with the chances of the hon. member for Cardwell if he does not also step into the breach. Representing as he does an Upper Canada constituency, residing as he does in the city of Montreal, having as he has a distant connection with the eminent journal to which I have referred, and having certain expectations, as we know he has, I have no doubt we shall hear from him, and in the way a Conservative ought to speak under these circumstances, a thorough defence of this transaction as one not merely to be excused, but as an additional instance of the common sense, the prudence, the good management, and the active administrative powers of this Government. Then the Government goes on and sets up a preferential claim. The hon. Minister of Finance did not appear to think of that at the time; it was apparently an afterthought. I cannot conceive myself that when the Government decided to make this loan, they thought at that time that they would make a preferential claim on the assets of the bank, because I think it would have been an act of positive wickedness to have lent the \$300,000, even with the little they knew of the persons in control of the bank, for the purpose for which they lent it, if they knew that they were the first mortgagees of the assets remaining after the circulation. It would be pretended to the public that the Government was taking an equal risk with the other depositors, while, in fact, the Government was only helping the bank to pay some of the depositors, and taking first mortgage on the balance of its assets. That would be a most unjust position to which to reduce the other creditors of the bank. What is the whole theory of the bankrupt law? It is that there should be an equal distribution of assets amongst the creditors; and if, without communicating with the public, you advance a sum of money for which you take a mortgage upon the assets, you are assisting that some creditors should be preferred, to the wrong and loss of others; and therefore I cannot conceive that at the time the Government were making this advance they thought they were going to establish a preferential claim, and were, in fact, assisting this bank to pay its favored creditors to the damage of other creditors. An hon. gentleman says they ought to have sued Mr. Ogilvie, and the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) tells us that they could not sue him until they had discussed the assets. That may be the Quebec law, with reference to the security of a guarantee, but it is not the law of Ontario; and if I rightly understand the law the rule would be the same. It would depend on the form of the instrument; and this is not a liability that would be after discussion; it is a liability of default; and if the law of Quebec be the same as that of Ontario on this subject, Mr. Ogilvie was sueable the moment the liability was made on the payment of this deposit. The hon. Minister of Finance evidently expected from my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) a different speech from that which he made. He evidently expected that he would be very violently attacked, and he had prepared the panoply of indignant virtue and retort and counter accusation, and even his jokes, for the occasion, and they came out one after the other. He even insinuated against my hon. friend, that he could not take his degree. Well, my hon. friend was a student at Trinity College, Dublin, where he passed eleven examinations, and his name is to be found in the honor list in every one of those examinations. Being born in this country, he came out, not having time to remain for his degree examinations. As to the old story about the calves, which we have read so often that we cannot laugh at it any more, but which the hon. gentleman appears to have dug out for the first time from the south of England, I did not see its application

to the present occasion. My hon. friend may have his faults, but no one, even his bitterest enemy, will say that that story was extremely *à propos*. With reference to the hon. gentleman's remarks about some former attacks of my hon. friend upon him, all I can say is, that I have nothing to say about the hon. gentleman's knowledge of the three R's, except one, and that is the last, arithmetic, and I do not think he is a great success in arithmetic. Now, Sir, I say, as this resolution says, that this transaction is a subject of regret. I say that no man in this House or out of it can affirm in his heart and conscience that it is anything but a regrettable transaction. You know it, but you won't say so; the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) has given the cue; and you will say not guilty. You won't say as the famous jury did, not guilty, but don't do it again. No; you will say not guilty here, but you will whisper into the ear of the Minister of Finance, don't do it again; it will be whispered only. But here, so far from agreeing with the facts, so far from agreeing to that qualified verdict, not guilty, but don't do it again, you will do as the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe did, say: "Well done, good and faithful servants, you have been faithful over a few things, be ye masters over many things, enter ye into the joy of your Lord."

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We are having, to-night, a very remarkable illustration of that kind of wisdom which comes after the event, and which is generally, according to the proverb, considered a very cheap commodity. The hon. gentlemen who have addressed us, from the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) down or up, as they may prefer to the hon. leader of the Opposition, have taken the ground that, because of certain circumstances which have since occurred in relation to the management of this bank, the loan made to the bank at a time when it was in difficulties ought to be condemned; and they have laid down this general proposition, that any act of a man's life which he may, upon reflection, or because of the results which have flowed from it, regret having been committed, must, by the fact of that regret, be open to censure. Now, Sir, it seems to me that that is a proposition which the hon. leader of the Opposition himself would hardly like to have applied to his own life and conduct. We know him to be a gentleman of very high personal character. We know him to stand, in his own estimation and that of his friends, upon a pedestal far above that upon which ordinary mortals are permitted to stand. We know that, reading the commentaries as to his position in this country, with which we are favored by the press and by hon. gentlemen opposite, when, with bated breath, they venture to refer to him at all, he is one of those favored gentlemen who never make a mistake; that he is one who never in all his lifetime committed anything which subsequently he could in any way regret; and, that therefore, the ordinary rule which applies to ordinary mortals, that an act performed in perfect good faith and at a time when, as everyone believes, it is not only not censurable but commendable—I am laying down a general proposition—does not apply in his case; and that, therefore, should the result turn out to be not precisely what was expected, it is to be condemned, and the person who committed it is to be censured. I do not think, in this particular case, we can take into account, as circumstances which ought to have been known to the Finance Minister, which he had the opportunity of knowing, when he made those advances, the events and circumstances which have since been made known in connection with the management of this bank; and I propose, before I get through with the very few words I intend to address to the House, to establish this to the satisfaction of this hon. House. There are two propositions laid down in the resolution. The first is, that an ad-

Mr. BLAKE.

vance made to a bank in difficulty is censurable; and the next is, that where a bank has applied to have its capital reduced, that alone ought to put the Government on its guard, and no further consideration or loan should be given it. These are the two propositions affirmed in the resolution. Now, the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Blake), made reference to an antecedent case, one that occurred in this country immediately after Confederation, when an hon. gentleman, who occupied at that time the position of Finance Minister, and whom the leader of the Opposition described as very much more able than the present Finance Minister, retired from the Government on a question arising out of a proposed loan to a bank. It is worth while looking for a moment at the statement made by that hon. gentleman, when he made his explanation on the floor of Parliament; and I think this House will agree with me, that whoever is entitled to bring in this motion of censure, it is certainly not the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). What do I find, according to the statement of Sir Alexander Galt, who gives the history of that whole transaction? He says:

"The first intimation which I received in reference to the Commercial Bank being in danger was from my hon. friend (Mr. Holton). I was at the time on a visit on public business to the Treasurer of Quebec."

And I am bound to say that when I heard the son of that hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton), the gentleman who succeeded him in the representation of Chateauguay, a gentleman for whom, personally, I have the very highest respect and whom I am very glad to number as a personal friend—when I heard him laying down the doctrine that no loan should be given to a bank which is in difficulties, I was reminded of the fact that the very first suggestion that came to the Government in 1867, in relation to the Commercial Bank, came from the honored father of that hon. gentleman, who went to the then Finance Minister and urged him strongly to advance to that bank a loan from the Government, in order to save it from difficulty. Sir Alexander Galt went on to say:—

"On my return to Sherbrooke, I found a telegram from Mr. Holton, informing me he desired particularly to see me on public business, and wished to know where he might do so."

I wish to call your attention, Sir, to the fact that Mr. Holton was at that time a director of the bank; that he stood, in relation to the Commercial Bank, in precisely the same position as that in which Mr. Greene stood to the Exchange Bank, and when he came to the Finance Minister of that day he came in precisely the same character and on precisely the same mission as did Mr. Greene to the present Finance Minister in this city a short time ago; and when one reflects upon the language which the leader of the Opposition ventured to use with reference to Mr. Greene's visit, when he suggested that the Finance Minister should have said to Mr. Green: Sir, you are a personally interested party; I will have nothing whatever to do with you; your visit to me is practically an impertinence,—

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE—go about your business, and I will enquire into this matter. When one remembers that language applied to Mr. Greene, and then remembers that Mr. Holton stood in relation to the Commercial Bank in precisely the same position and came with the language I am about to read to the then Finance Minister, and came, I venture to say, if it had been the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake's) case, with the entire approbation of the hon. member for West Durham, one has an opportunity of knowing the difference it makes on which side of the House an hon. gentleman happens to be seated:

"I replied, I wished him to come to Sherbrooke, which he did by the first train. He then informed me that the business on which he desired to see me related to the Commercial Bank, which, owing to the partial but continuous and continual withdrawal of deposits, was, in the opinion of the directors, getting into a position of serious danger—and

that he was desirous of submitting the case to me, that I might, if I thought proper, bring the matter before the Government, and obtain a deposit of public moneys, in order to give the bank an additional reserve as a security for their meeting their engagement."

That was the proposition made by the late Mr. Holton, when the Commercial Bank was in difficulties. His first thought was to obtain from the Government an advance in order to strengthen the reserves of the bank and enable it to avoid the difficulties. This statement goes on to point out that Sir Alexander Galt suggested some difficulties in the way, but he proceeds to say:

"However, at the desire of the directors of the bank, and particularly of its president, Mr. Cartwright—

Who, for the purposes of this discussion, I may assume to have some relation, at anyrate, to the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright)—

"I consented to accompany them to Kingston, for the purpose of myself submitting the case to Sir John A. Macdonald, ascertaining whether his views would differ in any material respect from those which had been expressed by Mr. Cartier and myself."

Then we have the statement of what occurred, and then we have this further statement:

"I then went down from Montreal, accompanied by Mr. Cartwright, the president of the Commercial Bank, and the other gentlemen who were then acting on behalf of that institution. I saw Mr. Angus, the manager of the Bank of Montreal—Mr. King being then in England—and expressed to him the hope and desire of the Government that that bank would, so far as was consistent with its own safety, and on the deposit of satisfactory securities, extend such assistance to the Commercial Bank as would meet the exigencies of the case."

I think I hear hon. gentlemen opposite saying that is precisely what we have been urging the Government should have done in this case—that it should have gone to the banks. Let us see a little further what happened. Mr. King at first showed a disposition to grant this assistance on the part of the other banks, he having come back from England, where he was. Sir Alexander Galt says:

"I would prefer postponing any decision as to the course I would recommend the Government to take, until the following day; I wished to have their sanction to communicate to Mr. King the information which had been conveyed by them to me, and they agreed to this."

They went on to consider, and this is a point of some little importance:

"We considered, moreover, the effect which would probably be produced on the country if the failure of the Commercial Bank became a fact. We looked into the condition, so far as the published statements enabled us to do so, of all the various banks of the country, compared it with what it had been at previous periods, and considered what effect, according to the best of our judgment, the failure of the Commercial Bank, coming unexpectedly on the country, would have. The conclusion which Mr. King and I arrived at was, that it might be fraught with very serious disasters indeed."

Then he goes on still further:

"After, as I have said, several hours of very serious consideration on these points, I came to the conclusion, and it was acquiesced in by Mr. King, that the best course to take under the circumstances was this: that the Government should take the responsibility of coming to the assistance of the bank, and that it would be well for me to submit the case to the Government, with a recommendation to give assistance to the amount of half a million of dollars."

Now, there was a recommendation that the Government should come to the assistance of this institution; but some members of the Cabinet still thought that the bank should assist, and we find a letter, and a rather remarkable letter, from Mr. King, showing, finally, the reason why the bank would not assist, and showing also the kind of management under which that bank labored at that time, and from which it failed, and, I think I may say, the responsibility in connection with that management rests largely on the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And of the hon. member for Carleton (Sir John A. Macdonald) another director.

Mr. WHITE. The hon. member for Carleton was a member of the Government at the time.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And a brother director and solicitor of that bank.

Mr. WHITE. He was a member of the Government at the time, with a great deal to attend to in connection with public matters; and, if he erred at all, it was probably in placing too much confidence in the gentleman who was the president of the bank. Now, what said Mr. King?

"I believe that the difficulty of the bank has been rendered more imminent by an unwise expansion of its discounts within the last few weeks, upon the unsatisfactory plea of rendering assistance to others when its own life was in danger."

So, according to Mr. King's statement, after agreeing that practically some assistance might be given to this bank, we find him writing a letter to the Finance Minister, withdrawing all offer of assistance, on the ground that, after the bank was in difficulties, at the very moment the president was travelling about with the Finance Minister, for the purpose of getting assistance for it, its manager was playing ducks and drakes with the interest of the bank, by extending loans right and left for the purpose of saving other institutions while its own life was in danger:

"I think it extremely improbable," said Mr. King, "that the bank can obtain assistance from any other quarter than the Government, as I should most strongly advise my directors not to increase the amount this bank has already advanced to the Commercial Bank, with the knowledge of the Government, for the reason that I believe all assistance will be in vain if there is not a peremptory contraction of their loans."

Well, did the hon. member for South Huron, the Mr. Cartwright who was the president of that bank, say: Since the banks will not assist us, since Mr. King declares that any assistance will be helpless and hopeless to relieve us, let us close our doors? Not a bit of it. He still travelled about with the Finance Minister; he still, in the face of that letter, stating that the bank would not assist the Commercial Bank, urged upon the Government of the day to advance this half million of dollars to relieve that bank from difficulty, and so to prevent, probably, a commercial disaster in the country. I am bound to say, in the face of that record of the hon. gentleman, in connection with that bank of which he was president, and for whose failure I fear he was as much responsible, to say the least, as any other gentleman connected with it, that it hardly lies with him to move the resolution of censure which has been moved tonight. So much for that precedent. Then, as to the other proposition laid down in this resolution, what is it? It is that, where a bank has reduced its capital, where a bank had come to Parliament and got its capital reduced, the fact of that reduction should prevent the Government from coming to its assistance; or, in other words, that, when once a bank reduces its capital it is practically no longer worthy of public confidence. That is substantially the proposition we are asked to affirm by the resolution now submitted to this House. What do I find? The Merchants Bank, the successor to the Commercial Bank, got its capital reduced, the Act reducing it being assented to on the 16th April, 1878. The hon. gentleman was Finance Minister at that time. What did he do? I find that, in July 1877, the public deposits in that bank were \$55,843; I find that, in January, 1878, they were \$83,134, and I find that, in May, 1878, immediately after the reduction of the capital of the bank, he had increased the public deposits in that bank, which practically amounted to a loan to the bank, to the amount of \$216,497. I only give two illustrations, but I venture to say that we might go through every bank and find that the same thing practically occurred in every case. We had a statement the other day from the manager of the Federal Bank, that already the Government of that day have had sufficient confidence in the future of that bank to renew their relations with it and to make deposits in it. If that be the case, we ought to have these gentlemen moving a resolution to condemn the Government for putting money

in a bank which is at this moment before Parliament for an Act to reduce its capital. I venture to say that they will do nothing of the kind. I take the Ontario Bank, whose Bill was assented to on the 17th May, 1882. I find that, in February of that year, after the notice had been given for the reduction of capital, the Ontario Government, whose careful management I presume hon. gentlemen opposite will not venture to impugn, had on call in that bank \$94,794.28, and on deposit to be drawn after notice \$300,000. I shall not read all the figures, but so these deposits continued in that bank, as an assistance to that bank undoubtedly, as Government deposits by the Government of Ontario, in spite of the fact that the bank was applying for that it obtained, and after it obtained the reduction of its capital. The hon. member for West Durham tells us that the Ontario Bank never was a political bank, that he never knew it to be a political bank. Well, that is rather a remarkable thing. I have here a letter from the president of that bank, which undoubtedly has some influence in the particular district where he was. It was dated Bowmanville, 17th January, 1874, rather a remarkable time, for, if I remember rightly, the elections took place on the 20th of that same month. I speak from memory.

An hon. MEMBER. The 30th.

Mr. WHITE. Yes, the 30th of that same month. Here is the circular letter :

"DEAR SIR,—Although I am not disposed to oppose Mr. Gibbs on personal grounds, in the approaching election, still, as one who has labored long and hard to promote the interest of Canada, I now ask my friends to support men who will support the present Government, for the following reasons:—

"Because many of the men forming the present Government are my personal and esteemed friends."

That is a very good reason, though it is not a banking reason :

"Because, if the present Government is sustained, I will be able through them to get justice for our party in needful appointments and otherwise."

In view of the fact that every gentleman who either recommends the exercise of patronage or is the object of patronage himself, is charged with being corrupt, it is rather remarkable that the president of this bank should have made the fact of getting needful appointments and patronage one of the reasons why the customers of the bank should support the opponents of Mr. Gibb. But here is a stronger point still :

"Because, if they are sustaining our bank, and other Ontario banks, and through them the country will have the use of the Government surplus until required."

And then follows:—

"May I ask you to give my old friend, Mr. Cameron, your candid and honest support?"

This is written by the president of the bank which the hon. leader of the Opposition declares had never been a political bank. His guilelessness in reference to everything of this kind causes him not to know that Mr. Simpson had ever been a political friend. I find that Mr. Simpson was not wrong in his anticipation of what would happen, and that the bank returns, as they came down afterwards, showed a steady increase of deposits, not simply from the Government here, but from the Ontario Government as well—deposits on call, not on interest at all, showing that he did not at all misunderstand the character of his friends for whom he was acting, in the issue of that circulation, when he told them that his bank and other banks—although the other banks did not fare so well—that his bank would get the advantage. Now, Sir, that is not the only case. I find here another circular that was issued—a more important one, in some respects, because, important as the president of a bank is, and especially such a president as was our good old friend, Mr. Simpson, one who understood the knack of mesmerising in batches, and who explained it to the court on a memorable

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

occasion—the manager of a bank, the gentleman who comes into direct contact with the customers of a bank, may be said to be even a more influential person. And what do we find? Here is a circular letter, dated from Oshawa, in January, 1874, to this effect :

"MY DEAR SIR,—We are very largely interested in the success of the present Government, as their continuance in power will add largely to the success and prosperity of the bank—

Not of the country, but of the bank, in this case. The president was a cunning old fox, who understood how to throw in a word or two about the country and all that kind of thing, but the manager knew exactly what he was required to do, and therefore he put the matter in plain English :

"And, through them, of the business people of the community. Our president, the Hon. John Simpson, is calling upon our friends to give us a hand for Mr. Cameron."

Signed by Mr. Holland, who was at that time manager of the Ontario Bank, and that was the bank that the hon. member for West Durham says he does not believe ever was a political bank—in fact, he knows it was not. He says that he never read these particular letters; of course the hon. member's reading is of an entirely different class. Now, Sir, as to this matter, I have shown that as far as precedents are concerned, at any rate, the hon. gentleman, to use a common phrase, has not a leg to stand upon in the motion which he has proposed, and the only question which arises, and the only question with which we have to do, practically, here, is this: had the Government reasonable ground to believe, when they made this advance, or gave this deposit, that the effect would be to enable the bank to tide over its difficulties, and to enable it to hold its own, and in that way, to avoid the difficulties which might occur in the event of a suspension of a bank at that time? The hon. gentleman, the leader of the Opposition, has spoken of the small effect of the failure of this bank, at the time it did fail, and he has done me the honor to make special references to myself, as having a remote connection with a particular newspaper from which he read a remarkably good article. Now, I want to point out to the hon. gentleman, that the condition of the bank, and the condition of trade in relation to it, in the month of April, was a very different thing to the conditions in the month of September. There is no doubt whatever that in the month of September those conditions had so far changed that the bank failed without any serious effect upon the commerce of the country, or upon other institutions. But what was the position in April of that year, at the time the directors came up to Ottawa? The hon. gentleman is good enough in this, as in all other discussions, to drag in the National Policy. He is good enough to tell us that we had promised prosperity and well-being to this country, and that there could be no depression, no difficulty, and no necessity for aiding the bank. But we know that at that time we were passing through a period—not of legitimate commercial depression, owing to difficulties arising from legitimate commercial operations—but we were passing through difficulties arising from the insane spirit of speculation, as it looks now, and as it looked to level-headed people then—although I am bound to say there were some people who were not level-headed at that time, in relation to particular transactions—but there was a widespread spirit of speculative transactions, especially in connection with our great North-West; and the failure of the boom, as it was called, in the North-West, made men feel that they might be on the verge of a serious crisis that would result disastrously to the welfare of this country. This was the condition of things at that particular period. It was then, Mr. Speaker, that the failure of even a small bank like the Exchange Bank, taking place in the presence of the failure of that boom in the North-West, when men who had gone in there expecting to be millionaires came out practically paupers—it was

at that time that this application was made, and that the Government had to face this difficulty. To say that five months afterwards, when men had come to feel that, after all, this difficulty was not going seriously to affect the welfare of the country, when, as Mr. Smithers fairly pointed out, the effect even of a bank failure had been discounted, and the difficulty would not be so great as it might have been, coming in the midst of this practical crisis—to say that at that time the effect of a failure of a bank was not disastrous, is a proof that it would not have been disastrous at the earlier period, is simply to ignore the condition of things at the two periods respectively. Now, Sir, what was the position of the bank? The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) told us that their reserves were almost exhausted. He says that if anybody had looked at the position of the bank, and seen how little gold and Dominion notes they had in reserve, and compared that with the liabilities which they might at once be called upon to meet, they would have said the bank was not in a safe condition at all, but in a condition of hopeless bankruptcy at that time. Why, Sir, the hon. gentleman knows this, that the specie reserve and Dominion notes of no bank in Canada would enable it, at a moment's notice, to meet the calls to which it is liable at any time. The strongest institutions in the country are enabled to meet their liabilities from their reserves, or from their Dominion notes, although they are happily abundantly able to meet them from their loans as they come in. But in this case, it was because the reserves were small, it was because their reserves were being exhausted, that they came to the Government, that they wanted assistance to tide them over their difficulties, until they could collect the money that was owing to them, and in that way meet all the obligations that they had incurred; it was precisely because their reserves were getting exhausted that it was necessary for the bank to come here. Had its resources been stronger, had there been sufficient gold and notes in the vaults of the bank to enable them to do what the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) thinks they ought to have been able to do, that is, to meet all their liabilities the moment those liabilities were called for, and in the event of those liabilities being called for suddenly, why, Sir, there would then be no necessity for their coming here at all. But what was the position? When I tell you that after the fall of the bank, that after the doors were closed, at a meeting of creditors, a statement was submitted by Mr. Campbell, of whose ability there is no doubt, who stands so high that at this moment, while there have been discussions in Montreal amongst the creditors in relation to the other liquidators, all concur in leaving him there as a liquidator—a statement was submitted, I say, by Mr. Campbell to those creditors, declaring, on an examination, a tolerably careful examination, so far as he could make it, within the two or three weeks he was there, that there were still sufficient assets to meet the claim of every creditor, you will agree with me that no examination of the books such as could be made at the time by an officer of the Government would likely have shown the condition of things which was afterwards developed. The unfortunate fact was simply this: the bank was undoubtedly badly managed. The unfortunate fact was, that the system of book-keeping was such that many of the bad debts and losses, which have since been shown, have only been discovered in books apparently hidden away, which even so skilful a banker as Mr. Campbell was unable to see. And so the consequence was, that he was in a position to come down to the meeting of creditors and declare, after the bank had closed its doors and when he had made that examination for the special information of the creditors, that the bank was solvent at that time and was able to pay all the claims of its creditors. What was the further fact? The directors have been referred to here almost as if they were a band of robbers, as

if they were men who came here to plunder the country. They, unfortunately, are the heaviest losers. They held, as the leader of the Opposition has told us, more than one-half of the entire capital of the bank. Certainly one would say that that was a ground for security rather than a ground for doubt, as to the management of a bank. And what is the further fact? That so shrewd a business man as Mr. Buntin—and those who are acquainted with him know him to be a shrewd business man; he was a director of the bank, and presumably knew how things were going on—on learning, on his return from England, that a loan had been obtained from the City and District Savings Bank to the amount of \$250,000 on the collateral security, if one may use the term, of the directors themselves, he had such confidence in the soundness of the bank and of its ability to pay all its debts, and to pay its stockholders as well, that he actually proposed, though not obliged to do so, to become a party to that loan. So we have this extraordinary fact in relation to this matter, that the directors of the bank who were there, who possessed a daily knowledge of what was going on, were so thoroughly convinced of the soundness of the bank and that its difficulties were merely temporary, the result, simply, of a bear movement on 'Change, that they were ready to risk their own individual fortunes in connection with that institution. The hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) has told us that this bank had failed before and had closed its doors, and he told us that it had taken, as manager, a gentleman who knew nothing of banking, who had had no banking experience, and who never should have been in that position. I can appeal to the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), that the directors of the bank, previous to that first failure, included in their number some gentlemen, who certainly were not Conservatives, and who were eminent and leading business men in Montreal. One was Mr. James Crathern, one of the shrewdest business men of the city, and another was Mr. Thomas Caverhill, and so confident were they, when they were directors, that they actually risked their own money in making the stock good on a reduction of the capital taking place, and they did that which, I believe, no directors have ever done in relation to a bank in this country, either before or since. Then as to Mr. Thomas Craig. He was well known in Montreal. I do not know whether he was trained in a bank, but he was recognised as a clever business man; and the gentleman who pressed his appointment on his brother directors was not his brother-in-law, the member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault), not Mr. Ogilvie, Mr. Buntin or Mr. Greene, but it was Mr. James Crathern, a political opponent, and a gentleman who, as I have said, is as shrewd a business man as there is in Canada. It was Mr. Crathern who urged his appointment, and his opinion in regard to that gentleman is certainly as good as that of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock), much as we may esteem his judgment of human nature. Under those circumstances, when the directors came to Ottawa they came here precisely as other bank directors had come. Why had we no resolution of censure in the case of the Consolidated Bank? We know what happened in regard to that bank. We know that the bank had as its president a gentleman who, from the time he came into this country, in 1836, down to the time he left it, in 1855, was the financial model of the Liberal party in Canada—I mean Sir Francis Hincks.

Mr. BLAKE. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman says, hear, hear. All I can say is, that Sir Francis Hincks then was Inspector General of the Government in which the hon. gentleman's father was Solicitor General and supported in 1848-49 until he left Parliament.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Does the hon. gentleman say no?

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman's observation was that Sir Francis Hincks had the confidence of the Liberal party up to the time he left Canada, in 1855.

Mr. WHITE. (Cardwell). So he had.

Mr. BLAKE. I differ with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Then all I can say is, that the hon. gentleman is splitting straws in a manner unworthy of him. It is quite true that a section of the Liberal party, from 1851 to 1854, opposed him. It is quite true that a section at that time thought a coalition between the Liberals and the Conservatives would be a good thing; that a section of the party endeavored to defeat him; and that to that end in Huron they supported Mr. Cayley against Mr. McQueen; that in Hamilton they supported Sir Allan McNab against Mr. Buchanan; that in Kingston they supported the present leader of the Government against Mr. Counter; that in various parts of Ontario, during that time, we had that condition of things, and a section of the party withdrew its support from Mr. Hincks. But if I do not mistake the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake), judging him by what we have seen since he came into public life, was not of that section, his boast being that he never was a Clear Grit, whatever he might be; and his efforts ever since have been to raise the Liberals out of the ruts into which they had got, through the actions of the leading man who at that time had not confidence in Sir Francis Hincks. What I was going to say was this, that Sir Francis Hincks was the president of that bank. He had a salary as president. He was at the bank every day; he had an office there; he was watching it continuously. Yet what occurred? We know that when the bank failed exposures occurred and a large number of transactions came to light to which Sir Francis Hincks would never have been a party if he had known anything about them; and the only question which seems to me to arise is this: whether there may not be something done by law or otherwise which will secure, not the inspection of the banks, which to my mind would be utterly futile, but the greater responsibility of directors in connection with the management of banks. How that can be done is a difficult question. We are told by the hon. member for Chateauguay (M. Holton) that a number of things have since come out which the Government might have ascertained for themselves if they had examined the books; but the answer to that is, that Mr. Campbell, who made an examination of the books after the failure, with the sole desire of finding out precisely what the condition of things was, reported that the bank was all right. True, it has not turned out to be all right, and everybody will regret it. It is somewhat difficult to understand what is the precise position of those hon. gentlemen with regard to the security of Senator Ogilvie. I know there are a great many persons who think that the Government should not have pressed its claims against the bank at all for those loans; that they should be willing to accept their chance with the rest of the depositors, and take their share out of what the assets will produce. I do not quite know whether that is the view of hon. gentlemen opposite, though I am bound to say that the statement of the leader of the Opposition would lead one to believe that that is his view; for while he condemns, in the strongest possible way, the granting of the loan, objects to the possible loss of the money as the result of granting the loan, he at the same time urges—if his argument means anything—that we should make the loan an ordinary one, and consent to come in with the rest of the creditors for share and share alike. Well, Sir, I do not pretend to be a lawyer, but I venture to say—and I do not think the leader of the Opposition will deny it—that if we took that ground, if we undertook to release the bank of our prior claim—if

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

we have a prior claim—to that \$200,000, if we undertook, of our own action to say that we would take from the bank the same proportion that the bank is able to give to its other creditors—in that case, at any rate, we could not hold the security. That is a proposition which, even according to Ontario law, the leader of the Opposition will hardly dispute. We must at least—if we did sue Senator Ogilvie—put him in as good a position as we are, to recover from the bank the full amount of that deposit. There can be no question about that, as a legal proposition; and therefore the only question which would arise would be this: so far as the bank is concerned, it would make no difference; so far as the creditors are concerned, it would make no difference, whether we are to ask that gentleman for the money in the meantime—and he has already lost seriously by his personal confidence in the bank, and has risked large sums of money as a shareholder in connection with it—whether we are to do that, or first to exhaust our rights against the bank, and then, if it is found that we have any claim against Senator Ogilvie, to go for him and recover that claim. That is the only difference between the two positions. I think no one will deny that having regard to the precedents, having regard to what has been the invariable practice, having regard to the opinion of the hon. member who has moved this motion in the case of the Commercial Bank—that even after the president of a bank had declared that it was hopelessly gone, because of its later mismanagement, still the Government should come to its assistance—I say, under those circumstances, I think the House should have no difficulty in voting down this resolution, and relieving the Finance Minister of the imputation which has been attempted to be placed upon him, for an act which he performed in good faith, upon precedents which are abundant in the records of this country; when he believed himself, in attempting to prevent the disaster of the failure of that bank, to be averting the consequent disaster, which, in view of the peculiar and speculative condition of things in Canada, and the failure of those speculations at the moment, might have resulted to the commercial interests of the country.

Mr. DAVIES. Hon. members must have observed that a large portion of the speech of the hon. gentleman has been devoted to the discussion of subjects which are not legitimately before the House, and which do not legitimately come before the House, in the proposition submitted by the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. gentleman is in the position of a man who, finding he has a bad case, is trying to draw a red herring across the track. He opened his speech by putting in the mouth of his opponents as theirs—a very weak mode of defence—a proposition which was almost diametrically opposed to the one they submitted. And the hon. gentleman cannot be excused on the ground that he did not correctly understand the statement made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), and the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), because the proposition to which they invited the attention of the House, to which they asked the consent of the House, has been formulated by them in a resolution which is in the Votes and Proceedings of the House, and which the hon. gentleman had before him when he spoke. The proposition to which the hon. gentleman asked the assent of the House, was not the proposition that under any and all circumstances it was unwise for a Government to come to the relief of banks in difficulties. No such proposition is advanced—no such argument was advanced in the speeches which were made in support of the motion. I invite the attention of both sides of the House to the proposition that we do ask the House to assent to, and which I say, in view of the language which fell from the leader of the Government a few days ago, should com-

mand the assent of himself and hon. members who have confidence in him. The proposition is that it be resolved:

"That it appears by the Public Accounts that \$337,000 are due to the Government in respect of the allowances made to the Exchange Bank in 1883.

"That the said bank had already, within two years, suspended payment and reduced its capital by 50 per cent.

"That the papers laid before this House—and the statement of the Minister—show that the bank was in difficulties when said advances were made,"—

And now, Sir, comes the crucial point of the proposition which the hon. gentleman, for his own purposes, seems entirely to have forgotten:

"and that no proper enquiries were had, or precautions taken, in respect of the loan of the \$300,000 of public money put in jeopardy by such advance."

The proposition is not that the money was advanced, but that it was advanced without enquiries, without those precautions which a prudent man should have taken, and which the leader of the Government himself, a short time ago, laid down as essential to an advance being made. The advance was made in this case in total disregard of the conditions laid down by the leader of the Government. Having laid down that proposition, the question for the House is, has that proposition been proved? The papers show it, the Finance Minister admits it, the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) almost glories in it, and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) ignores it. Then the resolution goes on:

"That the present condition of the loan is such that a serious loss may occur to the Treasury.

"That the developments in connection with the Exchange Bank show that the institution was, at the time of the loan, insolvent, and under grossly careless and fraudulent management, and that the result of the action of the Government was to bolster up the bank, by restoring, in some measure, public confidence, during an interval in which the said careless and fraudulent management was continued, enormous sums of money disappeared, the position of shareholders, depositors and creditors of the bank was changed, the liability of shareholders to creditors was lost, and the whole situation changed for the worse."

And then it goes on to ask the House to express regret that the Government, under those circumstances, without making any enquiry, without taking those precautions, and with a recklessness and want of prudence which we say deserves censure, should have gone on to make the loan. Now the hon. gentleman attempts to argue that this is an attempt to be wise after the event; that we are condemning the action of the Finance Minister on the ground that something has been discovered since that was not known, and he says that it is very well for us to be wise now, and that we could not then have ascertained the condition of things. The position we take is, that he being the trustee of the public money, was bound to take wise and prudent precautions—not that he must be wise above other men, not that he should be omniscient, but that he should take precautions which would commend themselves as those which a prudent man would have taken when acting as a trustee of public moneys. We condemn him because he has ignored the circumstances under which alone the Premier says the Government is justified in advancing moneys to a bank, not because of anything we have discovered since. What does the Premier say? Coming from a gentleman so highly respected by his party, and having the experience of his many years of public service, I think it will bear repetition. He says the Government of this country is justified, in times of "deep depression," for the purpose of avoiding universal panic and universal ruin, and acting in concert with other banks, in making advances to a bank in distress, but not in other circumstances or without making full enquiries. Has that been done in the present case? This is my third Session in this House, and I have never heard the hon. member for Cardwell saying, that the country was passing through a period of great depression. I have heard him saying, with his silvery voice, year after year, that we are on the wave of prosperity—

prosperity in the North-West, prosperity all through these Provinces; so that the condition of affairs which the Prime Minister laid down as essential to justify an advance of money by the Government has been wanting. This is not a discovery made since, but known to the Finance Minister then—that it was a time, not of depression, but a time in which, with prudent management, that bank should not have been in the position requiring Government aid. Then, the hon. leader of the Opposition condemns him, and, in my opinion justly, because, the times being good, prosperity, as he says himself, reigning everywhere, at the time the application for an advance was made, he was warned by the gentleman who made it that the affairs of that bank were not as they ought to be. He was told that the public had lost confidence in the bank, and that those who held its notes were making a run on it. He was informed of the fact which was mentioned by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), and has not been contradicted, that the commercial public of Montreal had no confidence in this speculative bank; and these facts combined threw an onus on the Finance Minister which I think he will hardly get rid of, of making an investigation before he yielded to that demand. Did he make any investigation whatever? Did he do what his leader tells us he ought to do, even in a time of deep depression? Did he go to the Bank of Montreal or to any of the other banks who would be supposed to know the condition of the affairs of the bank? Not a single enquiry was made of any of these banks; he took nobody into his confidence; he recklessly, without taking any precautions, without exercising reasonable prudence, advanced this money; and he therefore deserves the censure of the House and the country. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) brought forward certain precedents to justify the House in voting down this resolution. He says there are certain precedents in the history of Canada which show that the present Opposition have acted in a manner which they now condemn. I have been accustomed to listen to precedents and to analyse them, and to my mind the very precedents quoted condemn him most. He says there was a bank called the Commercial Bank, and that bank had the honor of having, as one of its directors, and the honor of being advised as its solicitor by a gentleman who then occupied and now occupies the position of Prime Minister of Canada; and that bank applied to the Government of which the right hon. gentleman was Premier for assistance. What does the hon. member for Cardwell say? He says that because the right hon. gentleman did his duty when that application was made, because he took those very precautions which a short time ago he took occasion to reiterate in the presence of us younger members should always be taken, because he consulted with other banks whether or not it was prudent to make such an advance, and because, after investigation, his Government determined that it was not prudent and did not make the advance, therefore we should not condemn Sir Leonard Tilley, the hon. Finance Minister, because not having made any enquiries he did make the advance in the case of the Exchange Bank. If there was a precedent required to condemn the action of the Finance Minister, that precedent was quoted by his successor, as we hear he is to be in a very short time, or as he hopes, at any rate, to be. If he does become his successor, I hope he will follow the lines of the gentleman whose action he has quoted as a precedent and not the lines of the gentleman whose action he is defending to-night. Then the hon. gentleman quoted another case, a case of a deposit made in the Merchants Bank of Canada. He stated that at a certain time the Government deposited in that bank a certain sum of money, which grew from \$60,000 or \$70,000 until it reached the sum of \$216,000, and with a triumphant air he turns around and asks: Is not that an analogous case; is not that in point?

Why did he not tell the House what proportion that \$216,000 bore to the capital of the Merchants Bank? The hon. gentleman tells the House that that bank had its capital reduced, but did he tell us that at the time the Government had that deposit, the capital of that bank in its reduced state, was \$6,000,000, and that not a dollar of that deposit was lost? Why, Sir, if the hon. gentleman wanted to draw an analogy which would make the two cases parallel, he would be defending the Finance Minister of the day for an advance equivalent to \$3,600,000 to the Merchants Bank, for that sum would bear the same proportion to its capital which the advance of \$300,000 bore to the \$500,000 of capital of the bank in question. So I submit to the House that the hon. gentleman has been most unfortunate in his precedents and quotations, and that the logical conclusion to be drawn from them is directly the opposite of that to which he wished the House to assent. The hon. gentleman, I regret very much, has gone out of his way in this discussion, to make a statement which I think is calculated to prejudice the commercial interests of this country to a very great degree. He stands in a responsible position in this House—in a more responsible position, I venture to say, looking at his expectations, than almost any other ordinary member—and he does not hesitate to rise and repeat here the fearful blunder—I say it advisedly—which the Finance Minister himself made in the debate on this question a year ago. I remember well when the Finance Minister, a year ago, when this question came up, declared that the condition of the banks of this Dominion was such that if called on to-morrow to meet their liabilities to the public, nearly every one of them would go down. I remember the alarm—the hon. gentleman laughs. Does he deny that he made that statement in the debate last year? If he does, I will read it from *Hansard*; and I will do more. I will call his attention to the storm that arose in banking quarters when that statement got circulated throughout the Dominion. I will tell him that the answer of the banks saw that the statement made was one that the facts would not justify—not from one bank, but from many; they denied that they were in that position; and so, I say, it is to be regretted that the hon. gentleman, who it is rumored is soon to be Finance Minister, should have been guilty of repeating that blunder of decrying the credit of the country and doing what he could to damage the solvent banks of this country. It is not only untrue in itself, but it would be unjustifiable, even if it had a basis of truth. It was not called for in this debate; it could do nothing but damage the banks, and being made without a fact to justify it is deserving of nothing but condemnation and censure. The hon. gentleman apologises for this advance to the Exchange Bank on the ground that, although the country was not then passing through a period of deep depression, still there was depression. Great speculations had been gone into; enormous speculations in the North West. The commercial world was almost panic-stricken; the air was pregnant with fear and danger; it was a time when men were almost trembling in their shoes; the boom in the North-West had been already broken. To hear the hon. gentleman talk, one would suppose that those who studied the signs of the times were anticipating depression and commercial disaster in Canada of the worst kind. Did the hon. gentleman forget the celebrated speech made by the Finance Minister within twelve days from that period? Has the hon. gentleman forgotten that speech? Has he forgotten the statement, which he, more than any body else in the House, cheered, made by the Finance Minister, to the effect, not that we were in danger of panic, not that there was any fear of commercial depression, but that the foundations of commercial prosperity of this country had been so deeply laid, that there was such a beautiful, splendid, and magnificent outlook for the future,

Mr. DAVIES.

particularly in the North-West, that every young man who had a head on his shoulders should clap on all sail for seven years, because the pendulum was going to stop its swing, and for that time we were to have unbroken prosperity. It may be said I have exaggerated the language used by the Finance Minister. Well, I will ask the House to bear with me while I quote from the remarkable speech made by the Finance Minister twelve days after the time when the advance was made to the Exchange Bank, which the hon. member for Cardwell defends on the ground that we were on the eve of a tremendous depression. What did the hon. the Finance Minister say? He said:

"The leader of the Opposition called the attention of the House to a remark which I made to a personal friend—and merchant of St. John—and I suppose I repeated it in public afterwards—to the effect, if I were his age, and engaged in business, I would put on the whole of the canvas I could carry for ten years, and then take in sail. I believe, from the fact that we are spending annually a large amount of money in opening and developing the great North-West country, from the fact that the population coming into the country at the present time are bringing in a large amount of money for investment, from the fact that, last year, we had of the value of imports over \$10,000,000 of settlers' effects—and which will be increasing, and which, of course, does not create any difficulty financially, and I hold that the return of the pendulum—which always does come back—will be deferred, and that we will have seven years of prosperity before the country."

I invite the attention of the hon. gentlemen who give weight to the argument of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), a financial authority, as he is, in this House, and who are prepared to follow him in this vote, because of his argument, into the facts which I have read, and which scatter that argument to the winds. I invite their attention to the answer which I take from the mouth of the Finance Minister himself, and ask them to pause before determining to vote against this resolution which asks the House to condemn the unfortunate advance made to this bank. The hon. gentleman attempts to argue—and, perhaps, there might be some degree of force in his argument—that really and truly, after all, when this bank wound up, in the month of September, affairs did not look so bad even then. And what authority does he quote? He quotes as authority a gentleman named Mr. Campbell, who enjoys the confidence of the commercial community of Montreal. I have no knowledge of the gentleman in question, but am informed by those who know, that the hon. member for Cardwell very largely over-estimated the confidence which the business community of Montreal have in Mr. Campbell.

Mr. MACMASTER. No, no.

Mr. DAVIES. It may be there is a difference of opinion, but the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster), who says no, will, I think, bear me out in this statement, that Mr. Campbell was called in as an accountant by the directors of the Exchange Bank, who brought about the state of financial ruin in which the bank was in the month of September; that he, as their accountant, made out a statement of the bank's affairs; that the statement was a false statement of the condition of the bank, as the facts afterwards proved; that he deceived the shareholders; and that, if he was afterwards appointed one of the liquidators, it was at the instance and through the efforts of the directors themselves, and not the shareholders. So far as regards any weight to be attached to statements of Mr. Campbell, these facts are a sufficient answer. But we are not discussing in what condition Mr. Campbell found the bank. We know that bank to have been rotten, to have been bankrupt beyond redemption. The fact we are trying to get at is this: Did the Finance Minister lend the money after taking the precautions every prudent man would have taken? I think the Finance Minister will rather accept the defence made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) for his action, than that advanced by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). What is the defence advanced by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe? He said the

policy of the Government is displayed in their action in lending the money, and as it is opposed to the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side, every member who supports the Government should support their policy. I find him not only supporting the policy of lending money to a speculative bank at the time when there was a run on the bank, without consulting the other banks in Montreal—I find him, not only defending that, but the results that flows from it. And why? He says it is part of the National Policy to help the banks. He said a great deal there. Very often a man in his position, advocating a bad cause, speaks, in a sentence of that kind, more than he ever intended to say. What was the policy of the Government? Their National Policy is to make the rich man richer and the poor man poorer, and their policy in this instance was to make the directors richer and the creditors and shareholders poorer. The result of the policy which the hon. gentleman defends was to put money in the hands of the rich directors, in order that they might relieve themselves of their shares and the liability which by law attaches to them and escape the payment of enormous sums of money, and throw the onus of that payment upon the other shareholders, innocent people, not responsible for the state in which the bank was brought, and thus make the poor shareholders and creditors poorer for the benefit of the directors. I accept the statement of the hon. gentleman, that this advance made by the Finance Minister was part of the National Policy, and the hon. gentleman was logical in calling upon his friend to defend it. From our standpoint we cannot defend it; we think it deserves condemnation. I am not going to detain the House very long; but I think that after the calm and judicial speech which was delivered by the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton), we would have had some reply from hon. gentlemen from Montreal who know the facts. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Holton) stated four or five broad facts, none of which were contradicted. In the absence of contradiction we are bound to consider these facts to be true. I say that, if these facts are true, no member, except one who is tied to his party, can refuse to vote for this resolution. What are the facts? The hon. gentleman says that, at the time the loan was made, the commercial public of Montreal looked with suspicion upon this bank. It was not a bank which enjoyed the confidence of the people of Montreal. It was believed to be shaky. Its customers were those who could not get credit elsewhere; and, as the hon. gentleman himself remarked, in a very pithy sentence, the best recommendation for your opening an account in their ledger was the refusal of the Bank of Montreal to give you credit. You have there a speculative bank, a bank which had not the public confidence, a bank whose customers are speculative customers, men who cannot get credit elsewhere; and, with all those facts before him, knowing that the cashier of the bank was, as he says, living openly a life of reckless extravagance; with all these facts stated by him, undenied, known or within the means of knowledge—for I say that the one is equivalent to the other—he made this loan, without enquiry, without the existence of one of these conditions which his leader says are alone a justification for an advance to a bank. How can it be defended? The miserable defence set up by the member for Cardwell has, I think, been already exploded. It is no defence at all. There is no defence, except that of the Minister of Finance himself, that possibly he erred. We know he erred. The question is not whether he erred, but whether he exercised and used those means of knowledge which were within his reach, to prevent him from erring. We say that he did not. We say that he did not attempt to exercise any of them, and therefore the facts which would justify a loan to the bank are absent, and therefore his conduct demands the expression of regret contained in the closing part of this resolution. But the effects of this loan are not confined to the loss of this money. That loss is

in one sense a small matter, if you consider the indirect effects which followed it. As the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) has stated, if, at the time the loan was made, the bank had been wound up—and it would have been wound up if the loan had not been made—the creditors would have been paid in full and the shareholders would not have been called upon for the double liability, in all probability. If that is the fact, what is the result of the loan, made without this inquiry and under these improper circumstances? The result is, that the shareholders, many of them innocent people, are called upon to pay this double liability, and the creditors are left unpaid or nearly so, and a great deal of misery and ruin has followed to innocent people as the consequence of this improper and unjustifiable advance. The consequences are far-reaching. The loss to the Government itself is nothing in comparison with the heavy loss that innocent people sustained in consequence of this loan. I will go further. I say the subsequent conduct of the hon. gentleman cannot be defended. He has, as has been stated already, a guarantee from one of the chief offenders in this bank, the Hon. Mr. Ogilvie, a Senator, a supporter of his own—a guarantee for the payment of \$100,000. He has never attempted to enforce it, but he has attempted to enforce what is called the prerogative right of the Crown, the right to take precedence of all other creditors of that bank, to gobble up—to use a vulgar expression—all, or nearly all, the assets, and let the creditors go without anything. I say it is most unjust that the principal offender should escape payment of his guarantee, and innocent creditors should be punished for his want of prudence and his mismanagement of this bank. It is absolutely indefensible, and the hon. gentleman knows it. There is another direction in which that injustice goes. It has not been the custom of the Crown in this country to enforce this prerogative right. In the case of the Liverpool Bank, of Nova Scotia—I believe I am right, but if I am wrong, hon. gentlemen can correct me—the prerogative right was not claimed; the Crown claimed *pari passu* with the other creditors; and, I think that, when the Crown goes into the banking business, when it goes into the business of lending moneys to shaky banks, it is the height of injustice that it should come in and refuse to share *pari passu* with other creditors, and should gobble up the whole. It is unfair and unjust in itself, and it has not been the practice heretofore, but the effect of this unfortunate loan has been, that not only to the creditors of this bank, but to those of the Bank of Prince Edward Island, has this prerogative right been extended, and the unfortunate creditors of this latter bank, many of whom were almost ruined but were left with a dividend of 15 per cent. from the bank, are still further injured by the Crown stepping in with their prerogative claim, because they had stepped in in the case of the Exchange Bank. Thus, widespread ruin has been caused among the shareholders, many of them women, and commercial men and other persons. This has been disastrous in the case of the bank itself, and it has established a wrong precedent which Parliament should condemn, which will be used in the future if Parliament approves of it now, and has ruined innocent people by the unjust pressing of this hitherto unused prerogative claim.

Mr. MACMASTER. It was not my intention to take any part in this debate, and I even had some doubt as to whether I had the right to vote until I submitted that question to yourself. I happen, like the hon. member for Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) to be a shareholder in this unfortunate Exchange Bank. I happen, also, to be a creditor of the bank and a depositor in the bank, and I happen to be engaged in the further capacity of counsel for the bank and for the creditors, in resisting the claim of the Crown to be paid by privilege. All these facts I have submitted to you, in view of the question, whether I ought to

cast my vote on this subject, and I think I have your authority, Mr. Speaker, to say that I have the right to do so. I would not say anything to this House were it not that certain statements have been put forward as matters of fact and matters of argument, which I believe to be neither, and upon which I think it to be incumbent on me, as one having a very intimate personal knowledge of the circumstances of this bank, to say something before this hon. House. In the first place, it is assumed by hon. gentlemen opposite that the Government, in the month of April, 1883, had the knowledge which the public had in the month of September, 1883, when the bank failed. It is assumed that they knew all about the failure at the time of the advance, and that, therefore, they acted wrongly in making the advance at the time they did. Well, what do we find the condition of the bank to be when the advance was made? The hon. gentleman who last addressed the House says, that if, at the time the advance was made, the bank had been liquidated, the shareholders would have lost nothing but the stock they had invested, and the creditors would have been paid 100 cents in the dollar. That is the best proof we could have that the bank was solvent at the time. Therefore, the proposition embodied in the resolution, that this was an insolvent bank, is not true and should not be sustained by the House. My hon. friend from Chateauguay has stated that the effect of the loan was to re-establish the credit of the bank and restore public confidence. That was the object of the loan and that object was achieved in that respect. How was it that the bank, at a later date, failed? I will explain. The bank was steadied by the loan; its business went on as usual; but about that time a new president was elected—Mr. Craig. The member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault), who had been the president of the bank, withdrew in consequence of ill health, and ceased to take an active part in the management of the bank. Mr. Craig came in as president and took absolute control of the bank, and what resulted? In the months succeeding the loan, when the bank was in good credit, he engaged in enterprises personal to himself; he forfeited the obligation of good faith he owed to the creditors and shareholders of the bank, and engaged, with some of the customers of the bank for his own benefit, without the knowledge of the other directors of the bank, in enterprises personal to himself. He engaged with Mr. Baird, a prominent coal merchant; he engaged with the firm of Taylor & Robertson, and with others, in business transactions far beyond the capacity of the bank, for purposes entirely personal to himself; and, by reason of this dereliction of duty and this forfeiture of duty to the bank and to the shareholders and creditors of the bank, these transactions having turned out unfortunately, the bank became ultimately ruined. Sir, it has been stated by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) that Mr. Campbell, one of the liquidators of the bank, made a statement while acting in the capacity of an accountant of the bank, that the bank was solvent in September and October, 1883, six months after this amount was loaned by the Government. That statement was perfectly true. Nay, more, Sir; in the month of December, 1883, at the meeting of the creditors and shareholders of the Exchange Bank, at which my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Holton) was present, the statement was submitted and affirmed before the meeting of shareholders, that the bank showed sufficient assets to pay the creditors of that bank, dollar for dollar, in full. My hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) has cast a slur upon Mr. Campbell—not intentionally, because any man who knows the capacity of Mr. Campbell, who knows his honorable and upright character, would not willingly cast a slur upon him; but he has done so when he said that Mr. Campbell was the nominee of the directors, and elected by the shareholders of the bank, and those who had an interest to

Mr. MACMASTER.

put him there. I will tell the hon. member for Prince Edward Island, that not only was he the nominee of the directors of the Exchange Bank, but he was the nominee of the faction represented by my friend Mr. Holton, in the meeting of the shareholders, in December, 1883. Nay, Sir, he was the nominee of both parties; he received the nomination of all sections of the shareholders as liquidator of the Exchange Bank. My hon. friend from Chateauguay will not deny that. Further, Sir, at a late period, when it was thought proper to remove the other two liquidators of the bank from their position, and to replace them by a third gentleman, more competent to fill that position, what happened? Not a word of dissent was raised against the retention of office by Mr. Campbell. All parties agreed that he was highly competent for the position, that he was the one man above all others who should be retained until the liquidation of the bank was finally completed. He was entrusted with the liquidation of the Consolidated Bank; he had been previously manager of a bank, and was regarded as a man whose capacity and honor was beyond all question in the commercial community of Montreal, and of the city of Toronto, where he was thoroughly well known. Well, Sir, I say it was this man who, in the month of December, 1883, eight months after this loan was made by the Dominion Government, who stated that this bank was in a solvent condition. Now, there were more people than Mr. Campbell who thought the bank was solvent. Whom does my hon. friend from Chateauguay represent in the litigation now pending in the Province of Quebec? Does he not represent the Crathern & Caverhill estate, which deposited large sums of money in that bank? Somebody has said this was a speculative bank; but, I ask my hon. friend from Chateauguay, if it was a speculative bank, how does it come that his client, James Crathern, a good Grit and a good business man, that the Crathern & Caverhill estate, which he advises—how does it come that these people left their \$40,000 in the Exchange Bank over the speculative period during which it is said this loan was made, until the time of the collapse in September, 1883? These are things for the hon. gentleman to explain, and for the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution to explain. More than that, Sir; the leading financial men in the city of Montreal had their money deposited in this bank. Mr. Mussen, one of the richest men of the city of Montreal, had some \$30,000; Mr. Beaudry, one of the richest men in Montreal, had some \$50,000; Mr. Andrew Allan, one of the richest men in Montreal, had some \$10,000 or \$20,000—and so I might increase the list. I only mention these to show that this bank was not regarded as a speculative bank, but was regarded as one enjoying the confidence of business men, and they deposited their money in it. Now, Mr. Speaker, a good deal has been said during this debate about the duty of the Dominion Government to proceed against Senator Ogilvie, who guaranteed the loan; and, in fact, this resolution states that sufficient precautions were not taken by the Government. I ask you what better precaution could be taken than the guarantee of a man in Senator Ogilvie's position? The hon. member for Chateauguay, who knows the city of Montreal as well as the hon. member for Cardwell or myself, and perhaps better, knows that Mr. Ogilvie was reputedly a rich man, and that he enjoyed the financial reputation of being worth something in the neighborhood of a quarter of a million of dollars. "Put yourself in his place," as the novelist said; and to any one occupying the position of Finance Minister it would seem, at once, be he political friend or political foe, that he was a safe man. He would look for the guinea stamp, and he would say: Mr. Ogilvie is a man who occupies a high financial position and I will accept his bond; and he did accept his bond. Yet it is contended that the Dominion Government should have enforced their claim

against the warrantor before proceeding against the principal on the bond of the Exchange Bank. But I say, as a position of law, and I challenge any hon. gentleman of the Province of Quebec, who is a legal gentleman, to deny it, that we cannot enforce, according to the law of Quebec, the bond against the surety until we have exhausted the principal debtor, and that the Dominion Government has no recourse against Senator Ogilvie until they have exhausted their full recourse against the Exchange Bank. That is the law of the Province of Quebec, and I have statements to the effect that a somewhat similar law exists in Ontario and the other Provinces. Now, Sir, it has been said, with regard to the directors, that they were reckless in the management of this bank. Sir, Thomas Craig, from the time he came into the management of that bank, was the factotum of that bank—the whole bank. He took control of it, and he managed it to suit himself, and for his own purposes. It may be that these men should have exercised greater supervision; I do not know but they should, in the light of latter events. Perhaps they should have been more careful; if they knew what we do to-day, they certainly would have exercised more care. But how were the books of the bank kept under Mr. Craig's supervision? They were so kept that it has been established by sworn testimony in the courts of justice—not merely by Mr. Campbell, but another gentleman, who was accountant in the bank—that the books of the Exchange Bank were so kept that certain entries never were discovered until long after the bank suspended. A few days ago, in a suit in which the hon. Senator Lacoste was opposed to me, it transpired that a certain remarkable entry was made in an obscure part of the books of the Exchange Bank, and the accountant of the bank swore that he never saw it until it was shown to him in court, and Mr. Campbell swore that he never saw it before, and could not have discovered it, because it was out of the usual place for making such entries. And slips of papers and documents of the highest importance to the bank pledging its credit, instead of being kept in the regular books, were kept in Mr. Craig's private drawer, so that even the regular executive officers could not have known of their existence. How could these business men have become aware of them? Sir, it may be possible for us to make too much reflection upon these men; they have lost severely. I am not here as their justifier—I have no right to do that—but they have suffered most keenly and lost most severely. They owned more than half the capital of the bank, and they have lost that completely. The stock was once at 80 above par, and they have lost the advance above par. They will lose the double liability and half their deposits. The leader of the Opposition, I think, said: Why did they not go to the bank and put their names on the back of a piece of paper to give it financial strength before asking the Government for aid? Well, no; I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I think it was his colleague, his armor-bearer, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) who made that statement, who is himself an ex-bank president and an ex-Finance Minister. Sir, the directors did go to the City and District Savings Bank, and they gave their personal security to that bank for \$250,000. They are on the bond, and they will have to pay it. These men have lost personally more than the value of the capital of this bank. That is not a justification for the Government making this loan, but I merely state the circumstances here, in order that it may be seen that these men, who are supposed to have neglected their duty, have paid in their own financial strength most severely for the whistle. Now, Sir, who was the prime mover in putting Thomas Craig into the position where he brought this bank to ruin? It is true, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island said, the failure of this bank has brought ruin to a good many people. The hon. member for Chateaugay is a sufferer, and several

others in this House are sufferers. I happen to be, in a light way, a sufferer myself. But who was the prime mover in placing Mr. Craig in this bank, in a position where he ruined it? Sir, it was a friend and client of my hon. friend from Chateaugay, James Crathern, Esq., a good Reformer of the city of Montreal. It was he who came, and, after laying hands upon the head of Mr. Craig, said to the directors of the Exchange Bank: Here is a worthy man and true; you are in a difficulty now; your former cashier has absconded to the United States; take this man, and he will draw you out of the hole; he will bring your bank to prosperity. And they took the advice of Mr. Crathern and trouble came which resulted in all the misery so graphically pictured by the hon. member from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). Some reference has been made here of the account in the books in the bank in which there is a sum charged to the Conservative Association or the West End Association of Montreal. It is quite true there is such an entry in the books. As I said before, the books were so kept that it was impossible for the directors to become aware of all the entries in them, and I have no doubt—and I know it, in my professional capacity—that the hon. member for Montreal West (Mr. Gault) was unaware of the existence of any such entry. But Mr. Craig had kept the transactions in such an extraordinary manner that we find an entry in regard to the Montreal West Association, and certain sums are charged as having been spent on the Montreal West election. The question of the liability of Mr. Gault to pay the amount to the bank, \$2,000, was submitted to my learned friend, Mr. Greenshields, my colleague and associate, an able man and a good Liberal, and he and I, conjointly, gave an opinion that Mr. Gault was in no way liable for the entries made in that form in the bank book. That opinion has never been questioned, and is not questioned to-day; it cannot be questioned and it cannot be successfully controverted. I regret that under the circumstances, it should be necessary for me to make any statement to this House. I will add but one statement further. It is this: That this extraordinary account of Mr. Craig's was not kept in the books containing the daily transactions of the bank, but in the savings bank ledger, where the savings of the poor were recorded; and in that way the manager kept from the directors the fact that he had overdrawn his account \$220,000. Why, if the Government is to be held responsible for the acknowledged defalcations and defaults of this officer, who is an absconder from the country, it would be a most outrageous injustice to the Government of the day. When under examination in New York before Mr. McGibbon, commissioner, in which Mr. Geoffric, another good Liberal, represented the other side, and I represented the creditors, what did Mr. Craig acknowledge? He acknowledged that he had endeavored, with two gentlemen in Montreal, to buy up the stock of the Royal Canadian Insurance Company, in order to ensure control of that company, and the profits would be divided between himself and those two gentlemen; and he declared he temporarily took the funds of the bank for that purpose. Is it fair that men like Mr. Buntin, Mr. Ogilvie, Mr. Greene and Mr. Gault, men who have obtained a high reputation and position in the commercial world, should have their honorable names tarnished by the acts of such a man? Is it fair that the Government which has administered its funds with such success and prudence should be reproached because a mishap has occurred beyond human prudence and foresight, which may result in the Government losing a small sum of money. I forbear to say what the loss may be. The Government claim that they must be paid in full. They have a right to make such a claim, and the creditors have an equal right to resist it, and to submit to a legal arbitration the question as to whether the Government should be paid in full or not. It is true, as the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has said, that up to this time the decision has been

against the Government, to the extent of saying that its claim is not so privileged. The Government has taken the case to appeal. It is further true that the Government have facilitated the appeal; that they have communicated to the liquidators and counsel of the bank their desire that every facility shall be given to try and determine that question at the earliest possible day; and so far as I am concerned, in connection with the liquidation, speaking personally and on my responsibility as a man, I say the Government have acted with that fairness which should characterise a Government, able and willing to do justice to the people as a whole and to a section of them who unfortunately met losses in connection with an unfortunate bank.

Mr. LISTER. Before the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) commenced to speak, I had no intention of saying anything on this subject. The hon. gentleman told this House that he occupied many positions, so far as this question was concerned—that he was a stockholder in the bank, that he was a depositor, that he was the solicitor of the bank, the solicitor of the liquidators. And I would ask him what position does he occupy to-night? He appears here and argues the case with a warmth that would lead us to believe that he is the solicitor still of certain gentlemen in Montreal. I can say, from what I have heard to-day, from what I have seen in *Hansard*, and from what I have heard from the Minister of Finance, that there never was a more utter disregard of his duty, as Finance Minister, than that which has been shown in this matter. If anyone had gone to the Finance Minister and asked him to lend him \$10 out of his own pocket, he would have shown more care than he has displayed in expending \$300,000 of the people's money. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) has told us that this was not a speculative bank. In that he contradicts the statement made by the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives); he also contradicts the statement made by a coming Minister, the proprietor of the *Montreal Gazette*; both hon. members said this was a speculative bank and a speculative institution. We know, as a fact, to-day, that at the time the money was borrowed from the Government the bank was hopelessly insolvent; and the question before this House to-night is, whether the Finance Minister, in lending that money, exercised that care, caution, judgment and discretion that should be exercised by a gentleman occupying the position he did, as trustee of the public funds. The question is, whether he was justified, on the representation made to him by the managers of the bank, in advancing the large sum of \$300,000, and enabling that insolvent bank to continue its business, thereby giving an opportunity to stockholders who were in the "ring" to dispose of their stock, and when the time came to wind up, instead of finding men responsible on the double liability, there were found worthless stockholders. As the name of the hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Gault) has been mentioned, perhaps it would not be improper for me to say something respecting him. We know that he was intimately connected with that bank, that he was a large stockholder of it, that he was a director, and so must have been familiar with all the business transactions of the bank. He was president of the bank, and he resigned. We find, Sir, that he knew, or he must have known at the time he resigned, that the bank was insolvent, and within a few days after his resignation the stock held by him was sold on the Montreal market and bought by his brother-in-law, Mr. Craig—paid for out of the money of the bank by Mr. Craig, who was an officer of the bank. If that was an honorable transaction, one which will be approved by the people of this country, then I have nothing further to say. The hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) says that Mr. Gault is not responsible for the money taken to pay his election expenses. Well, Sir, he may try to evade that responsibility,

Mr. MACMASTER.

but I do not think he will find an honorable man to justify his conduct. We find that his own brother-in-law, the cashier of the bank, advanced to the Conservative Club the money of the bank to promote his election to this House, and that debt, the hon. member for Glengarry (Mr. Macmaster) says Mr. Gault was perfectly justified in repudiating. He says further, that the Government holds the security of Mr. Ogilvie. The statement is made here that the Finance Minister could have got the security of Mr. Ogilvie and Mr. Buntin, but he does not say that all the security the Government held was Mr. Ogilvie, for only \$100,000, while for the other \$200,000 there is no security, and it does not appear that the Finance Minister ever requested either of these gentlemen to give security for the further amount. It is said that the debt he claimed could not be collected. I would remind the hon. gentleman that this contract was made in Ontario, and that in this Province there is no such law as he states exists in Quebec. The Government would have the right immediately to bring an action on that guarantee and recover whatever Mr. Ogilvie would be responsible for. Now I do not see how it is possible for any hon. member to vote against this resolution as it is worded. The resolution regrets that the Finance Minister should have made this advance under the circumstances, and there is no person, except the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) who pretends to justify it. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), it is true, in his own paper and probably with his own hand and pen, says that the bank was insolvent in April, 1883, and still he attempts to get up here and justify the action of the Government. I believe he would justify anything that the Government could do—that there is nothing that the Government can do that the hon. gentleman would not be found justifying and defending. That has been his course for the last three years, and I have no doubt that he will shortly get that reward which he is so anxiously looking forward to, when the Finance Minister is made Lieutenant Governor of New Brunswick. I say that the Finance Minister, in lending this money, is not only taking from the people of this country that which belongs to them, but he has been guilty of a gross breach of trust, for he occupies the position of a trustee, and it was his duty as a trustee to satisfy himself by every means in his power that the money was safely invested. If he had been entrusted with the funds of an estate he would have been responsible in law for the investment, and occupying his present position he is responsible to the country, and is censurable for his conduct in that transaction. The whole question is, whether the Finance Minister is justified in advancing the money as he did; whether, under the circumstances which then existed, he used that caution he should have used as a public servant when he advanced public moneys to an insolvent institution. It is impossible but to feel that there must have been on his part something more than a mere desire to benefit the people of the country. When we find that Mr. Ogilvie was a supporter of the hon. gentleman, that every member of that insolvent bank was his supporter, it does strike one strongly that if they had been opposed to him possibly he would have taken more care of the funds of the country. When we remember that Mr. Gault was intimately connected with him, that he was intimately connected with the affairs of the bank—taking all the circumstances into consideration, it leads one strongly to believe that the motives of the Finance Minister, when he made these advances, were not merely to secure the interests of the public.

Mr. McMULLEN. Hon. gentlemen who are making a noise may as well keep quiet. I have no desire to give a silent vote on this important question. I think it is in the interest of the constituency I represent to offer a few remarks on this subject, which has been discussed by the law-

yers of the House, though I do not know that any remarks have been offered by others on this side but lawyers, except the hon. gentleman who made the motion. I regret, in the interests of the ratepayers of this country, that this amount of money should be lost to the people of this Dominion. I may just say that hon. gentlemen are not going to force me to take my seat. If they listen to me quietly, I will not take long; but the more noisy they are, the longer it will take me. I deeply regret I repeat, in the interests of the ratepayers of this Dominion, that this money should have been lost. I think it is worth the while of the representatives of the people here to frankly and fully discuss the whole question which is before the House, and express themselves plainly with regard to advances made in this way to questionable institutions. When we come to consider the fact that this money is gathered out of the pockets of the hard-working and industrious people of this country, and in this way it has, unfortunately, got into the hands of a chartered institution in a very rotten and insolvent position, I say it is sadly to be regretted that the people must submit to the loss. The proper view to be taken of the question is this: Would the Finance Minister have made this advance to the Exchange Bank if the money had been his own? Any man occupying a public position, a position of trust in the discharge of public duty, should discharge that duty with the same care and vigilance and the same anxiety that he would bring to the discharge of a duty for himself. Now, I hold that if the Finance Minister had been possessed of that \$300,000 as his own money, he would have made a better and more searching investigation of the affairs of the bank before he deposited money in the institution. I say that he would have taken the trouble at least of having some person sent down, and its position at the time it sought relief carefully investigated. Last year, when this House was assembled for the purpose of transacting the business devolving on us, we can well remember that the Minister of Railways, when he came to the House for the purpose of presenting his railway resolutions, in order to back up the financial status of the Canadian Pacific Railway, stated that he had sent experts from his own office to Montreal, for the purpose of inspecting their accounts; and they were such thorough experts that they managed to get through the whole financial position of that company in an afternoon and come back here and report to the Government that that institution was in a very sound financial position. Now, if we have experts in the Departments who are able to perform such duties in such a very short time, I think he might have sent two or three of them to Montreal to make a real investigation of the affairs of that bank. If he did not do that, I think he might at least have insisted on having, from the entire directorate of the bank, as well as from the inspector, a statutory declaration, setting forth its true and exact position at the time they made the application to the Government for assistance. It does appear to me that no very great effort was made to ascertain the true position of that bank. Now, I think that should have been done; I think the Finance Minister, in the discharge of the duties devolving upon him, should have made some vigorous and determined effort to ascertain whether that institution was in such a position that he could safely trust to the handling of its manager \$300,000 of the taxes of the people of this country. We have some reason to believe that some of the other banks approached did exact security for money they advanced to that bank; and if they exacted collaterals from it, would it not have been reasonable and right, would it not have been prudent, for the hon. Minister to have taken what was left at the time, and hand it over to the Bank of Montreal, as treasurer of the Dominion, and there let it remain in the interest of the Dominion. He should have done something of that kind. I think any ordinary man, going into a transaction of that

kind for himself, would have taken that course. I am sorry to notice, in connection with that matter, that an effort has been made by the Finance Minister to put the responsibility on the Deputy Minister.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; I would contradict that. I did not throw the responsibility on the Deputy Minister. I merely stated that I had communicated with him, and conferred with him with reference to the nature of the security; that he had made enquiries, and that the information received was satisfactory. I did not throw any responsibility on him, only to show that I had taken the precaution to confer.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I may have misunderstood him. I understood him to say that he had relied largely for the financial affairs of the bank on the statement made by the Deputy Minister. I was going to say that it is not right that responsibility should be shifted that way from the shoulders of those who should be prepared to assume the responsibility of these transactions. Now, I cannot understand how the hon. Finance Minister permitted himself to be led astray in this matter. It is quite evident, that he was anxious to assist this institution. I think it is quite evident that he felt that his friends and himself, to some extent, were indebted to it. I think it is quite evident, from the admissions made by the solicitor of the bank, that it had rendered services in past political contests. I think it is quite evident that the president had a claim for the very able services he had rendered, and the books of the institution show that advances had been made in the interest of the party in the elections. I think this, along with the statement that the Finance Minister had a large amount of money on hand, largely explains why this money has been deposited there. He named a large number of banks in which he had deposited money, as well as in the Exchange Bank. I cannot conceive, looking at the matter from an ordinary common-sense point of view, how he has been misled in this matter, if it has not been by his own prophecy, made in his Budget Speech, delivered a few days before he made this advance. He then stated to the House that he anticipated seven years of prosperity, and in order to support his prediction he had risked his money in this way, and there it has been lost. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe made some remark about the previous Government being flies on the wheel, and said the present Government were endeavoring to uphold and sustain the business of the country and to prove themselves not to be flies on the wheel. Well, Sir, it appears in this case that they actually risked \$300,000 of the people's money in order to prevent a disaster happening to this peculiarly cherished institution of theirs. But notwithstanding all that, they proved to be flies on the wheel after all, for it went down and carried \$300,000 of the people's money along with it. Now, I do not think the story told by the Finance Minister with regard to the fatted calves exactly suited the present case. The story is a very stale one. So far as he is concerned, he has been evidently financially well fed for the last four or five years. He has been drawing financial strength from more resources than one. He has been drawing financial strength by extra taxation on the people under the operation of his policy; he has been drawing financial strength from the people by the increased deposits in the post office savings banks; and he has been drawing financial strength from the money lenders of England, by placing the debentures of this country on the market. He said that my hon. friend had been fed from two cows, but I think he has been fed from three, and the result is that he has imprudently and injudiciously disposed of \$300,000 of the people's money, simply because he had too much of it. This is an illustration of the fact that when the Finance Minister is getting into the coffers of the Dominion more money

than he can use properly there is great danger that some of it will be lost. In this case he had drawn from the people more money than was necessary; and as the natural result of having an overflowing Treasury he has risked, in the interest of a few political friends, a large amount of the people's money, and it has been lost. Now, I say it is quite right that every member of this House should fully and frankly express his views on this question. It must be remembered that the action of this House in regard to this question will be quoted as a precedent years after we have left the active stages of life. This act of the followers of the Government in sustaining this unfortunate transaction will be made a precedent in future years for transactions of a similar kind. With regard to the position Mr. Ogilvie occupied, he must take either one or other of the two positions. In the first place, he was a director of this bank, and, as a director, and, I think, president, he should have been thoroughly posted with regard to its affairs—he should have known the exact position in which it stood. If he did not know that he did not efficiently discharge his duties; if he did know it, he made representations whereby he got \$300,000 and did a very imprudent and dishonest thing. In either case he was not discharging his duty properly to the bank, or else he was deceiving the Finance Minister. I would say, in this connection, that I am sorry to think that owing to losses of this kind, owing to increased demands upon our Treasury, owing to the fact that money is spent in many ways and frittered away in directions we should avoid, the Finance Minister, a few days ago, when he delivered his Budget Speech, was under the necessity of increasing the duties of some very important articles that enter into the every-day use of the laboring classes. He has added 5 per cent. on winceys, an article which is used by the laboring classes, the farmers and mechanics of this country, very largely, and simply, because it is necessary to provide for losses of this kind. It is unfortunate, when the people's burthens have been increased so largely, that money should be thrown away and literally lost, as it has been by the advances made to this bank. There was some reference made to the letter of President Simpson, by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White). That letter has on many occasions been brought up to do service to the Conservative party. I have no desire to detain the House by referring to some things to which I could refer, and which would not be very creditable to hon. gentlemen opposite. The Pacific Railway scandal was not very creditable to them; and that to which the hon. gentleman referred stands as far back as the Pacific scandal. If they have the right to quote the one we have the right to quote the other. There is nothing in connection with the political history of the country that reflects so severely upon the transactions of hon. gentlemen opposite as that particular affair. I say they should hesitate before going back and referring to those old questions, because I contend that unfortunate and disgraceful transaction, the Pacific scandal, was a thousand times worse, and I say that years after this, when hon. gentlemen opposite shall have left the active stage of life, their memory will not be forgotten, owing to acts of that kind. The hon. member for Cardwell can well afford to defend the Government and the Finance Minister on an occasion of this kind. That hon. gentleman receives annually a very handsome sum, paid to the institution with which he is connected.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. McMULLEN. Well, I shall not refer to that matter. I shall not further detain the House. I simply wanted to give expression to my feelings on this subject. I do so honestly and earnestly, and I feel it my duty now and always to condemn the Government—I care not what

Mr. McMULLEN.

Government it be—that will make reckless and unadvised advances of this kind. I will always consider it my duty to condemn acts of this kind, by which the people of this country are called upon to submit to loss that otherwise they would not be called upon to sustain.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not desire to protract the debate, but some things have been said, and very foolishly said, with respect to a matter in which I am personally concerned, and on which I have a few words to say before this question is disposed of. In the first place, I may say that I regret to find that I disturbed to so great an extent the equanimity of the Finance Minister. All I have to say to that hon. gentleman is, that really I have, under the circumstances, treated him as leniently as I could be expected to. If the hon. gentleman only knew all that I could say on this subject, all that I can say is, as Lord Clive, in olden days said, he would be very much astonished at my own moderation. However, my object is not so much to refer to what the Finance Minister said. I am quite ready that what I said and his reply should go together to the country; but my object is to say I fear the hon. gentleman is not going to be much longer with us, and I am sorry to find that I have exercised such a disturbing influence on his mind, and when he goes I may say I wish him well. The other matter I have to refer to is, the unfortunate allusion made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) to the affairs of the late Commercial Bank of Canada. Now, if the hon. member for Cardwell knew all that I know about the secret history of the Commercial Bank, he would have gone a very long way out of his way to avoid alluding to that matter. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, particularly about transactions which took place seventeen years ago. I could, if I pleased, make a statement that would not be pleasant about the secret history of the downfall of the Commercial Bank; but I may tell the House at once that I fully recognise that there are obligations laid on men who have occupied the position I have occupied, and I would not be justified in using knowledge I then acquired, at any rate in reply to attacks made by the hon. member for Cardwell. If gentlemen who sat on the board of the Commercial Bank with me, have any charge to make against me; if my own brother director who sits opposite where I stand has any charge to make against me, then I shall be prepared here or elsewhere—and I think the House knows I am able and willing generally to defend myself—to go from first to last into the history of the Commercial Bank, to state the immediate cause, the remote cause, and the more proximate causes of its downfall. It is not my intention to do that, unless he first should desire it or call upon me to do so. He has never, knowing the facts, ventured to bring any charge against me. I do not think he will venture to bring any charge to-night. He was for a long time connected with that bank. He had good opportunities for knowing. The relations between myself and that gentleman have been, to say the least of it, a little strained for a few years past, and I do not think that the First Minister—never that I have seen, never that I have heard in this House—has ventured to say anything as to my connection with the Commercial Bank of Canada. Now, he, knowing the facts, has not ventured to make any of the insinuations which the member for Cardwell has ventured to make. I will simply say this to the House; seventeen years have gone, many persons, who, as well as myself, were intimately acquainted with these affairs, are dead; I do not like, even in my own defence, to bring up things which might affect the memories of those dead men, or might be unpleasant to their children; but I will tell the hon. member for Cardwell this, first of all, I took the chair thrice after the suspension of the Commercial Bank, in the bank parlor of the Com-

mercial Bank, with the shareholders angry and disappointed before me. Not one single soul there ever dared to question my conduct, and for the best of all reasons, that not one single soul among them had any charge to prefer or any evidence to bring against me. More than that, the Commercial Bank of Canada cost no man a penny. Its depositors, its note holders, everyone who had a claim upon it, was paid in full to the last farthing, and if it be true that Mr. King, the then president of the Bank of Montreal, declared, in a letter which the hon. gentleman read, that that bank was insolvent, Mr. King's act was strongly contradictory of Mr. King's letter, because I was present when Mr. King offered an exceedingly large sum for the assets of the Commercial Bank, and undertook to pay all its liabilities besides. The affairs of the Commercial Bank really came to grief, not from the cause that Mr. King, who did not know so much about them after all, assigned, but from this very simple cause that, unfortunately, and in opposition to my direct instructions and to the instructions of the board, too, one of the gentlemen who was charged with the management of the bank, not for several years, but for a few weeks before its downfall, weakened the reserves and resources which had been brought together, as the bank returns in yonder library would show, by my express direction and order, acting in conjunction with the other members of the board, and foreseeing that there would be a run in consequence of the reduction of our capital. I think the First Minister's memory is good enough to enable him, if he chooses, to recollect that fact. At all events, whether he does or does not, I could prove it even from the *Gazette* returns, and I have plenty of other modes of proof. I do not, as I said, choose or intend, on any challenge from the member for Cardwell, who knows nothing about the facts of the case, to go into the secret history of the Commercial Bank of Canada; but, if I am challenged by any one who knows, I will be always prepared to justify my conduct, at any rate, to the fullest possible extent. I am going to say no more to-night than this, that I think that every action that was taken by the First Minister at that time in his capacity of First Minister only goes to show clearly and distinctly how perfectly correct was that advice of his which I read but lately from the *Hansard* of a few days ago, laying down and defining what a wise and prudent Finance Minister should do under the circumstances, and precisely what he did himself in conjunction with his former Finance Minister, Sir Alexander Galt, and precisely what the present Finance Minister did not attend to in one particular in this unfortunate transaction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I did not intend to take any part in this debate, because, in the first place, early in it my colleague, the Finance Minister, had, in my opinion, fully stated the case of the Government, the case of himself as Finance Minister, and of the Government who supported him in everything he has done, and I only rise now in consequence of the gentleman's having alluded to the Commercial Bank. I have brought no charge against him, but he seems to throw out the suggestion that I would be afraid to bring a charge against him. I absolve him, on my account, from any secrecy, as far as I am concerned.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do you bring any charge?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I bring no charge, but, if he wishes to bring any charge or to insinuate any against me, I give him full permission to bring it. Mr. Speaker, I am highly complimented in having my words of wisdom, apparently, quoted with such approbation by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is not often that they honor me in that way, but, though perhaps my self-conceit has been raised by the smiles of approbation I have got from the other side, I honestly think that, if they read my speeches oftener and

took advice more readily from me, they would not make such continual mistakes as they are doing, they would have remained in office longer, and they would get back to office sooner. But they will not take it. Like the old American democracy—they have succeeded at last, after twenty years exclusion from office, and perhaps after twenty years the hon. gentlemen may learn wisdom from experience; but the old democracy failed by making mistakes, and the republicans remained in office, not so much by their own strength as by the mistakes of their opponents—as long as the Grit democracy makes the same mistakes we will remain in office, much, I believe, to the satisfaction and benefit of this great Dominion of ours. The hon. gentleman in his speech, in which he enlivened a very dry subject, a matter of account, a matter of financial relations with a bank, with certain jokes, carefully prepared and well delivered, as he always does, stated among other things that we were bound to support the Finance Minister, that the majority in this House were bound to support the Finance Minister, and if an angel from heaven came it would not alter the opinions of the majority in this House. Well, I do not know what might be done if an angel from Heaven came, but if a fallen angel comes, he cannot expect that we should accept his views—fallen from the high estate he held before, and weltering in the Grit slough. But the hon. gentleman and his leader both said, and especially the leader, with respect to my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Ives)—the leader of the Opposition said, in rather discourteous and unparliamentary phrase, that he acted servilely and subserviently, that he was looking for office, and that it was in order to be Minister of Railways or to fill some other office of that kind that he made that speech. Now, that was out of order, and in strictness you, Sir, should have called him to order, though he is the leader of the Opposition. He has no right to impute motives or to make such charges. It was unparliamentary, and the hon. gentleman is inexcusable for doing so. He should show an example to the House, as the leader of a great party, and hoping one day to be the leader of the majority of this House, instead of descending to personal attack, which is too much his habit. When he has not the courage to assert, he has always the malice to insinuate. Supposing the hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe had taken the same course. The hon. gentleman says that my hon. friend from Richmond is anxious to get into the Government. Who is more anxious to get into the Government than the hon. gentleman himself, caring not whether he rides over friend or foe in order to get there. Whether it is the Minister of Finance or the First Minister, or the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), he cares not whom he rides over or tramples down, so that he rattles his unscythed car over the body of anyone and everyone in order to get the most coveted position which I hold at this moment. And he is the man to get up here and sneer at my hon. friend when he gave a clear and logical argument addressed to the subject before the House, without one irrelevant word. He is not the man to charge motives to anybody, especially when he charges my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) and my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives) with an over-anxiety to get office. He is the last man in this country who ought to attempt to make any such allusion, or assertion, or insinuation against any member of Parliament. The hon. member who moved this motion said, when he spoke, that not even an angel from Heaven could convert the majority of this House. Oh, says he, I make a mistake; perhaps the House might be converted, or the Government might be converted if an angel came from No. 8. There is no man in this House who was more anxious to get into No. 8 than the hon. gentleman. There is no man, being a guardian angel or a fallen angel, who would try harder to get into confidence of the gentlemen who assemble in No. 8. But they know when they are well off,

The little Garden of Eden is not going to allow any serpent to creep in among them, and the hon. gentleman must be satisfied to take the Mount Pisgah view of the beautiful plains that lie before them on this side of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. They have a tempter of their own in that Garden of Eden.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A tempter; yes, I dare say they have a tempter, but they do not try to seduce the hon. gentleman. I do not think the blandishment of any hon. member on this side will be put forth in the vain attempt of making the hon. gentleman a Conservative in principle, a Conservative in standing, a Conservative in object. We must leave him out in utter darkness, and there, Mr. Speaker, he will stay. Now, Sir, I have only one thing more to say, and it is, that this motion ought not, in my opinion, in fairness or in common propriety, to have been made. The hon. gentleman had moved it last Session, he had moved it for the purpose of eliciting a direct vote of want of confidence in the Government, a direct censure on the Finance Minister. He ought to have been satisfied with that. This is a second motion, and is simply a proof of faction. That is not the kind of warfare which is conducted in England; that is not the kind of way in which the two parties fight each other there. We had this matter discussed last Session. The whole circumstances connected with the loan to the Exchange Bank were ventilated, and a vote was taken. The hon. gentleman could not hope to get a reversal of that vote this Session. It is a waste of time to attempt it, and Parliament and the country will feel that it is a waste of time in bringing up this motion a second time.

House divided on motion (p. 363) of Sir Richard Cartwright:

YEAS:		
Messieurs		
Allen,	Edgar,	McCraney,
Armstrong,	Fairbank,	McMullen,
Auger,	Fisher,	Mills,
Bain (Wentworth),	Fleming,	Mulock,
Bécharé,	Forbes,	Paterson (Brant),
Bernier,	Geoffrion,	Platt,
Blake,	Gillmor,	Rinfret,
Bourassa,	Gunn,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Burpee (Sunbury),	Haley,	Scrivier,
Cameron (Huron),	Holton,	Somerville (Brant),
Cameron (Middlesex),	Innes,	Somerville (Bruce),
Campbell (Renfrew),	Irvine,	Springer,
Cartwright,	Jackson,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Casey,	King,	Trow,
Casgrain,	Kirk,	Vall,
Catudal,	Landerkin,	Watson,
Charlton,	Langelier,	Wells,
Cockburn,	Laurier,	Wilson,
Davies,	Lister,	Yeo.—59.
De St. Georges,	Livingstone,	
NAYS:		
Messieurs		
Abbott,	Ferguson (Leeds & Gren)	McGreevy,
Allison,	Fortin,	McNeill,
Amyot,	Foster,	Mitchell,
Bain (Soulanges),	Gagné,	Moffat,
Baker (Victoria),	Gandet,	O'Brien,
Barnard,	Gigault,	Ouimet,
Beaty,	Girouard,	Pinsonneault,
Bell,	Gordon,	Pope,
Benson,	Grandbois,	Prunyn,
Bergeron,	Guilbault,	Reid,
Bergin,	Guillet,	Riopel,
Billy,	Hackett,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Blondeau,	Haggart,	Robertson (Hastings),
Bourbeau,	Hall,	Royal,
Bowell,	Hay,	Scott,
Bryson,	Hickey,	Shakespeare,
Burns,	Hilliard,	Small,
Cameron (Inverness),	Homer,	Smyth,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hurteau,	Sproule,
Carling,	Ives,	Stairs,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Taschereau,
Chapleau,	Kaulbach,	Taylor,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

Cochrane,	Kilvert,	Temple,
Colby,	Kinney,	Tilley,
Costigan,	Kranz,	Townshend,
Coughlin,	Labrosse,	Tupper,
Coursol,	Landry (Kent),	Tyrwhitt,
Curran,	Landry (Montmagny),	Vanase,
Cuthbert,	Langevin,	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Lesage,	Wallace (York),
Dawson,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Cardwell),
Desaulniers (Maak'ngé),	Macdonald (Sir John),	White (Hastings),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),	Mackintosh,	White (Renfrew),
Desjardins,	Macmaster,	Wigle,
Dickinson,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Williams,
Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),	Wood (Brockville),
Dugas,	McCallum,	Wood (Westmoreland),
Dundas,	McCarthy,	Woodworth,
Dupont,	McDougald (Pictou),	Wright.—118.
Farrow,		

Motion negatived.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 6th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Order, House again in Committee of Ways and Means, (Sir Leonard Tilley.)

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In rising, Sir, to continue the debate upon the motion that you do leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means, I desire to say that I think the debate might very fairly, if both sides would agree to it, be left precisely where it stands at this moment. We have had from the hon. Finance Minister a speech as able as it was exhaustive, a speech than which, I believe, no better has ever been delivered from the Ministerial benches on a similar occasion in Canada, and which embodied as complete a statement of the financial and industrial position of this country as could very well be embodied in any statement of the kind. We have had as a reply to that a speech from the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), who speaks for the Opposition, in matters of this kind, with some degree of authority, which, I think, even his own friends will admit, was hardly equal to the reputation which he deservedly possesses as an able debater. If one may judge of the speech—if one may use, in fact, the concluding sentence of the speech as a commentary on the speech itself—the hon. gentleman unfortunately indulged in those extravagances of statement which, I think, impair very greatly, the effect of what otherwise might be useful statements in relation to public affairs, and which certainly, so far as we are concerned on this side of the House, do not make his speeches, as a rule, very dangerous to us. Sir, let me ask you what will be thought, what can be thought, of an hon. gentleman with the responsibility that rests on that hon. gentleman as an ex-Finance Minister, who, after three hours of discussion of the affairs of the country, concluded in these words:

"I say this in conclusion, and I say it, not as a matter of rhetorical statement, but as a simple matter of fact, capable of mathematical demonstration, that I believe to-day, if we sat down and counted the cost, we would find that this country has lost more in six years of evil Government relatively to its population and its resources than the people of the United States did in the four years of desperate civil war which immediately preceded the formation of our Confederation."

It does seem to me, Sir, that an hon. gentleman who approaches a discussion of the affairs of this country, of its

financial and industrial position, holding the view which is embodied in the words which I have just quoted, puts himself out of court altogether as a reasonable authority upon the questions with which we have to deal in a discussion of this kind. The hon. gentleman commenced by telling us that he proposed to deal in some disagreeable truths. He commenced by telling us that he anticipated that possibly from this side of the House he would be charged as unpatriotic because of the statements he was about to make; but influenced, like one of Gilbert's creations, with that terrible sense of duty, being in fact the slave of duty, he thought it necessary to tell the truth, whatever might be the result to the country, or, in fact, to himself. Well, so far as I am concerned, I do not think this country has anything to fear from the truth. I believe that the truth fairly told, I believe that the truth fully told, told without mitigation, without concealment of any fact, will not injure but benefit the country. But the hon. gentlemen, under the guise of truth commence their statements by the declaration that they are overwhelmed with a sense of the duty attaching to them to tell the truth, and then deliberately proceed to make statements which, to say the least of them, would not, in any other place but Parliament, be entitled to be called truth. We may fairly conclude that the hon. gentleman who makes such statements to the prejudice of his country is not entitled to any great consideration, and is certainly not in a position to set himself up as being influenced simply by his sense of duty to the country. The hon. gentleman on this, as on former occasions, dealt with the question of the population of Canada, and it does seem to me that it is very greatly to be regretted that we should find ourselves, on almost every occasion when this debate arises, or similar debates arise, compelled to defend the country against statements, which, if they were true, even in part, it would not be necessary at any rate to parade on every possible occasion; but which, as I shall show in a moment, are not only not correct even in part, but are so absurdly incorrect that the hon. gentleman who presents them to the House can hardly be credited in courtesy with believing them himself. The hon. gentleman reiterated here the statement which he made with regard to the loss of population to Canada in a memorable speech in Montreal. On that occasion he elaborated his figures more than he ventured to do yesterday; but as he took the full responsibility for them, I shall take occasion to refer to them, and I think I will be able to convince even the hon. gentleman opposite that they are not entitled to the credit which he would desire they should obtain. The hon. gentleman admits that from 1840 to 1861, the country made considerable progress. He gave the figures of the census in 1840 as 987,000; those by the census of 1851 as 1,842,000, and of 1861, 2,507,000, which figures, he admitted, showed a very rapid increase indeed. And having made that admission, he started for the purposes of his discussion with the census of 1861. The population of the old Provinces in 1861, he said, was 3,200,000; the net increase of births over deaths, or the natural increase, he said, ought to have been 2,000,000; that is, that the population, without the addition of any immigration, should have been 5,200,000, or an increase of $62\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. How he obtained that $62\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. as the basis of his calculation I shall show in a moment or two, but that is the basis—and I want hon. gentlemen to remember it—of the increase which he has taken in all of his calculations, and upon which he has ventured to say that this country, so far from progressing, has steadily lost in population. He went on to say that the immigrants settled in Canada during those 20 years numbered 499,562, that the natural increase of the immigrants would be 210,000, or a little over 42 per cent.; and the curious thing is that in order to make that increase he assumes that the whole 499,562 immigrants were here at the commencement of the 20

years, and that that increase has been going on ever since. Why, those immigrants have been coming in during those twenty years, year by year, the larger part of them practically during recent years, and to talk therefore of an increase of 42 per cent., the natural increase over a period of 20 years on those 499,000 persons, as if they had all been here at the commencement of that period, will, I think, show the carelessness at any rate with which he has made up his calculations. Upon those calculations, however, he comes to this conclusion, that the population in 1861 was 3,200,000, that the natural increase in 20 years should be 2,000,000, that the immigrants who came into the country were 499,562, that the natural increase in relation to them should be 210,000—making a total of 5,909,562. Then the census, as stated by the hon. gentleman, gave 4,242,000, and he finds therefore that there has been a decrease in the population of this country, or rather that the population of this country is in fact 1,667,562 less than it should have been if we had not lost greatly from our population by immigration from the country. Now let us look at the figures in the light of the census of the United States. The Canadians in the United States, and I think I may fairly say our friends on the other side of the line are not apt to understate the case, the Canadians in the United States in 1860 were 249,970; in 1870 they had increased to 476,572; and in 1880 they had increased to 710,585. Now, the latter two periods are, for the purposes of this discussion, the only important ones, as the people represented by the first figures were in the United States, at the time the hon. gentleman selected as the starting point in his calculation. You deduct, therefore, this 249,970, or, in round figures, 250,000 people from the population, and then if you add the natural increment to the remainder, by the ratio used in the United States census, which, I think, is not an unfair calculation, you will find that the Canadians in the United States, going there since 1861, and by the natural increase to them since that time, would number 758,637. Now how would the case stand? The comparison would stand thus: According to the hon. gentleman's calculation the loss to Canada is 1,667,562, but the actual loss, as shown by the American census of Canadians in the United States, giving the natural increase to those persons according to the scale established by the American census, was 758,637. So that there is an exaggeration at the very outset of the hon. gentleman's statement, against this, his own country, of 908,925; that is to say that, in order to establish the statement which he made, there ought to be no less than 900,000 more Canadians in the United States than the census of the United States assumes to be there. I leave it to the hon. gentleman to discover where these 900,000 people have gone. Then there is another thing which ought to be taken into account. Although I suppose these persons would be regarded as part of the general immigration, it is well just at this point to state the fact that there have been persons coming from the United States to Canada as well as persons going from Canada to the United States. According to the census of 1880 in the United States and the census of 1881 here, while there were 14 Canadians to each 1,000 in the United States, there were 18 Americans to each 1,000 in Canada, so that after all there has been a fair interchange of the courtesies of visitation between the peoples of the two countries during that period. But the hon. gentleman carried his calculation still further. When he was speaking in Montreal, in November, 1884, he said that Canada had at the outside, exclusive of Indians, a population of barely 4,400,000, while it ought to have had 6,700,000, making a loss, according to the hon. gentleman, of 2,300,000 persons, or an additional loss in the last four years of no less than 700,000. That is, that our loss had increased, according to the hon. gentleman's statement, between 1880 and 1884, by no less than 700,000 persons. Now, on the same basis of calculation, which I presented before, we

have the loss calculated by the hon. gentleman, 2,300,000; the loss according to the United States census, 836,404, so that we have an exaggeration on the part of the hon. gentleman, according to that method of calculation, the correctness of which I venture to say cannot be successfully impugned, of 1,463,596, or in round numbers an exaggeration of a million and a half. We have an opportunity of knowing something, during the last few years at any rate, from statistics that cannot be very well questioned, as to what has been the movement of the population between the United States and Canada. The Department of Agriculture, I believe, have obtained from the Grand Trunk Railway audit office a statement of the actual number of passengers going out and coming in at the different points at which the line crosses the frontier. So that, so far as that railway is concerned at any rate, we have in these figures a tolerably accurate statement of the difference between the income and the outgo of the people between the United States and Canada. What do we find? For the fiscal year ending the 30th June, 1883, the net total number of passengers from Canada to the United States, excluding through passengers, by the Grand Trunk Railway system was 187,935; the total number of passengers from the United States to Canada, excluding again European immigrants simply passing through the United States to Canada, was 192,627, or a net gain to Canada, according to the official statement of the audit office of the Grand Trunk Railway, of 4,692 persons. Then, if you take the last fiscal year ending June 30th, 1884, you will find that from Canada to the United States the number of persons, again excluding European passengers, was 201,931, while the net total number of passengers from the United States to Canada, excluding in the same way those who came through from Europe, was 204,838, or a net gain to Canada of 2,907 persons, or in round numbers 3,000. Now, these figures may or may not be absolutely accurate. We have possibly as good a test in regard to their accuracy as it is possible to get, from the fact that they have come from the audit office of a railway corporation which has not, I am bound to say, shown itself much interested in building up either this Government or this country during recent years; and we have a statement from that audit office which shows, at least, that there has been no such loss of population by persons going from Canada into the United States as would at all justify the statements made by the hon. gentleman. Then we may take another way. We may take the immigrants from the United States, some of them returned Canadians, some of them Americans coming to settle in Canada—and you will find Americans in every town in Canada, in all the manufacturing centres in Canada you will find American workmen who have come to find employment here just as you will find Canadian workmen who have gone to find employment there—and if we take the entries of settlers' effects, we shall find that in 1879 the settlers who entered their effects at the Custom house, and so registered themselves as people coming to settle in Canada, were 9,775; in 1880, they were 10,961; in 1881, 15,404; in 1882, 30,554; in 1883, 34,987; and in 1884, 35,891. I think that will show that there has been a steady increase in the number of persons coming from the United States to Canada to settle, and yet, in spite of those figures, which the hon. gentleman could have got without any trouble if he had been anxious simply to tell the exact truth in relation to this matter, he has ventured to base his whole argument upon the supposition that a much larger and a continuing larger outflow is going from Canada into the United States. There is no doubt whatever that during the last 30 years a good many Canadians have gone to the United States. Nobody doubts it; nobody denies it; nobody can question it. There have been reasons for it, and reasons are of a very simple

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

character. If you go, for instance, to the great lumber regions of Michigan, you find a number of Canadians who have gone there to work in the lumber shanties and the saw mills. That is an industry with which they have been acquainted here, and they have gone in great numbers, to find employment which they could not find here. Then, in the industries of New England, an incentive has been offered to a great many Canadians to find employment in those manufactories, and there have been still greater inducements in the great prairie lands of the American north-west which were opened long before our prairie lands, in our North-West, were open to settlement, and which annually attracted large numbers of persons not only from Canada but from the old States of the Union as well, who have gone there to settle. All these inducements proved attractive to the people of the Eastern States, and those States have suffered in quite as great a degree as Canada. Now, Sir, I come to what seems to be a crucial test of the unfairness of the hon. gentleman's mode of calculation upon this subject. He has assumed 62½ per cent. as what should be the natural increase for 20 years, irrespective of immigration altogether, and he has based his entire calculation as to the loss of population to Canada upon that figure. Now, what is the fact? We find, for instance, that the decennial increase in the United States was as follows:—

From 1830 to 1840.....	32·67
“ 1840 to 1850.....	35·87
“ 1850 to 1860.....	35·58
“ 1860 to 1870.....	22·63
“ 1870 to 1880.....	30·07

Making an average decennial increase of 31·36, or, for 20 years, 62·72. The hon. gentleman takes 62½, but he did not take the trouble to remember that this increase in the United States was not the natural increase of the people.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Why don't you take 1790 to 1810, when the population was the same?

Mr. WHITE. Well, if the hon. gentleman chooses to go back to those dates he is at liberty to do so, but I think he will find that the argument in relation to the natural increase will be precisely the same as the argument here. Now, when I find that the United States show an increase of the population, during twenty years, of 62·72, and that the hon. gentleman has taken as a reasonable basis for the natural increase of Canada, and as the basis of his entire calculation, an increase of 62·50, I have a right to assume, at any rate, that it is upon that he has made his calculation. But he has ignored altogether the fact that that increase of 62·72 in the United States for the twenty years actually included the immigration as well as the natural increase, and therefore was not a fair test to apply to this matter at all. The United States have increased during that time from various causes, from the annexation of territory, and in other ways, but whatever the increase was, the figures I have given cover the whole increase and not the natural increase alone. Now, Sir, another way of testing the absurdly exaggerated character of the hon. gentleman's figures is to take the increases in the United States as they are stated. From 1860 to 1870 the increase in the United States was 22·63, and of that 15·38 was put down as the natural increase, and 7·25 as the increase from immigration. From 1870 to 1880 the whole increase was 30·07; the natural increase being put down as 22·78, and the increase from immigration at 7·29. Now, Sir, apply these figures to the population of Canada, and what do we find? The population in 1861 was 3,200,000 and the natural increase from 1871 would be 492,160 and the increase from immigration would be 242,000, making a population in 1871 of 3,934,160. Then take the actual increase in 1881, of 896,202 and from immigration of 286,801, and taking the figures of the United States and applying them to Canada, the population of this country in 1881 would be 5,117,163.

But the actual population by the census was 4,324,810, or a loss by the calculation of this standard of 793,353. But the hon. gentleman states that the loss during that period was 1,667,563, showing a mistake in the direction of exaggeration of 874,209. Now, Sir, how do we stand—for I think after all that is a fair way to look at this question—in relation to the tolerably prosperous eastern States of the Union? I take the State of Massachusetts which, I think, the hon. gentleman will admit is a tolerably prosperous State, probably the most prosperous of the New England States, in which is found a very large number of French Canadians, for a great many French Canadians who have gone from Canada have gone into Massachusetts. We find that the increase in population of that State between 1860 and 1880 was 18 per cent. We find that some other of the New England States as well as Canada, are subject to the same process of emigration to the Western States, particularly into newer fields. We find in some of them, as in New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont that there was scarcely any increase whatever, and I believe in one of those States during one decennial period there was an actual decrease. Now, the increase of population in Canada in the same period was 36·3. On the other hand, in the same period, Dakota showed a gain of 193 per cent., Kansas, 239 per cent., Minnesota, 155 per cent., and Illinois, 48 per cent. Then Sir, if I take the State of New York, which is called the Empire State of the Union, with its large urban population, with the enormous growth of population in the cities of Brooklyn, New York and other great cities of that State, what do we find? If you take the State of New York according to the principle laid down by the hon. gentleman, and when he asked me to go back to 1790 I point him to the State of New York, which, standing alone, at any rate, offers a fair comparison—if you take that State, and apply the hon. gentleman's method of calculation, adding for 20 years 62½ per cent. as the natural increase, the population should be 6,306,625; but the actual population by the census was only 5,083,000, or a loss in population to the State of New York, according to the method he has applied to Canada, of no less than 1,223,625. If to that is added the immigration and its increases, as the hon. gentleman did in the case of Canada, we have 750,000 more, and the loss in that case would be in the State of New York, applying the same method of calculation that the hon. gentleman has applied to Canada, 1,973,625. Now, Sir, that is 300,000 more than the hon. gentleman, in his wildest flight of imagination, says was the loss to Canada. The actual facts of the comparison are these, as ascertained by the census, which we may fairly assume to be correct: that the State of New York increased in 20 years 1,202,000, or 30·97, while Canada increased 36·03, or one-fifth more than the State of New York. I do not think it is unsatisfactory when you come to remember that down to 1881 we scarcely had a North-West in the sense of an attractive territory to which settlers could go, when we were only beginning to open it up, to offer inducements to people to go there by means of the construction of railways through that territory, that Canada, with all the attractions which the Western States had to offer, with all the attractions which the industrial policy of the United States had to offer, taking our people from this country to the other side, still increased one-fifth more than the great State of New York. Yet the hon. gentlemen, for the purpose of injuring this Government—although how this Government is going to be injured by the fact that we have lost population since 1861, I cannot very well see—undertook to state that there has been a loss to Canada. The hon. gentleman, however, went on to another process of argument. He took the school population, and he asked us to believe that the population as there stated is absolutely correct. I hold in my hands the report of the Minister of Education of the Province of Ontario for 1884, and as the hon.

gentleman made his statement in November, 1884, I have a right to assume that this is the book from which he took his figures. Yet on the very threshold of his enquiry, if he had chosen to read it, in the very first report of an inspector published in this book, what do we find?

"The average number of days the schools have been kept open is 207·8, or one-fourth less than for 1881. The number of pupils 5 to 16 years of age enrolled is 5,215, or 24 less than the previous year. It is to be noticed that trustees' returns made the number of pupils resident December, 1882, 423 less than at the same date the previous year. Considering that the number of students enrolled in 1881 was 581 less than the number returned as resident, and that for 1882 the number enrolled approaches within 182 of those resident, I cannot but think that the census has been defective, and that there are more than 5,397 children residents in the county."

That is the statement from the very first report of the inspector in the very volume which the hon. gentleman has taken for the purpose of using the figures, declared by that inspector to be inaccurate, to be notoriously inaccurate; that is the report of the inspector which the hon. gentleman met at the very threshold of his enquiry; and yet he was bound by his sense of duty, by that overwhelming disposition to tell the truth and nothing but the truth, to ignore that statement and take those figures as if they were absolutely correct, although I may fairly say that they bear evidence in the very character of the figures themselves of being anything but correct. Taking those school figures, what do we find? The school population between five and sixteen years in 1874 was 511,603, in 1878, 492,360, or a decrease from 1874 to 1878 of 19,243. In 1883 the number was 478,791, or a decrease of 13,565. So that the average yearly decrease from 1874 to 1878, according to the figures which the hon. gentleman relies upon, was 4,811, while the average yearly decrease from 1878 to 1883 was 2,714, showing a smaller annual average decrease during the latter period than during the former. The hon. gentleman was in office during the whole of the former period. Whoever then thought of taking up the school statistics for the purpose of injuring the hon. gentleman even at the risk of injuring the country, or whoever attached any importance to those statistics, as showing that this country was not reasonably progressing?

Mr. MILLS. What figures were appealed to?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Certainly not these school figures. We knew they were inaccurate—they bore inaccuracy on the face of them. No one could look at the figures without knowing they were inaccurate. Look at the figures and see how they stand. Take the town of Belleville. We have the number returned for four years as 2,610 each year, not one more and not one less. That one fact, together with the report of the inspector, ought to have taught the hon. gentleman that this was not a very safe weapon for him to use in order to show that our population is diminishing. Take the city of London. I find that for three years, 1881-82-83, 4,900 was the exact figure, neither one more nor one less. Then I find St. Catharines had a little bit of an increase, a slight change. In 1880-81-82 there were 2,500 for each of those years, neither one more nor one less; but in 1883 there was an increase of 60—exactly 60. But I will not detain the House with going through this list of figures. If you take towns that are familiar to all of us, you find similar inaccuracies. Take Peterborough, which has been growing rapidly and is an important railway and industrial centre, and what do we find by these figures? We find that they show 1,950 in 1880, 1,800 in 1881; the number went up to 2,000 in 1882; and in 1883 the number was 2,000 still, exactly the same figure, neither one more nor one less. I might go through the whole of the figures and show that on the face of them they bear the evidence of being utterly unreliable as a basis on which a fair calculation could be made as to the movement of population in Canada. Then I take another point with respect to them. If you take the municipal statistics, to which the hon. gentleman attaches some importance,

what do we find? Take the municipal statistics and the school statistics for 1878-79-80-81-82-83—I will not trouble the House with reading them—and what do we find? According to the municipal statistics the population of the Province increased during those years 64,341, while, according to the Minister of Education, the school population decreased 13,596 during the same period. It is certainly remarkable that so far as the school statistics are concerned the same fact is apparent in the United States as here. In nearly every State of the Union you find that while the population has increased there has been a decrease, apparently, in the school population. For instance, in Connecticut there has been an increase in the population in six years of 51,000, and a decrease in the school population of 8,000. In Illinois there has been an increase in population of 161,400, and a decrease in pupils of 9,238. In Tennessee there was an increase in population in two years of 56,800, and an apparent decrease in the school children, according to the school returns, of 25,785. Take the great State of New York; there has been an increase in the population during those ten years of 700,000, according to the census, while there has been an actual decrease, so far as school returns are concerned, during the same period, of 6,820. The whole of the statistics, both in the United States and Ontario, show that the school returns—and I do not say that as attaching any fraudulent blame to any person connected with them—almost from the incident connected with the collection of these statistics, are utterly unreliable as a basis of calculation in connection with the population of the country. The hon. gentleman assumes that we have lost population. It is rather a remarkable thing that in certain portions of the country—I take Ontario and Quebec particularly—there has been a remarkable increase in the population. I think we may lay it down as almost an axiom, in dealing with the movements of population, that in the rural districts, in the agricultural parts of the country, as the country gets pretty well settled, the population becomes practically stationary. The increase will be found in the urban and suburban populations within those districts, but so far as the agricultural portion is concerned the population does not show any great increase. But where you will find the increase is in the newer districts of the country, to which the young people and even the old people remove themselves, to find in them an opportunity to devote their enterprise and industry to building up homes for themselves. We have had that going on at all times in Canada in the newer districts of the country—in the county of Huron, in the county of Bruce and now it is going on in Muskoka, and Algoma, and in many places in the Province of Quebec I am happy to say the same kind of thing has begun to go on. Take, for instance, the district of Saguenay and Chicoutimi; according to the censuses of 1871 and 1881 the increase in that district was 68 per cent., and I believe that if the people of Quebec are successful in the enterprise they have in hand, the Lake St. John Railway, the population will show a much larger increase at the next census than it did at the last. There is in that country at the head of the Saguenay, as it is said by those who know it, almost a new—North-West, I was going to say—but, at any rate, a great north, almost equal to the great North-West for agricultural and other purposes. Take the county of Ottawa; I find that the increase there has been far in excess of the general increase of the country. Twenty-nine per cent. was the increase, and there, too, as these new railways go on, as those settlements increase, which are happily going in at this moment under the direction of the Rev. Curé Labelle and other persons, we will find that a large number of people will go and settle in those newer parts of the country, which before were looked upon as uninhabitable and utterly useless, except perhaps for raising timber. Take again Muskoka, in the Province of Ontario; I find that from 1871 to 1881 the

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

population of Muskoka increased 400 per cent. I find that in North Renfrew, where there is a large district opening up for settlement, the increase was 51 per cent. I find that in South Renfrew the increase was 36 per cent.; North Simcoe, 46 per cent.; Algoma, 189 per cent. And, Mr. Speaker, it is rather a remarkable thing that while we have here hon. gentlemen telling us that the population is not increasing, their friends in the Legislature at Toronto—so convinced are they of the enormous movement of population to the Algoma district—have actually introduced a Bill for the purpose of giving an additional member to Algoma, and they have made use of that fact to effect a Gerrymander system—

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Who says no?

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). All I can say is, that in my own constituency of Cardwell nobody will recognise it as it is fixed up now, with the simple object, and none other, of giving Mr. Chisholm a safe seat in Peel, which he would certainly have lost if the conditions had remained the same as they now are. For the object of possibly securing one safe seat in Simcoe we find that we are given for the Local—and I am not sorry that Cardwell is to be made a good constituency—a majority of some 400 and odd, when before we had only 40, after very hard fighting. But I say that these gentlemen have in Ontario, for the mere purpose—because that is the pretence—of giving an additional member to Algoma, indicated the fact of their belief in the enormous growth of population in that district, and for the purpose of giving this additional member they have introduced this remarkable Gerrymandering Bill, which, I am bound to say, utterly puts to shame any efforts made in this House in the way of a redistribution of seats, and which, Mr. Speaker, will entitle—not the hon. gentleman in this House, of course—but the Liberal party, to continue to deserve the name which was given to them some years ago by one who knew them well—of the party of organized hypocrisy. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman objected very much to immigration. He told us immigration should, practically be stopped. He said, in fact, that to invite immigrants into this country was simply to bring people here who could only get food by depriving some native-born Canadian of his means of livelihood. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am a native-born Canadian, and I am proud of it; but I am bound to say this: my father was not a native-born Canadian, and I am not going to say here, that because he was not a native of this country he was not just as good as if he had been born here. This country has been made by people who came from the old world; it is being made now by the sons of those who came from the old world, and this attempt to organise a know-nothing club in Canada, and to declare that no man shall have a position in this country unless he happens to be a native-born Canadian, no matter how long he may have resided here, and to do so in the interests of persons who have largely come to the country within a comparatively few years, is a policy which I venture to think will not meet with much sympathy outside. Now, what has been the conduct of the hon. gentleman's friends and himself when he was in office? I think we may fairly say that in those days the condition of the labor market was certainly as depressed, to say the least, as it is at the present moment. In 1877 the number who came into Canada, the number who were encouraged to come to Canada by the efforts of hon. gentlemen opposite, through their agencies on the other side, was 27,076; in 1878 it was 29,080, and a remarkable feature with regard to that immigration is as to its character. Only at Quebec was there a classification of immigrants, according to occupation and nationality, but I think

we may fairly assume that that classification at Quebec will apply pretty well over the whole volume of the immigration. Now in 1877, as I have said, 27,076 immigrants came into the country. Of the number of those who were registered at Quebec, a large proportion were laborers, and I do not think the condition of the labor market in Canada in 1877 was any better than it is to-day. Of the total registered number in that year, 1,118 were mechanics, and I am quite sure that there was not a greater amount of employment for mechanics in that year than there exists at present; and of these two classes of the immigrants which came into Canada, under the auspices of hon. gentlemen opposite, no less than 91½ per cent. were of the very classes as to which last year they were moving resolutions objecting to their immigration, and as to which they are now asking questions, in the direction of excluding them from Canada altogether. Then if you take the year 1878, I find that there were 2,839 laborers and 879 mechanics, or, of the classes objected to by hon. gentlemen now, there were 92 per cent. of the entire classified immigration that came into the country. Well, Sir, I think in the face of that, these hon. gentlemen are hardly in a position to say that this Government has dealt in any sense unfairly with the great working classes of the country in their efforts to encourage immigration into Canada. Sir, we have some illustrations of what the condition of this matter was in these two periods, as indicating, at any rate, that there has been no special reason why an immigration policy which was considered good in 1877 and 1878, should be considered so very bad in 1884. Here, for instance, is a statement of the average rate of wages paid in the Dominion in 1878 and in 1884; and these returns, I may say, are obtained from the agents of the Department of Agriculture in all the cities of Canada where there are agents: Farm laborers, in 1878, got from \$10 to \$20 a month with board; in 1884 they got from \$15 to \$22 per month with board. Common laborers, in 1878, had from 80 cents to \$1 a day; in 1884 they have been getting from \$1 to \$1.75 per day. Female domestics, in 1878, were getting from \$5 to \$6 a month; in 1884 they have been getting from \$6 to \$12 a month; and so far as mechanics are concerned, although there is no statement made, I think we may fairly assume that the rate of wages for mechanics will run substantially upon the same lines as the rate for laborers. We have, Sir, another fact which gives a very strong indication of what the rate of wages at these two periods was—I mean the rate of wages paid in the lumber woods. That is a matter which anyone can test for himself. In 1878, according to the returns, the rate of wages in the woods was \$12 a month, in 1879 \$14, in 1880 \$15.50, in 1881 \$18, in 1882 \$22, in 1883 \$23, and in 1884 it had got back again to \$18 a month; but as between 1878, and 1884 the rate was \$12 a month in the former period, and \$18 a month in the latter, indicating, I think, pretty clearly, that there has been no such plethora of labor in the country as the hon. gentlemen opposite would desire us to believe, in the efforts they are making to show that the country is losing its population and has no room for any others who may wish to come here. Now, Sir, so much for this general question of population; and I have ventured to detain the House thus long upon it, because I notice that it is one of the special arguments which are being used, and I believe it is one of the arguments which, in England, has most effect, in deterring persons not only from coming to Canada but from taking an interest in Canada. I can remember, Sir—I do not know whether I have mentioned it in Parliament before—when in England, in 1870, as a commissioner from the Province of Ontario, as they did me the honor to call me—I remember being in the House of Commons when Mr. McCullough Torrens brought up a motion on the subject of State aid to emigration; and I remember Sir Charles Dilke, as an effective and conclusive answer to the proposition to

aid emigration to Canada, stated that we were losing more population than we were getting into the country by immigration—that is to say, that the population of the country was absolutely decreasing instead of increasing. I know that his argument was regarded as most effective. I do think it is most important in the interests of the country that the simple truth should be told, in order that it should be shown that these statements—and the hon. gentleman gave us the advantage of seeing upon what he based them—are utterly unreliable and are grossly exaggerated, in relation to the actual position of the movement of population in Canada. Now, Sir, I come to another point upon which the hon. gentleman dwelt with some earnestness, and that is as to the expenditure and debt of the country. I do not intend going into this subject at any great length, for the reason that I think the statement made by the hon. Finance Minister on that subject is in itself thoroughly complete. He took, as he had an opportunity of taking, two periods of five years, and he averaged the expenditure during those two periods, for purposes of comparison. Now, I do not propose to do that, but I propose to take two years; I take 1875-76, which may be said to have been a year of plenty in one sense if not in another; because, I suppose, at that time hon. gentlemen opposite thought themselves firmly fixed in their seats, and believed that they were there, at any rate, for a great number of years, if not for all time—I take 1875-76 and the year 1883-84, for purposes of comparison. The expenditure for the first year was \$24,483,372, and the expenditure in the second year was \$31,107,706; so that the excess of expenditure in the latter year over that in the former was \$6,619,334. Now that, on the face of it, is a large increase; nobody can doubt that. As to whether it is a wise increase or not depends entirely on an examination of the figures by which it is made up. The increase is made up by increases in the interest, sinking fund and charges of management of the public debt, amounting to \$1,901,945; increases of ordinary expenditure, amounting to \$2,624,540; and increases in the collection of revenues, amounting to \$2,079,488. Now, Sir, as to the first of these payments: the increase in the net debt since 1878, taking the increases as they appear in the Public Accounts, amounts to \$57,610,336, or 46 per cent. But, Sir, the expenditure upon capital account in connection with the great works upon which the future of this country largely depends, has increased during that period, \$31,822,923, or \$24,211,587 in excess of the addition to the public debt. Then, in this increase to the public debt, we have, included on the Canadian Pacific Railway alone, no less than \$44,353,705; and we have, as debts to the Provinces assumed by the Dominion, that is, simply giving back so much money to the Provinces, \$7,172,297. But, Sir, while the debt has increased 46 per cent., what it is important to remember is, that the burden of the debt—the interest and other charges, the payments which we have to make from year to year, and which may be said to be the measure of the burden of the debt, has only increased 25 per cent.; so that we have an increase of debt of 46 per cent. and an increase of charges connected with the debt of only 25 per cent. Now, Sir, I take the ordinary expenditure, which has increased \$2,624,540—and practically the whole of this increase is included in five items, namely: Public works, \$959,910; mail subsidies and steamboat subventions, a new item, \$238,054; railway subsidies voted by Parliament—and I believe the different sums which go to make up this amount were voted without division—\$204,090; Indian grants, \$839,831; and the Mounted Police, \$116,465; or in all, in these five items, \$2,558,350, or within \$65,190 of the total increase that has taken place between the year 1876 and the year 1884. Now as to these items, I think there is no difficulty, not only in explaining them, but in justifying them. The expenditure on public works has all gone to the country. When a country is well off, when there are surpluses in the

Treasury, it is a wise policy, and it was the policy announced by this Government, that during such time there should be a generous system of dealing with public works, that new buildings should go up where required; and the money was voted by Parliament, if I mistake not, without any one objecting to a single item—nay, if I mistake not, the only complaint made was, that there was not enough voted, that there were not more buildings to be put up than were proposed to be erected according to the estimates. Then there is the item of mail subsidies and steamship subventions, an expenditure entirely in the interest of building up the trade of the country. The railway subsidies were voted without opposition in Parliament, both sides agreeing to the grants. The estimates with regard to Indians and Mounted Police have relation to maintaining the peace and welfare of the great North-West. In the olden days, when the Hudson Bay Company wore a monopoly in the North-West, they looked after the Indians; true, they paid less for the furs and got more for their goods, but they paid considerable sums in a direct way for the maintenance of the Indians and the preservation of peace. Since that time the buffalo, which is the natural food of the Indians, has practically disappeared from the North-West, and the question which we have to deal with is, whether we will feed or fight the red man. Our friends across the line have tried the fighting process, and the history of their western country, is a history we would not desire to see repeated on Canadian soil. The expense, therefore, on the Indians for the purpose of maintaining peace and order among them and giving security to the settlers, is one that cannot be cavilled at, and the same argument applies equally to the grant for the Mounted Police. As I have said, on these items we have, within \$65,000, the entire increase of our expenditure from 1876 to 1884. Take the cost of collecting the revenue. The increase of that is \$2,079,488, but the revenue itself has increased in that same period to \$9,274,373. Of the items mentioned in the cost of collecting the revenue, the post office shows an increase of \$690,138, railways, canals and public works, \$1,258,293, or together, \$1,948,431. But the increased revenue from these sources shows \$281,261 in excess of the increase of the cost of collecting, so that after all, with regard to these two items, which are the largest in connection with the collection of the revenue, we have, as the result of that larger expenditure, an increased revenue of over \$250,000 in the public Treasury. Outside of these two items the increase in the cost of collecting the revenue during that period was only \$131,056, and the increased revenue collected by that \$131,000 was \$8,993,111; or, in round figures, we collected \$9,000,000 increased revenue by an increased expenditure of \$131,000. I do not think that fact indicates that wanton extravagance, that disposition to play the spendthrift in connection with public moneys, which hon. gentlemen would lead us to suppose has characterised the administration of public affairs by the present Government. The statement is very often made, and it was made in this debate by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), that the debt has enormously increased, and we hear hon. gentlemen opposite frequently referring back to 1867, in order to show how serious has been that increase. Well, since 1867 the debt has increased by \$106,433,209, but the capital expenditure during that period has been \$35,841,378 in excess of that increase. What were the causes of the increase. Why, here are four items alone: The debts allowed to the other Provinces \$27,624,638—surely that is not an increase of the burdens of the people; it is a transfer of the burdens from the people in their character of members of the Provinces to the same people in their character as members of the Dominion. Then there is the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$47,291,564; the Intercolonial Railway, which was the work of both parties, undoubtedly,

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

whatever may be said of the Canadian Pacific Railway, \$29,486,027; public works canals etc., \$31,404,938—or on these four items alone we have had an expenditure, since Confederation, of \$135,807,209, or, as I have said, \$29,374,000 in excess of the entire addition to the public debt. Surely, when we are able to show as assets great public works for that increase of debt, we may say that the country is not chargeable with loss under the management of its affairs in this respect. If we take the credit of the country which, after all, is a very fair indication of what is the estimation of our position of people outside, who study our affairs to some extent, if you take the condition of the credit of the country during the two periods, 1867 and 1884, I think you will see that it stands in tolerably good credit. In 1867 the average interest on our debt was 5.41; to-day it is 4.06, or, in other words, while the aggregate debt has increased 145 per cent. the interest charged has only increased 79 per cent. Now, if we take the increase of debt during the last and the present administration, we find the increase from 1874 to 1879 was \$34,665,223, averaging \$6,933,045 a year; from 1879 to 1884 it was \$39,171,663, or, deducting the amounts paid to the Provinces, which we have fairly a right to deduct, of \$7,172,297, this leaves an increase, during the period the present Administration have been in office, of \$31,999,366, making an average annual increase of \$6,399,873, or \$544,172 less than the average annual increase during the preceding five years. Then the net interest shows a still further decrease. The increase in the annual average net interest during the period of office of hon. gentlemen opposite was \$222,345, from 1879 to 1884, under the present Administration, it has been \$124,047, showing that while the debt has increased almost in as great a ratio during the one period as during the other, the increase in charges for interest has been nearly \$100,000 less. Extravagance or economy are, after all, relative terms. If, for instance, you take a farmer, and that is the principle on which hon. gentlemen opposite argue this matter, who starts out with 100 acres of land and who shows, by his books, that to cultivate that land costs so much; and if, after ten or fifteen years, you return and find he has 600 acres of land under cultivation, and that in consequence his expenses are five or six times greater than it was at the outset, what would be said if you were to say to him: Sir, fifteen years ago you only spent \$1,000 a year; to-day you spend \$6,000 a year; therefore you are a spendthrift. Yet, that is precisely the argument hon. gentlemen use in dealing with this country. But, Sir, the hon. gentleman undertakes to tell us that we have increased the debt and that we have increased our expenditure not only very seriously in itself, but that, relatively to the United States, this country is losing the advantage it used to possess of being a less heavily taxed country, with less debt and less annual expenditure. The statement he made at his Montreal meeting was this:

"I am sorry to say that the taxation and expenditure of the people of Canada per head are nearly double those of the United States. Instead of being a lightly taxed country, it is fast becoming one of the most heavily taxed countries in the world."

It is unnecessary to repeat the statements made by the hon. the Finance Minister in his speech upon this subject. Those statements are taken from official records.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE. Does the hon. gentleman doubt that they are taken from official records?

Mr. MILLS. I am not disputing it.

Mr. BOWELL. Then you are approving, I suppose.

Mr. WHITE. Then I shall assume, in future, that when the hon. gentleman says "hear, hear" in an ironical tone of voice, he is approving of the statement made. That is a very useful thing to know in regard to the hon. gentle-

man's utterances. Whatever may be the disputes as to certain items of expenditure, there are two items that cannot be fairly included in any comparison between Canada and the United States. One of these items is subsidies to Provinces, \$3,603,714. The other is the expenditure for the operating of railways and canals. We have simply constituted ourselves a railway company in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, and that ought not to be charged, as we get the receipts from it in the same way as any other railway company. That amounts to \$3,302,791; or together these two items amount to nearly \$7,000,000, or about one-fourth of our total expenditure, and they have no relation whatever to any expenditure of the Federal Government of the United States.

Mr. MILLS. There is the war debt on the other side.

Mr. WHITE. Of course they have the war debt, and that is precisely where we have the advantage of them. They have a large debt incurred for destructive purposes. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) wound up his speech by telling us that that war was less destructive than the public works in Canada.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As administered by this Government.

Mr. WHITE. But it is not necessary, for purposes of comparison, to exclude their war debt. That would be a folly even beyond what I can imagine the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) could be guilty of. What I want to point out is, that the hon. member for South Huron, in his reply, did not successfully, did not venture, I may say, almost at all, with any reasonable attempt at accuracy of statement, to meet the statements made by the Minister of Finance in regard to the comparative expenditure and comparative debt of the two countries. But, after all, there is a way of comparing this matter of expenditure which may be worth while referring to. The hon. gentleman assumes that there ought to be no increase of expenditure in Canada; that we ought to have no public works, no expansion of our railway system; that we ought to leave the Indians in the North-West to do the best they can; that, in fact, anything like an increase of expenditure is, in itself, a blameable act. Well, I will take their favorite Province and mine, for I lived twenty years in it, and I happen to represent a constituency in it to-day—the Province of Ontario. They take the Government of the Province of Ontario as their special model, though I do not think it would be mine. I will take that Province which, according to the hon. member for South Huron, has been actually decreasing in population, which has been losing its population and has not been adding to its territory, a Province where, if anywhere, you ought to have a condition of things, where the expenditure might practically be stationary. But what has been the condition of things? Under the head of consolidated fund, the Dominion increased its total expenditure, from 1876 to 1884, \$6,619,434, or 27 per cent.; and in the Province of Ontario for the same period, the increase was \$905,632, or 46 per cent. Hon. gentlemen may say that we do not include in that the open accounts, and that the expenditure in the Province of Ontario has not been so great if the open accounts are included; but I will take certain details of expenditure; take, for instance, civil government. The cost of civil government in Canada must, in the nature of things, as everyone knows, have largely increased. The statutory increases alone amount to about \$120,000 since the Government came into office. The enormous increase in the North West, the demands upon the Post Office, the Interior, the Indian Office, the large increases which are necessarily coming upon our Department of Railways and Canals for the construction of railways—all these things naturally necessitate

an increase in the cost of civil government. There were none of these things practically in the Province of Ontario. There were no such expansions as required that increase, and yet in Ontario, between 1876 and 1884, the cost of civil government has increased 16 per cent., while, with all our extensions, with all our enlargement of work, it had increased in the Dominion less than double—only 28 per cent. The administration of justice in the Dominion increased 13 per cent., and in the Province of Ontario 15 per cent. The cost of legislation, which is a tolerably good test, increased in the Dominion only \$35,536, or 5½ per cent., while in the Province of Ontario it increased \$34,499, or 32 per cent. And that is a very fair test, and shows that while in that period we have only increased the cost of our legislation by 5½ per cent., that model Government of Ontario has increased it by 32 per cent. The cost of collecting the revenue of all kinds in the Dominion increased 43 per cent.; and the cost of collecting the Crown land revenue, which is the special revenue in Ontario, which involves the maintenance of a machinery for its collection, increased 45½ per cent., or 2½ per cent. more than the increase in the cost of collecting for the whole Dominion. But the revenue in the Dominion increased 41 per cent., while the revenue in Ontario increased only 9 per cent. In other words, it cost the Dominion \$2,079,000 to collect an additional revenue of \$9,247,000, and it cost the Province of Ontario \$32,236 to collect an additional revenue of \$50,052. Practically, every additional dollar of revenue in Ontario cost an additional dollar to collect it. I take the expenditure upon public institutions in the Province of Ontario, and I want you to bear in mind that this is a Province which hon. gentlemen opposite say is stationary in its population, or, at all events, is not growing. I find that the expenditure on public buildings in Ontario has increased, from 1876 to 1884, by 118 per cent., while in colonization roads, which may be said to have some relation to our public works—except that they varied more during election years and non-election years in the Province of Ontario—the increased cost was 116 per cent. Now, Sir, I think that that comparison between the Province of Ontario, the favorite of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the Dominion of Canada, is not at all unfavorable to the present Administration. I think we may fairly say, at any rate, that the mere representation of a charge of more on one side and less on the other, a smaller sum at one period and an increased sum at another, does not in itself indicate that there has been any extravagance in the public expenditure—or at least, the hon. gentlemen, with their knowledge of the conduct of the Government of Ontario, their own friends, are not in a position to take that ground. I referred, a few minutes ago, to the question of the credit of Canada. Now, as indicating what degree of confidence the administration of the affairs of this Government has inspired in that most sensitive of all classes, the investors in public securities, we might fairly take the relation which the securities of Canada bear to those in other countries. The Minister of Finance dealt with that question and gave the figures. If you take the loan of 1876, which the hon. member for South Huron negotiated, and the loan which was put on the market by the hon. Minister of Finance, I think you will find that the credit of the country has so increased as to show, at any rate, that there has been no falling off of confidence in the administration of the affairs of this young Dominion by the gentlemen who are now entrusted with that administration. There are two ways of determining the comparative credit of countries, the price obtained for loans at different periods and the relation that price bears to securities of other countries. The "Cartwright Loan," negotiated in November, 1876, was placed at 91. Now, Sir, on the 27th of February, 1877, Canadian 4's in the English market stood at 93½ to 94½; South Australian 4 per

cents. at 98 to 99; Victoria 4 per cents., 98½ to 99, or an average of nearly 5 per cent. in excess of the price at which Canadian 4 per cents. stood. If you take, on the other hand, the relative of Canadian credit, as shown by the 4 per cent. bonds in London last month, you will find this: that Canadian 4 per cents. stand to-day at 105 to 107; New South Wales, 104½ to 105½; South Australian, 102 to 102½; Queensland, 100 to 102½; Victoria, 103. So that while, in 1877, the relation which Dominion securities bore to those of these Australian colonies was 5 per cent. lower, during the month of February last the relation they stood in was from 2 to 3 per cent. higher, so that to-day no securities stand higher in the English markets than Canadian securities. But, Sir, there is another fact, and although it was stated by the hon. Minister of Finance, I may briefly refer to it, and that is the relations which our securities bear to American securities. Our 4 per cents. have increased since 1878 by 17 per cent., and the value of American 4 per cents. have only increased 19 per cent. The hon. member for South Huron stated, in reference to the last loan, that the Finance Minister had a peculiarly favorable time at which to put it on the market, and he intimated that it was more favorable than the time when he put his loan on the market. Now, the hon. gentleman put his loan on the market in 1876, in November of that year, and we find that the Bank of England rate of discount from May, 1876, to May, 1877, stood at 2 per cent., which was a longer period than it has remained in that position at any time since 1867; so that if there ever was a favorable time for putting a loan on the market it was when the hon. gentleman put his loan on the market in 1876. I do not say that he did not get as much for that loan as he could have got; I do not say that the loan was not well placed; I do not say that he could have adopted another plan and got more for it; I am not going to revive in any way the discussions which have taken place in this House in regard to that subject, but I do say that it is an extraordinary commentary upon the statement which the hon. gentleman has been making, both in Parliament and in the country, that the credit of Canada, in spite of these comments, has gone on so steadily increasing that to-day our securities stand so high that the hon. Minister of Finance was able to put a loan upon the market at such an excess of price over that which the hon. member for South Huron obtained, that the difference in the interest charge in fifty years will wipe out the loan altogether. A stronger illustration of the increased credit and confidence in our financial soundness it would be difficult to find. Now, in regard to the relative merits of the two Governments, the hon. member for South Huron took occasion to read from the *Economist*, of 1874, a very startling statement. He does not give the name of the writer and, of course, he is not called upon to do it; but he says it is a gentleman with whom he is well acquainted, and he wrote to the *Economist* at that time as follows, with reference to the condition of Canada:—

"Thus," he says, "a splendid position has been changed into one of danger, if not of imminent danger. At the beginning, there is a moderate surplus upon moderate totals of receipts and expenditures. Then these totals on both sides increase, with a very large surplus. Finally, there is an enormous increase of the total on the expenditure side, with a deficit of nearly half a million pounds sterling. It is not difficult to see how all this has been brought about. First of all, the great expenditure on new works has gradually increased the direct charge for debt interest. The second cause of increased expenditure has been the maintenance and working of certain undertakings which were intended to be reproductive, but so far from having that character are a direct source of loss. The third source of increased expenditure has been the political extension of the Canadian Dominion. The incorporation of outlying Provinces, like Manitoba, is immediately a source of expense, just as Central Asia costs money to the Russian Government, and many of our Indian Provinces yield less than the cost of governing them. So Canada has added to itself a territory which is a burdensome charge. The older and richer Provinces of Canada are, in fact, paying heavily for the accomplishment of certain political objects, and, now that the penalty must be paid for all these extravagances, the history may be left to tell its own tale. There is no kind of expenditure which re-

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

quires more careful study beforehand and more rigorous restriction by Governments than expenditure on new public works. Territorial expansion is also a luxury, the cost of which should be carefully counted beforehand. Canada has committed the most serious blunders in both respects, and the result is the large deficit and the disagreeable outlook we have described."

Now, Sir, I did not quite understand from the hon. gentleman whether he approved of that statement, and whether, at the time it was written, he thought it fairly and properly described the position of this country. Why should he have presented it and read it unless he intended that to be the case? Yet what do we find? That the hon. gentleman was in England, a short time afterwards; that he being in England issued a circular to the people of the United Kingdom, and I find that circular, which has relation to those very matters which are referred to here, contains some very valuable statements which certainly are not in accord with the extract he read to us from the *Economist*. This statement, I find, is signed by "Richard J. Cartwright, Minister of Finance for the Dominion of Canada." I find it is dated 19th October, 1875, and that the statement in the *Economist* read to us, and which I presume he believed to be a correct statement, was dated 1874. The hon. gentleman being in England—I will not read all the circular—made certain statements, I say, which are certainly interesting. He says:

"The net public debt of Canada of all kinds, after deduction of bankers balances, sinking fund investments, and other cash assets, is at the present day nearly £24,000,000, being about £6 per head of the population on the 1st July last (estimated at the rate of increase established by the census of 1871)."

I notice the hon. gentleman, when issuing that circular, did not object to assume the rate of increase as established by the census of 1871 when dealing with the population of Canada in statements to the English public. Then he gives the particulars of that debt, and he goes on to say:

"The annual interest charged on the external or bonded debt is about £1,000,000, and on the whole remainder, £300,000—in all, about £1,300,000, or about 6s. 8d. per head."

That 6s. 8d. is rather a remarkable statement. The hon. gentleman was in England for the purpose of obtaining a loan; he was there for the purpose of presenting the affairs of this country in their most attractive form, and he thought that the statement that the debt of Canada was 6s. and 8d. per head was such a statement as would not, at all events, alarm investors on the other side. Yet what do we find? While that was the gross interest, we find that at this moment the net interest is only \$1.46, or, in round figures, 6s. per head, instead of 6s. 8d. And yet with that fact, that the net interest to-day is only 6s. per head,—and the hon. gentleman considered 6s. 8d. a fair and reasonable sum to present to the people of England as proof that this country was not in an unsound financial position in 1876—we have the wonderful statement made by him here as to the miserable condition of this country that it is, in fact, worse than if we had gone through a four years' war. What does he say further?

"The whole of this debt has been incurred for legitimate objects of public utility."

If those were legitimate objects of public expenditure, surely the expenditure since made has been made for legitimate objects of public utility as well. They are largely the same objects. For instance:

"Canals, about £5,500,000."

But there has been an increase since that time, and a very large increase, in the expenditure made, first by hon. gentlemen opposite and then made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, in continuation of their contracts, and on new contracts which they entered into themselves.

"Railways, including advances to and the cost of those actually owned by Canada, about £12,000,000."

That was considered an object of public utility; it was so considered by that hon. gentleman when he referred to this matter in the circular to English investors:

"Lighthouses, river improvements, harbors, roads and public buildings, £2,000,000."

If it was legitimate before 1875 to spend money on lighthouses, river improvements, harbors, roads and public buildings, it cannot have been unwise or extravagant to have made similar expenditures upon similar works since.

"Compensation to the various Provinces for property and revenue surrendered to the Dominion, the purchase and organisation of territories, and the freeing of land in the Province of Quebec from the feudal tenure, etc., £5,000,000."

That again is the same compensation as is paid to the various Provinces. The hon. gentleman has objected ever since to any increase of the debt which has practically for the same object, compensation to the various Provinces; yet this circular was written after the first arrangement for better terms, which he denounced from his place the other night. He goes on to say:

"Though many of the public works have so far yielded but a small revenue in comparison with the interest on their cost, much of the expenditure has been regarded, both by the Imperial and Dominion Governments, as necessary, not in the interest of Canada exclusively, but also on national grounds; so much so, that the Imperial Parliament has, at various times, sanctioned guarantees in aid of their construction to the extent of £8,400,000. The engagements of Canada in connection with all these guarantees have been punctually met without any advance whatever from the Imperial Treasury."

The hon. gentleman tells us of another important attraction which Canada had to present to the people of England when he went to get from them a loan of money. That was the deposits in the savings bank. He said:

"The deposits in the savings bank and societies have increased from £1,240,069 sterling, in 1867, to £3,754,820 sterling in 1875."

For what purpose did the hon. gentleman get his loan? Surely, when he asked for a loan in England and issued this circular, it was not for objects on which it was improper to spend money? We have the statement here of the purposes for which the hon. gentleman wanted the money:

"The objects of the Government of Canada in contracting the present loan are threefold:

"(1). For the construction of several great works of internal improvement—

So he was quite prepared at that time to go in for a policy of constructing works of internal improvement. He continues:

"chiefly in connection with the enlargement of the existing canal system, by which it is proposed to improve the communication between Lake Superior and the ocean to such an extent as to permit the passage of vessels of 1,500 tons burden, carrying from 50,000 to 60,000 bushels of grain, the largest size heretofore admitted having been about 500 tons, carrying less than 20,000 bushels.

"(2). To defray expenditure incurred on works of communication with the North-West Territories and the Pacific Railway.

"(3). To recoup the exchequer for bonds actually paid, bearing a higher rate of interest, and to provide for others falling due."

And then we have a very proper and very well written eulogy of the advantages of trade by the St. Lawrence, and reference is made to the great good which would accrue to this country if those expenditures were made. Says the hon. gentleman:

"It need hardly be observed that Canada, possesses many important branches of revenue still untouched, and that the population, though exceedingly well-to-do in the mass, contribute a comparatively small amount per head as compared with most other countries."

It is worth while to point out that when the hon. gentleman told the people of England that Canada had other sources of revenue still untouched, he must have meant that Canada was to go forward in a course of material development and construction of public works, and in those matters connected with the public improvement of the country, to which, since that time, he has seriously objected, and which,

the other night, he undertook to tell us, were equivalent, as regards expenditure, to a four years civil war, such as prevailed in the United States. And, Sir, the hon. gentleman when he came to deal with the business of the country, went further, and he objected to our taking periods of five years. He said:

"Besides, when we have a series of good harvests the manufacturers reap the benefit, to a large extent, and the hon. gentleman is not entitled to take credit for his policy for the fact that there were three successive good harvests in 1881-82-83, and three poor harvests in 1876-77-78. Such an argument merely requires to be stated to be exposed."

In another part of his speech he declared that the Mackenzie Government had been so unfortunate and had been so frowned upon by Providence, while they were in office, they had had five years of bad harvests. Now, what is the fact? The hon. gentleman was a Minister at the time; he had to advise in the preparation of the Governor General's speech, on his sworn responsibility as a Minister of the Crown, and in relation to the condition of the country perhaps he was more directly and personally responsible than any other Minister. And yet what do we find in the Governor General's speech of 1876? The Governor General is made to say:

"At the same time we have reason to be grateful for an abundant harvest."

In 1878, which is certainly included as one of the years mentioned in the extract I have read, the Governor General was made to say:

"I am happy to be able to congratulate you on the abundant harvest reaped in all quarters of the Dominion."

So here we find the hon. gentleman who, on his responsibility as a sworn adviser of the Crown, recommends the speech of His Excellency to be delivered in Parliament, congratulating the country on the abundant harvest reaped in all parts of the country, and then we have him a few years afterwards declaring that that period is not to be judged in comparison with the later period, because during his period the harvests were all bad. Was he right when he made his first statement and advised His Excellency the Governor General to use those words? Did he mean—did he believe what he said? And if he did, how does he venture to stand up in this House, in the face of that statement, which is practically a sworn statement of the Minister at that time, and try now to escape from the results of his own maladministration during the period he was in office, by declaring that during that very period there were bad harvests? Now, Sir, as a matter of fact, we all know that the harvest of 1883 was not an abundant harvest. We all know that in Western Ontario particularly, the harvest of 1883 was a most deficient harvest. We all know that the compiler of statistics in the Bureau of Industries for Ontario, estimated, in his reports, a loss in the grain crop alone, because of the failure of the harvest of 1883, of some 20,000,000 bushels. We know that in Manitoba, during that year, there was a most unfortunate failure in the harvest because of those early frosts overtaking the crops which were sown too late, perhaps owing to the inexperience of the new settlers in that country—a mistake they will, from their experience, be able to avoid in future. Why, Sir, in neither one case nor the other, neither as to the harvests prevailing during his own time of office, nor as to the harvests of the last three years, is the hon. gentleman accurate, and his statement in the first instance is shown to be inaccurate by what is equivalent to his own sworn testimony at the time that condition of things existed. The hon. gentleman went on to say, referring to the condition of the country and referring to the report which has recently been laid on the Table of Parliament by a commissioner appointed to enquire into the condition of the industries of the country—that that report was utterly unreliable, because in one or two places which he men-

tioned—one being the town of Chatham—he says only four industries were referred to, when, as a matter of fact, there were fifty, and where the hon. gentleman, according to his own statement, intimated that the industries, so far from prospering in that place, had actually gone back. I am not here to defend the commissioners' report. We have not all the report before us, and I am sorry for it. I regret it very much; and when the statement was made on the floor of Parliament, I went to Mr. Hartney to get him to press the printers to put the report through as rapidly as possible, so that it would be in the hands of members in the course of this debate. I have seen Mr. Hartney three or four times since; I have strongly urged him to press on the printing of that report; and I cannot understand why—at the moment the printers were complaining that they had no work, and were asking us to send documents to be printed without taking the responsibility of getting the assent of the committee—we have not been able to get printed documents of that kind, which would be of value to us in this discussion. I can only say, Sir, that no one in this House is responsible for that difficulty. But, Sir, there are thirty-four of these fifty industries which the hon. gentleman refers to that are not referred to anywhere, or in relation to any place visited by the commissioners. For instance, there are two malt houses, one brewery, three saw mills, four planing mills, four brick-makers—although I do not see how brick-making establishments can be called factories—two soap factories, two pop factories—and I suppose they will be increasingly important since the adoption of the Scott Act in that country—three marble works, four printing offices—and I do not think printing offices have been referred to anywhere; and nine flour mills, that have not been referred to in any case. Those make thirty-four out of the fifty which are not referred to anywhere, and which lessen, to that extent, the statement of the hon. gentleman. But I find that a local paper in Chatham, has in reply to the other local paper which furnished the hon. gentleman with the statement he made here the other day, gives us some information on this point:

“Of these sixteen namely, nine foundries, two furniture establishments, one biscuit factory, one coast factory (small), one tannery, one cigar factory (small), one woollen factory—do not occur in the report at all, and if we deduct from these all the industries employing less than ten hands—and that is the rule that the commissioner adopted—we reduce the number to a figure which shows that the commissioner was not far astray.”

I find this statement in the paper:

“Of these, the biscuit factory and the tannery (which do not figure in the commissioner's report) have come into existence since 1878. Two of the small foundries are gone, but another, which in 1878 was a small concern, has developed into a large and prosperous business. Another has built new and large workshops, and still another has been merged into one of the most prosperous joint stock companies in the west.”

That is the condition of things with reference to that town. If anyone has reason to complain of the report it is the Ministerial party, because the commissioner has not done full justice to the rapid development of the industries in Chatham. Then the local gives the industries which are not mentioned, and which I have just referred to, and adds:

“If these had all been taken in, the report would have been equally favorable, as there is now four times the amount of milling done than was in 1878. One planing mill has dropped out and two have taken its place.”

That is the position with regard to Chatham, and I do not think, therefore, that it is necessary to go further on that point. I have no doubt that later in the Session there will be a more thorough discussion in regard to the commissioners' report. But, Sir, there is another way in which you can estimate, to some extent, the development of the manufacturing industries of the country. Perhaps one of the most striking ways is to take the imports of coal into a country—the consumption of coal indicating the character of the manufacturing industries of a country. I

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

find, Sir, that of coal—which is an especially good test—the importations were as follows: Of anthracite coal there was imported, in 1878, 420,110 tons, and in 1884, 868,000 tons; of bituminous, there was imported, in 1878, 513,970 tons, and in 1884, 1,118,615 tons, or altogether there was imported in 1878, 933,980 tons, and in 1884, 1,986,615 tons; or an increased importation of coal of 1,053,635 tons; and I find that the increased output of Canadian coal during that time, according to the statement of the Minister of Finance the other night, was 900,000 tons; so that we have an increased consumption of coal in the country, between 1878 and 1884, of 1,952,635 tons. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a tolerably good indication of the growth of industries in this country during that time. Then, Sir, another indication which may be taken is the increased importation of raw material, which, if hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to examine the figures, they will find has increased about the extent of \$13,000,000. Our cotton mills, for instance, it has been said, have been standing still; and yet, curiously enough, we have imported, of raw cotton, in 1884, between 19,000,000 and 20,000,000 pounds, against about 7,000,000 pounds in 1878. That certainly does not indicate that the cotton mills have been standing still. They have not been running as constantly as they were before; they have not been running full time, and some of them have been stopped altogether for a few weeks or months, although business is now reviving and they are beginning to run again. But in the facts of the importation of raw material and the consumption of coal, we have an indication of the growth of industrial enterprise in the country which shows that the statements made in the commissioners' report are what one might expect would be established from the figures furnished by the Trade and Navigation returns. Now, Sir, times have been less active perhaps—that would be the proper way to put it—less active recently than in 1882 and 1883, and there are reasons for it altogether apart from the question of the Government policy or any policy that might be adopted. We had first a large withdrawal of capital from legitimate enterprises to put into speculative enterprises in the North-West. In Toronto, for instance, when the North-West Land Company, which had bought a large quantity of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, opened their books, I am told there was almost a riot in the effort to get into the room to subscribe for the stock of that company, so valuable was it supposed to be. People were anxious to go into all these new enterprises. The tendency of the age, I am sorry to say, is a gambling tendency, in commercial as well as in other matters. There is an eager disposition to make fortunes rapidly. We know that there was an idea that in the North-West there was a remarkable opportunity for making rapid fortunes, and people took money from their ordinary legitimate business and put it into North-West enterprises, and lost it, to the great injury of the credit and business of the country at large. Then we have had, as a result of the boom thus produced, over-importation. That is an event that comes, as we all know, at regular periods. Fortunately, in this case, I believe the merchants of Canada discovered early the mistake they were making, and they began to pull in sail much earlier than they did in 1874 and 1875. They saw, for instance, that manufactories were springing up in the country; they saw that the place of imported goods was being taken by goods manufactured in the country; they sat down and calculated what the effect of this would be; and they commenced lessening their importations at an earlier period than they otherwise would have done. In the meantime, however, there was some depression in consequence of over-importation; but I think the cotton industry may be said to be, after all, almost the only great industry in which there has been any serious or continued depression; and is it to be very much wondered at? We had hon. gentlemen opposite rising in Parliament and declaring what great

profits the cotton lords, as they called them, were getting. We had them telling us that the cotton manufacturers were making their 60 or 70 per cent.; and many people, anxious to make money rapidly, and believing these hon. gentlemen, went into this enterprise. New mills sprang up; and some of the hon. gentlemen themselves, if I mistake not, were so confident of the success of the policy they were condemning, that they actually put money into these cotton mills. If I mistake not, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) had an interest in a cotton mill in the city of Kingston. I know another gentleman who is a very pronounced opponent of this Government, who was on two occasions the opponent of the hon. First Minister in Kingston, Mr. Carruthers, invested money in it, and I think my hon. friend, the present member for Kingston (Mr. Gunn) put money in. These hon. gentlemen, although declaring that the policy was going to ruin the country and everybody connected with it, actually themselves aided in this inflation and this over-production by putting money into these industries. At the start, the cotton mills all went largely into the manufacture of grey goods, because that was a kind of cotton they thought they could get an early market for, and could turn out easily. The result followed which everybody regrets. But there is this fact to be borne in mind with satisfaction, that the cotton industry, as every other industry in the country, is getting down to a business basis; that people are now more careful; that they are multiplying the varieties of their products, and are studying the market very carefully; and I venture to suggest, that if each mill had been its own merchant, a great deal of the difficulties that have arisen would not have arisen in connection with the cotton industry of the country. All these things had their effect. Then another circumstance was the depreciation of values. Every one knows that that was a very serious circumstance; it happened in England as well as in this country. I find, in the London *Economist* of the 31st of January last, an article on the condition of trade, which I have reason to know is from the pen of Mr. Stephen Bourne, who will be remembered as having read a very valuable paper on Imperial Confederation before the British Association last year in Canada, and who is the chief of the Statistical Branch of the Department of Customs in England. He quotes a number of figures, all going to show that there has been a very serious depreciation in the value of goods in England as well as elsewhere. For instance, he takes four classes of goods—textile manufactures, minerals and metals, articles of food, and miscellaneous—and he finds that there was a larger quantity of these goods exported in 1884, by £2,733,000, estimated by the price of the year before, than in the year before, and an absolute decrease in price of £9,605,000. I think that is a remarkable statement in relation to the depreciation in values. Then he comes to these conclusions:

"First. During the year just ended our whole exports were valued at £10,000,000 less than last year, for, although our increased sales are represented by nearly £2,000,000 for quantity, the fall in prices have occasioned them to bring in less by £12,000,000. In other words, our export trade has expanded a little beyond 6 per cent. in volume. This larger volume has shrunk by just about 4 per cent. in value.

"Second." That of British produce and manufacture alone, the increased quantity figures for not far from £3,000,000, or at the rate of 1½ per cent. for addition to volume, accompanied by a decreased value of nearly £10,000,000, or 4½ per cent."

And he makes the general statement that, taking the aggregate trade of Great Britain, the depreciation of values alone represents the large sum of £46,000,000 sterling. That depreciation had its effect. The merchants in Canada had bought goods at figures on which they could not realise a profit. Take, for instance, the case of the sugar refiners. The sugar refiners, many of whom are merchants as well, imported the sugar at prices which they supposed were certain to bring them a profit, because the prices were lower

than any known for years, yet the refiners found the prices going down lower and lower, and they had to stand a loss; but the loss suffered by them during the past year could not, in consequence, be charged in any way to the effect of the National Policy. Owing to the enormous depreciation of the value of the raw material, which they had imported at higher prices than they could sell it at, they had to stand heavy loss. These facts have tended very considerably to reduce the volume of business in the country, and to bring about in that way the comparative depression that has existed. The same thing has occurred in the United States. In Bradstreet's circular we find an estimate of the prices in the United States of certain articles in July, 1878, and December, 1884. The remarkable thing with regard to that estimate, and it applies equally I believe to Canada is, that while the articles which the farmer uses have gone down enormously in value, the article which he produces, leaving out wheat, or, at any rate, many of them, have actually increased in value during that period. The following are the figures:—

	July 1878.	Dec. 1884.
FOOD PRODUCTS :		
Wheat, No. 2 red, bushel.....	1·05	·87
Flour, extra (winter), barrel....	4·00	3·00
Corn, No. 2, mixed, bushel	·47½	·75
Butter, State dairy, pound	·16	·25
Cheese, State factory, fancy, pound	·08½	·12½
Sugar, fair refining, pound.....	·07 3-16	·04½
Sugar, refined granulated, pound	·09½	5·08
Coffee, fair Rio, pound	·15½	·09½
Tea, Formosa, Oolong, superior, pound	·25	·23
Tea, Japan (good medium), pound	·23	·19
Rice, domestic, fancy, pound.....	·07	·06½
Tobacco, leaf, pound	·05	·08½
Fresh beef, pound	·08½	·10
Fresh mutton, pound.....	·08	·06½
Mess pork, barrel	10·30	12·25
Mess beef, barrel	11·50	11·50
Lard, refined, per pound.....	0·72	0·72
MISCELLANEOUS :		
Cotton	·11 7-16	·11 1-16
Wool	·36	·32
Cotton cloth	·03½	·03 3-16
Nails	2·25	2·10
Coal	2·75	3·00
Lumber	8·00	8·50

Those depreciations in the values of the articles which enter into the ordinary business of the country have had the effect to which I referred. Another thing which has had a depressing effect is, that the settlement in the North-West has not been as large as we reasonably expected it would be.

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

After Recess.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 72) respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Rykert.)

Bill (No. 73) to incorporate the Calgary, Edmonton and Athabasca Landing Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 74) respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Royal.)

Bill (No. 76) to amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macmillan, Middlesex.)

Bill (No. 77) to incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Bill (No. 78) to incorporate the Truro Bank.—(Mr. Tupper.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). When the House rose I was about proceeding to refer to another of the incidents which led to some check in the flow of business in this country, and

that was the disappointment in relation to the extent of settlement in our Canadian North-West. I think we may fairly say that under all reasonable circumstances we had a right to anticipate a larger settlement than took place in that part of the country, but there is a remarkable fact in connection with it, and that is, that although the settlement in the Canadian North-West was not quite up to what was expected, the deficiency in the settlement was about the same in the United States as well. In Dakota and Minnesota I find that the proportion of the falling off in the previous year was just about as great as that in the North-West. For instance, in 1883 there were taken up of homesteads, in the Canadian North-West, 970,719 acres; and in 1884, 582,280 acres. Of pre-emptions there were taken up in 1883, 659,120; and in 1884, 364,060. Of sales there were 202,143 acres, in 1883, and 213,172 acres, in 1884; or a total, in 1883, of 1,831,982 acres; and in 1884, 1,110,512 acres. We find that in Dakota and Minnesota the falling off was as follows: From 15,196,594, in 1883, to 9,222,757, in 1884. That is to say, the decrease in the settlement of the American Territories was 39.56 per cent., and in the Canadian North-West, 39.92 per cent., so that the decrease in each country was, in comparison, almost precisely the same. The most serious regret in connection with that is that the falling off is to be traced to circumstances which I believe were largely within our own control. In the opening up of that country, in incurring large obligations for the purpose of putting a railway through it, to supply railway facilities to the people who might go in there, we had a right to expect, whatever differences of opinion might exist as to the policy of the Government or as to the manner of constructing that railway, that, in relation to the effects of that railway upon the country and as to the country itself, there would be no difference of opinion. We had a right to hope, and I think everyone will say that it was not an unreasonable hope, that, while we might have our conflicts and our controversies on the floor of Parliament as to which was the better way of developing that country and constructing a railway through it, at any rate, as to the country itself, there would be a unity of sentiment in the House and out of it. But we found that in almost every debate in this House hon. gentlemen opposite were doing whatever they could to discourage immigration to that country, to create an impression that it was not a desirable country to emigrate to, and to depreciate its value in this way as a desirable field for emigration. We had a member of that party, no less distinguished than the leader of the Opposition, at a meeting in Bowmanville, declaring that, although he had not theretofore said very much in relation to that country, although he had been cautious not to express any opinion of his own, yet, having made thorough enquiry from a number of persons who had seen the country and whose opinions were therefore of value, he was in a position to state, and he did state, on his responsibility, that 300 or 400 miles of the country were utterly unfit for settlement.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE. Well, it was so near that, that if the hon. gentleman will state what he did say, I venture to say it will be found to be practically that, that the road ran through a country practically unfit for settlement. On the floor of this House, what had we in regard to the route of the Canadian Pacific Railway? We had statements that it ran through a country, for the large part of it, several hundreds of miles of it, simply fit for the growth of the cactus and unfit for ordinary cultivation and for successful settlement; and yet we have had evidence since, from a quarter that I think will be received in this House as worthy of all possible acceptance, that is the testimony of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who, after going through the country, after travelling over that railway, after examining for himself, in his own practical way, the character

Mr. WHITE (Gardwell).

of the country through which the railway passed, came back to Winnipeg, and in a speech there, declared that he was himself surprised, gratifyingly disappointed, at what he had seen, and condemned his own press and his own colleagues in public life, members of his own party, for the exaggerations they had been guilty of in regard to that country. That was one of the reasons why the settlement of that country was not as great as it might otherwise have been. Then we had the agitations in the North-West itself. We had those agitations, largely promoted, I believe, by political motives. I should be sorry to say that all those who engaged in the meetings of the Farmers' Union, that all those who believed honestly that they had grievances that might be remedied by meeting together and having concerted action, were influenced by partly political feeling. But, I have no hesitation in saying that the motive and inspiration of those who took the leading part in the organisation was political and only political, that it was designed for the purpose of creating a feeling against the country, in that way lessening the immigration to the country, in that way lessening the value of the policy which this Government had adopted, and to the extent of the failure of that policy resulting from these causes, discrediting the Government itself. Thus we had these attacks made upon that country. I can quite understand that last year, or rather the year before, owing to the early frosts that occurred, the exceptionally early frosts, such as had not been known for years before, and may not be known, I trust, for many years to come, judging the future by the past, many of the farmers there felt they had come to a country where they were liable to these disadvantages; but, when this organisation met together in Winnipeg, and deliberately passed a resolution—a more insane proceeding one could hardly imagine—warning people against coming to the country at all, one could readily understand that under the influence of an agitation of that kind and action of that kind there would be a less gratifying flow of immigration to the North-West. I am glad to see by the papers of this evening that the Farmers' Union, at any rate, whatever they may have to say about their local grievances, are no longer disposed to attack the country itself. I am glad to see, if the statement is true, that when it was supposed that a secession movement was on foot, and when some loyalists went to put it down, they found only one man a secessionist. I am glad to see that this is the fact, and that the Farmers' Union are not disposed to be made the tools of political agitators to injure the future of the country. If they will fight their own political battle, with which we have nothing to do here, if they will conduct their own local controversies with respect to their own Local Legislature, with which we have no concern, and will do it as men anxious each to promote in the best possible way the advantage of the country, nobody can possibly object to controversy of that kind, and I think we may very fairly look forward, in view of what has occurred last year in Manitoba and the North-West, to a better condition of things in that regard and a larger immigration into that country in the early future. The hon. gentleman from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), spoke of the conduct of this Government as having retarded settlement in the North-West; he described it as having prevented people from going in; he even referred to the Canadian Pacific Railway and its construction as one of the causes which had prevented settlement from going in. What do we see this year, with all this huge monopoly, this grinding monopoly of which we have heard—the Canadian Pacific Railway? We see these two remarkable facts, that while in the American States of Minnesota and Dakota the railway companies and the millers are practically one combination, the one playing into the hands of the other, so that no man is permitted to buy wheat unless he buys

it through the elevator, which is the property of the miller as well as of the railway company, and while, as the result of that, the millers have been able to control the price of grain in that American North-West, to the great disadvantage of the farmers, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, in their operations in our Canadian North-West, have refused to yield to any such influences as that, and have declared that every man shall have the opportunity of going into the market as a free man and getting the highest prices for wheat, and shall have the best facilities for the shipping of it at every practicable point; and, Sir, what has been the practical result of this? The statement has been made, upon the responsibility of gentlemen who are themselves interested, and who have paid money in connection with the wheat products of that country, that the average price of wheat in Manitoba and the Canadian North-West this year has been 12 cents a bushel more than it has been on the American side. And more than that, we have seen farmers on the American side actually teaming their wheat across into the Canadian territory, paying the 15 cents duty, and then going back with 4 cents a bushel more in their pocket than they would have had if they had sold their wheat on their own side. These are evidences that the policy of the Government in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway has not been an injury to the farmers of that country; and it is a proof that the farmers are beginning to realize the advantages which they possess in the Canadian North-West over the farmers of Dakota and Minnesota. There is no doubt that there will be, in the near future—in fact, I believe the movement has already begun—a migration of Canadians hitherto settled in Minnesota and Dakota—largely because of the agitation in this country against our own territory, the statements as to the greater advantages offered by the Americans, who will take up their residence in the Canadian North-West, becoming loyal British subjects, and live under the old flag which, I am sure, in spite of the fact that they have gone to Minnesota and Dakota, they still revere and honor. I think, therefore, we may fairly expect that this cause which has tended to place a momentary check on the commercial prosperity of that country will soon pass away. We have, as one of the evidences often referred to, of the fact that there has been some depression in Canada, a reference to the failures that have taken place; and let me, for a moment, state the facts briefly, in order to complete this part of the argument. Everyone who knows anything of England will admit that the depression has been more severe there during the past year than it has been at any time during the last quarter of a century. Ask any commercial traveller who has been in England buying goods what condition of things he found there; ask anyone who has an opportunity of testing the feeling of the commercial circles in Great Britain; look at the records of people out of employment, and at the record of failures, and you will find the statement is absolutely accurate, that for a quarter of a century no such depression has existed in England as was that which has existed during this last year. In the United States the depression has been about as severe as the depression of 1877-78. I find that the failures in Canada this last year have been 1,327, with liabilities of \$19,191,306; while in 1879 the failures were 1,902, with liabilities of \$29,347,937. Then, Sir, the trades have increased in number from 56,000 to 69,994, an increase of 13,994; so that while in 1884 we had one failure to every 53 persons in trade, in 1879 we had one failure to every 29 persons in trade; while in the United States there was one failure to every 82 persons in trade in 1884, and one failure to every 62 persons in 1878. This shows that while there has been a depression in Canada in some particular lines, and while all have felt the effect of a depreciation in values, the number of failures, relatively to the number in 1879, has been very much less in Canada than in the United States. Now, Sir, I daresay

that hon. gentlemen opposite will say that there ought to have been no failures, and that at the time of the adoption of the National Policy the country was promised that there would be no depression; they will no doubt contend that we ought to have avoided the evil results of a depreciation in values. I have no doubt that my hon. friend from Brant (Mr. Paterson), who is going to follow me, will take that line of argument, and will probably quote a number of extracts from speeches made by Conservatives in 1877, when this question began to be agitated, for the purpose of showing that there should be no failures whatever. Sir, what was urged in 1877-78 was this: That in view of the conditions of this country and its relations to the neighboring Republic particularly, there were means which might be adopted by the Parliament of Canada that would do much towards mitigating the depression which at that time existed. The question of the National Policy, allow me to say, has never been a question of 20 per cent., or 25 per cent., or 30 per cent.; the question of the National Policy has been simply this: What arrangement of our tariff, what arrangement of our commercial system, will reasonably give to men of capital an opportunity to carry on their business with a prospect of success against the competition of our neighbors on the other side. At that time we pointed out two or three ways in which injury was being done by the absence of legislation, and when we urged legislation to remedy it, these hon. gentlemen folded their arms and took the ground that it was no part of the business of Parliament to consider how, by legislation, our commercial interests could be promoted, but that on the contrary it was a matter which must be left to the ordinary laws of supply and demand, and that in relation to a commercial policy Parliament should have regard simply to the question of raising so much revenue to meet the expenses of the Government. Sir, we pointed to the West India trade—gone. We urged that a change should be made in the sugar duties, not altogether for the purpose of promoting refining in Canada, but of promoting the West India trade through refining in Canada. That was the policy we urged and that policy was adopted. Did it produce the effect?

Mr. VAIL. No.

Mr. WHITE. Let the hon. gentleman look at our import trade from the West Indies to-day, compared with our import trade from the West Indies in 1878, and will he tell me that the result of the policy that has been adopted has not been to bring in raw sugars instead of the refined sugar, which formerly came from the refineries of Great Britain and the United States, by that means to promote trade with the country of production instead of with the country where the sugar was refined? Sir, I know that the people of Halifax have an idea that a rearrangement of the method of collecting the duty might have the effect of promoting still further trade with the West India islands to the prejudice of trade with other foreign countries. I know they have an idea down there—I am not going to say whether it is correct one or not; that is a matter, I fancy, that the people will have to arrange with the Government—I know they have an idea that if people could be prevented from introducing raw beet root sugar, they would have a larger quantity of sugar brought in from the West Indies. That may be true, and it may be wise to adopt that policy. I am not discussing that question; but what I am discussing is this, that the policy which was adopted has had the effect of bringing enormous quantities of raw sugar from the West Indies, and creating in that way a trade with those countries of sugar production which, at that particular time, had practically ceased to exist. Then, Sir, we pointed out to them, with respect to the tea trade, that their policy was destroying the distributing trade in Canada, that the large tea merchants were being deprived of the business which

legitimately and fairly belonged to them, and that American merchants were becoming distributors, not to the advantage of Canadian consumers, but to the disadvantage of Canadian merchants. We pointed out how that might be remedied. But the hon. gentlemen said: No, we will do nothing of the kind; that is a matter we have not care of, that affects us not in the least. Well, Sir, that policy was changed, and what has been the result? Let the hon. gentleman look at the figures of the direct importations from China and Japan, as compared with what they were in 1878, and let him look at the distributing trade in the hands of Canadian merchants, results which have been secured since the National Policy has come into play. If he will look at other industries he will find similar results. That men who, before, could have little chance, and less chance in view of the steadily growing condition of things in the United States, than they had before to continue business in Canada successfully under the competition of the manufacturers of that country, have been able to carry on business since. In 1873, in 1872 and still further back, during the period of and succeeding the American war, when there was an inflated currency on the other side, when values were exceedingly high there, when, as the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) admitted in his speech the other night, the smuggling was from this side into that country, there was no necessity for protection, no necessity for a high duty. We had, as a matter of fact, in the conditions which existed in the two countries at that time, even a higher protection in our favor than the protection we have had since, in view of the relative conditions which existed between the two countries. But as those conditions changed, as, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman, the smuggling is from that country into this, instead of from this country into that, then came into play the policy which has been and is now adopted, and without which the vast majorities of the industries of this country would have ceased to exist and the capital invested therein would have been absolutely destroyed. No policy can compensate for the want of capital; no policy can compensate for the want of skill, because in these days we have keen competition, we have improved machinery, and when the appliances are so great as they are the competition is necessarily keener than it was before. And all we propose to do, all the Government policy proposes to do, is to give to the skilled, industrious, competent manufacturer, the opportunity of carrying on business in fair competition with his American neighbors who are engaged in the same occupation. I believe that at this moment there are indications that trade is getting into a better condition. We have been enjoying for some time past the free traders paradise—a cheap country to live in. The real trouble has been that articles have been too cheap, and that very thing which hon. gentlemen opposite have been arguing we should endeavor to bring about is the very thing which has produced the difficulty from which to some extent, we have been suffering during the last twelve months. Go to a merchant and ask on what his hopes rest for a revival of business. He will tell you, in the fact that prices are beginning to stiffen, as he expresses it, and there are likely, therefore, to be better times. I say there are indications of that at this moment, indications that give hope to the commercial community that things are going to be better than they have been recently. Then we have an indication in the revenue for the last two months, as compared with the corresponding two months of last year, that there is a probability of a revival of trade. I shall be sorry, I have no hesitation in saying it, if merchants imagine that all possible difficulty has passed away. But I am satisfied of this, that business in this country is at this moment in a condition of great promise than has prevailed for the two years past, and that by reasonable precaution on the part of the commercial community we are likely to enter upon a period of substantial prosperity.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

similar to that which we enjoyed a year or a year and a half ago. We have some evidences of this in what is said by the people. Take the city of Montreal, which may be said to be in some sense a barometer showing the commercial condition of the country. The *Star*, which is certainly not a conservative newspaper, and it is certainly not a liberal one in the party sense, sent a reporter to find out from the different merchants and manufacturers of Montreal what was the present condition of trade. He found that vast differences of opinion existed. He heard in some quarters statements that there were a large number of people out of employment; in other quarters that times were tolerably dull; but he found in other quarters, and the curious fact is, that in those quarters where they had the means of making a substantial test, the condition of things was reported to be a great deal better even than the editor of the *Star* had imagined them to be. For instance, Mr. McMillan, superintendent of the Protestant House of Industry and Refuge, reports that there were in the institution during the first three weeks of January, 1884, 2,840 inmates, and during the same month of 1885, 1,956, a decrease of about 900. The number of meals distributed, because that institution distributes meals, taking the same months, was, in 1884, 8,467; in 1885, 6,033, or a decrease of about 2,500. That does not look like a serious condition of things in a great manufacturing city like Montreal. On the contrary, it shows that the destitution among the working class is just about the normal destitution prevailing at the same season in other years. We have in Montreal, as they have in Toronto and other cities, institutions for taking care of the poor and helpless who will always be with us; we have those institutions to which wealthy men, recognising the responsibilities of wealth, contribute of their money in order that persons may not suffer want or starvation; and we find in Montreal that the condition of things is, as I have stated, at that leading institution, as between that period of 1885 and 1884. We find Mr. Gilbert, of the Canada Engine Works, saying:

"The men are working full time. The firm has discontinued altogether the manufacture of steamboat engines, and the employes are engaged solely upon work for the establishment, repairing dredges, etc. There have been a large number of applications for work from workmen, sometimes as many as twelve a day, and tales of distress are frequently heard. They had no personal knowledge of any cases of absolute want, but had heard rumors of instances in which the men hardly knew how to get a living. Mr. Gilbert is of the opinion that there will shortly be an improvement in the state of trade, as matters have begun to assume a more favorable aspect in the States.

"The railway car wheel manufactory of Messrs. John McDougall & Co. is running full blast, and has a full complement of men employed. It was learned here that there had been a great many applications for work, but in nine cases out of ten the unemployed were either men of unsteady habits or men who could not take such work as he offered them."

There is no one who knows anything about large cities who does not know that this is unfortunately a class to be found in them at all times, and unfortunately there are numbers of them who appeal to the charity of those who are disposed to be charitable.

"A responsible employe of the foundry said that in his opinion there was lots of work for all men who are of good character and men who wanted work.

Then I find that:

"About four hundred hands are employed at the mills of Messrs. Belding, Paul & Co., silk manufacturers. Of these, about one-fifth are men. There has been no decrease in the number of employes as compared with this time last year," said an official. "There have been no more applications for work than formerly, and there is no more distress among the bread winners." The official who tendered this information stated that business is not as much demoralised here as in the States. They have had some employes who went to the other side for work, return to them after a short time with the intelligence that in the face of the high rate of living and other similar circumstances, they were unable to secure as good a living as in Canada."

Then I find that both of the sugar refineries were practically working at full time. Then I have the statement of a gentleman whose opinion will be received by hon. gentle-

men on the other side as of some value—Mr. J.K. Ward, the gentleman who was the Liberal candidate in West Montreal at last election, and who, if report speaks truly, will be the Liberal candidate there at the next election. He says: "So far as the cotton trade"—and he is largely interested in that trade:

"So far as the cotton trade was concerned, the mills were not employing their full number of hands; the Merchants Company were running about two-thirds of their machinery; the St. Ann's about one-third or a half, and the Hudon about two-thirds. Of course in all cases the best hands has been kept on, and the inferior or unsteady ones have been dismissed. In the timber trade —

In which Mr. Ward is also largely engaged,

"there was the usual slackness, but married men often refused to go out in the lumber camps where they would get good wages, and preferred to remain at home in idleness. He did not think that there was very much more than the usual number of unemployed work people."

Then Mr. P. W. St. George, who is city surveyor, and is in a peculiarly favorable position to know something of the labor market in Montreal, says:

"That he was of the opinion that there are no more laboring men out of employment now than there have been during the past few winters. He remarked that after the recent heavy snow storm his foremen had been unable to procure the required number of men to clear the streets, and when the ice roads were made, considerable difficulty was experienced in procuring laborers."

Now, that does not look as if people were seriously—there are always a number of them—as if an unusual or abnormal number of people were out of employment. Mr. King, of Rogers & King, founders, said:

"He believed that the want said to be existing in Montreal was not greater than that usually found at this period every year. Investigation would show that the majority of those out of employment were laborers who worked along the docks in summer. The works of his firm are running full time, and employing over 110 men. They have not discharged a hand, nor have the wages suffered any reduction. A greater boom in business is anticipated at an early date."

Mr. A. F. Gault, the well known director of the Hochelaga cotton mills, said:

"We have not discharged one hand on the score of retrenchment during the season, but, on the contrary, want more weavers; our staff now numbers about 900 operatives at Hochelaga, all told, and 400 at St. Ann's, all working on full time and at current wages; any rumor of distress through discharge of hands from our mills is without the slightest foundation."

Now, Sir, it will be seen, with regard to that, that the condition of things in that large manufacturing and commercial centre is about the same as the year before, and certainly no one will pretend to say that the condition of things the year before was a condition of distress or depression in connection with the business of the country. The hon. gentleman made complaint as to the future policy of the Government. Referring to their failure in the past, as he described it, he said there were no references whatever to the question of a treaty with the United States, and he evidently thought that was, on the part of the Finance Minister, a serious omission in a Budget Speech in a time like the present. The hon. gentleman is quite right in saying that this year we shall enter on a new condition of things; that the lapsing of the Washington treaty will close the markets of the United States to the fish of the Maritime Provinces and Quebec. But, what I am bound to say, is rather remarkable, is to hear these hon. gentlemen who denounced, as we all remember they did denounce, the Washington treaty when it was adopted; who charged the First Minister with having been a recreant to his trust as a Canadian, in consenting to that Washington treaty at all, now conjuring up enormous evils as certain to result from the lapsing of the very treaty whose enactment in the first instance they so strongly condemned. In the elections of 1872, as I remember very well, their strong card was "the Washington capitulation," as they were pleased to call it, and we were told that the Government committed an act of arrant folly in entering upon the treaty at all. Well, if that

was true, if the treaty was a bad one; if it was one which should not have been negotiated; it seems to me that we should not be seriously alarmed now, when the time has come when we are to be rid of a bad bargain. But I did agree with the hon. gentleman then; this country did not agree with him then, and I am satisfied the people of this country, not agreeing with him then, realise that it would be to the advantage of Canada, and to the advantage of the United States as well, if we had fair reciprocal relations, both as to fish and the other natural products of the country, between those two great peoples. But when the hon. gentleman says that there has been no reference to treaties, he does not quite state the fact as it exists. We find that this Government, in the very first Session in which they met Parliament as a Government, placed on the Statute Book, an enactment which was practically an invitation to the people of the United States to enter into reciprocal relations with them. They took the power from Parliament, that whenever the United States chose to remove the duty, chose to enter into reciprocal relations with them, they would have authority to enter into those relations. The Finance Minister is charged with having made no reference to treaties in his speech; but we find that he has, in a much more formal manner than by a mere speech, by resolutions which he has submitted to Parliament and which will be embodied in an Act of this Parliament—taken power to arrange for such a treaty, if the United States are disposed to enter into it. We have imposed duties on fish, and I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will not say that that is not a wise thing to do with them, in view of the fact that the American market has been closed to us. We have adopted, in regard to fish, practically the same policy which has been the policy of this Government in relation to other matters. Not having reciprocity of trade, we are going to have reciprocity of duties; and those duties are imposed so that the Canadian market may, to its extent, be supplied by our own fishermen—the Canadian market is to be kept for the Canadian fishermen. But while doing that the hon. gentleman has put into his resolution this proviso:

"Provided, that the whole or part of the said duties hereby imposed may be remitted upon proclamation of the Governor in Council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that the Governments of the United States and the island of Newfoundland, or either of them, have made changes in their tariffs of duties imposed upon articles imported from Canada, in reduction or repeal of the duties in force in said countries."

Now, Sir, there is a distinct statement, made in the most formal manner in which a statement can be made—a statement in an Act of Parliament, that the people of Canada are ready to enter into reciprocal relations with our friends on the other side or with our fellow-colonists of Newfoundland, the very moment the one or the other is prepared to enter into arrangements with us. No more formal declaration of the opinion of Parliament could possibly be made; and I think it is a much more dignified way, in view of what has occurred in the past, of dealing with this question, than would be the plan of sending commissioners once more to Washington, to be received as unfortunately as our commissioners have been received in the past. Sir, I had the privilege—I regard it as a very great privilege—during six years, I think, of attending the meetings of the National Board of Trade of the United States. I went there, along with other gentlemen from Canada, as representatives of the Dominion Board of Trade, which was then in existence, for the purpose, not of urging, but of discussing this question of reciprocal trade relations between the two countries. At every one of those meetings we had reasonable and fair discussion; but if hon. gentlemen will look at the records of the National Board of Trade during those years, if they will look at the record of its last meeting, as the expression of the opinion of the merchants of the United States, they will find that that body, in view of what Canada has done in the past, in the way of sending

commissioners to the United States, recognise that all that Canada is called upon to do is to indicate its willingness to enter into negotiations, but that, in view of the past, the first advances in that direction should come from the United States. I do not think for a moment that the Government of Canada should stand upon any punctilious form in regard to a matter of this kind. No doubt a suggestion from the British Minister at Washington, for instance, that there was a prospect of fair relations between the two countries, would at once lead to such negotiations as might result in bringing about reciprocity between the two countries. But for the Government of Canada to do as hon. gentlemen opposite indicate they should do, as the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) indicated in his speech, by his reference to this question, was his desire they should do—send down to Washington, without invitation, without suggestion, verbally made or received, another commissioner, to meet with the same humiliation which was meted out to the late Hon. George Brown, when he went there, and when he constructed a draft treaty, which practically gave up everything and got comparatively little in return, and then found that it was not even discussed in the Senate of the United States—that this Government should be asked to do that, is that they should be asked to do what I venture to say the people of Canada, having regard for their own self-respect, would not ask them to do. Now, Sir, we have had in this debate from the hon. gentleman, and we have seen in other quarters as well, extraordinary appeals, both direct and by way of suggestion, to the workmen of Canada. We had in the know-nothing proclamation of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), a suggestion that we were to have, hereafter, nothing but native Canadians in Canada; that, practically, it was an offence for any man who was not a native Canadian to come into the country or to remain in it. We had the suggestion that the policy of the Government in relation to workmen, and especially with regard to immigration, has not been a favorable policy; and we have had statements by hon. gentlemen on the platform outside of Parliament, and by some of them in Parliament, calculated to excite the feelings of workmen against the Government of the day. For instance, as to the question of the terrible burden which has been imposed on the working men of Canada, the leader of the Opposition, in one of his speeches, in Toronto, I think, made the statement that the direct burden of taxation which workmen have to bear under the present tariff is about \$50 per family. Now, Mr. Speaker, one does not know quite how these figures have been arrived at; but if you look at the census of 1881 you will find that at that time there were 812,136 families in Canada. Taking the accepted increase at 2 per cent. a year since that time, there will be an addition of about 50,000 families; so that to-day there ought to be 862,136 families in the Dominion. What were the total Customs duties?—and after all, as a matter of the incidence of taxation, that is all a man has to pay in Canada, because he does not need to pay any Excise duty. If he drinks whiskey, it is his own lookout; it is a luxury; he takes it and he pays for it. If he smokes tobacco, that is a luxury; he is not bound to smoke tobacco.

Mr. BLAKE. Is he bound to take sugar, too?

Mr. WHITE. Is there an Excise duty on sugar?

Mr. BLAKE. No; there is a Customs duty on it.

Mr. WHITE. I am discussing the question of Customs duties, and I have just stated that the Customs duties are what the workmen have to pay.

Mr. BLAKE. Very well.

Mr. WHITE. Does the hon. gentleman agree with me, then?

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

Mr. BLAKE. No; what I said was, that the hon. gentleman said the workingman was not bound to take whiskey, and therefore the Excise should not be charged. I ask, was he bound to take sugar, and should the Customs be charged? Does he take sugar in his?

Mr. WHITE. There is a model temperance man for you. There is the hon. gentleman who is going to lead the temperance cohorts in Canada, who is pleading to-day for the support of the temperance people, and who insinuates that whiskey and sugar are equally unnecessary, are one and the same thing, and that because a workingman is not bound to use whiskey, the same argument applies to sugar. Well, I think sugar may be regarded as a necessary of life. I do not think whiskey is a necessary of life. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman thinks so or not.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not.

Mr. WHITE. I do not think so; but I do think sugar is a necessary of life; and when the hon. gentleman endeavors to draw a parallel between the workmen's ability to give up the use of sugar and their ability to give up the use of whiskey, he simply insults the intelligence of the workmen, whose intelligence, let me tell him, he very greatly underrates. I was saying that the Customs duties, and they include sugar, are, after all, what the workmen may be said to have to pay; and the Customs duties in that year amounted to \$20,023,890. or at the rate of \$23.22 instead of \$50 per family, as the hon. gentleman put it.

Mr. BLAKE. No.

Mr. WHITE. No? Does the hon. gentleman pretend to say that \$20,000,000 of Customs duties to 862,000 families is more?

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman want to know the basis of my calculation?

Mr. WHITE. Yes, I do; most decidedly.

Mr. BLAKE. What I stated was reported in the newspapers. I did not exclude the Excise. I took the Customs and the Excise duties, and I pointed out that the consumer paid something approaching 50 per cent. in excess of what went into the Treasury. I took the Customs and Excise duties and I added something approaching 50 per cent., and that made \$50 a head.

Mr. WHITE. I see that hon. gentlemen behind the leader of the Opposition are satisfied with that statement.

Mr. BLAKE. It was the statement I made.

Mr. WHITE. What then has become of all the arguments we have had during this debate, as to the relative taxation of the United States and Canada? Are we to be told that because we charge an average here of somewhere about 20 per cent. on our importations—

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Nearer 40.

Mr. WHITE—that the man who buys, pays that fine on the article that is produced in the country, and that in the United States, where nearly double is charged, the man who buys does not pay it? Let the hon. gentleman take one ground or the other; but let him not, in this House, as in everything else, take one measure for the people of Canada and a different measure for the people of the United States, in order that he may prove to people outside that the people of Canada are much more burdened with taxation, much less advantageously situated, than the people of the United States. The hon. gentleman should take one position or the other, and I care not which he chooses to take. If he chooses to take his last position, and will apply it all around, to the United States as well as to Canada, he will have to revise the figures he has been giving us and I am sure the Finance Minister will be glad to

revise the figures he gave, and will show, upon that basis, that the condition of things in Canada is infinitely more advantageous to the people of Canada than is the condition of things in the United States to the Americans. Every loyal man, every man in Canada who loves his country, will decline to adopt one basis of calculation for Canada and a different basis of calculation for the United States. I will give the hon. gentleman the benefit of the Excise; nay, more than that, I will give him the benefit of the entire revenue, and I find that if he takes the whole revenue, including the revenues from post office and railways, he will find that instead of \$50 per family it is only \$36 per family. Why should the hon. gentleman, with his responsibility as a public man, looking in the future, I suppose he thinks the near future, to be the leader of the Government, and therefore to control the public affairs of this Dominion, why should he go on to a public platform, and, addressing an audience of fellow Canadians, venture to make a statement of that kind, a statement which is false in fact, which is false in inference, which is false in every relation in which you can possibly look at it—a statement which has simply one result, that of creating the impression outside that the people of this country are less advantageously situated than are the people of the United States. These hon. gentlemen have been making their appeal to the workingmen and they talk to us about immigration. Well, in the earlier part of what I had to say, I referred to the condition of immigration during the time they were in office, and I do not feel disposed to repeat what I then said. But what is the position of the Government, as regards the workingmen? In the first place, we have had the announcement from the Minister of Agriculture, in answer to a question put to him by an hon. member of this House, that the Government not only is not going to assist but is actually going to discourage the introduction of ordinary laborers and of ordinary mechanics into Canada; as, in view of the fact that the Pacific Railway will shortly be completed and that there will not be much prospect of any great railway work being constructed then or in the immediate future, it may not be necessary or advisable that these people should come to Canada. We have that statement from the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. Then we have an important statement in the Tariff resolutions which are now brought down. When I was in Gananogue the other day I had an opportunity of visiting a large industry there, and found that industry to be suffering very severely—from what? Not from the honest competition of honest labor paid for at honest prices, but from the competition of prison labor in the United States, hired by manufacturers at 30 cents a day, the products of which were sent into this country to compete against the honest mechanic in Canada, who receives his \$2 a day. What did the Government determine to do in view of this fact? The Government determined to prohibit the products of prison labor coming into this country. That is an act worth dozens of the kind words which, as the proverb tells us, "butter no parsnips," of the hon. gentleman opposite. I am glad to see that Act has been put into force, and that the importers of prison labor have already been made to understand that, hereafter, prison labor will not be allowed to come into competition with the fair labor of the honest mechanic of this country. What more do we find? We find a large part of the hon. gentleman's speech devoted to a denunciation of the policy of the Government with reference to our savings banks; and hon. gentlemen opposite are urging that the interest on the savings of the laboringmen and mechanics should be reduced $\frac{1}{2}$, or 1 per cent, for the benefit of the banks. When these hon. gentlemen were on the stump in Ontario, or addressing a large audience of workingmen in the city of Montreal or the city of Toronto, they had nothing but kind words to say to them; but when they come to Parliament, and they think they can excite against the

Government the larger interest, as, for the moment, they choose to consider it, of the banking institutions of the country, then they forget the workingmen and they denounce the Government for that measure of encouragement to thrift and saving which the Government have adopted, by giving a fair liberal interest to those who put their money into the savings banks. It has been said these savings banks are injuring the banks of the country; that they are taking deposits which otherwise would go into the banks of the country. A gentleman, one of the best officers in the services, Mr. Cunningham Stewart, who is at the head of the savings banks, in the Post Office Department, read a very interesting paper before the British Association last year, and I take my figures from that paper. I find, taking the classes of persons who are depositing their money in the savings banks, that, in the first place, they comprise 14,000 farmers who had deposits when the paper was written to the extent of \$4,722,000 in the post office savings bank, or an average per farmer of \$337. Now, these hon. gentlemen would be very glad indeed if these farmers who are getting 4 per cent, for their money, and who, when they unfortunately have to borrow, are compelled to pay a great deal more than 4 per cent.—these hon. gentlemen would be very glad to have these farmers deprived of $\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 per cent, on their savings. I would like to see some of those gentlemen before an agricultural constituency in Ontario say to the farmers: 'Gentlemen, this country is being ruined, because you are getting 4 per cent. on your savings instead of 3 per cent., the banks do not like it, and therefore you must give up 1 per cent. Then we find that there are 7,850 mechanics who have deposited their savings to the extent of \$1,422,000 in those banks, or an average of \$181 each. Now surely these mechanics who have deposited, these, on an average, small sums, sums which certainly would not ordinarily go into a bank by way of deposit, surely it is an advantage, an act of kindness and consideration towards them, much more valuable than the statements and praises which are bestowed upon them by hon. gentlemen opposite, to allow them this 4 per cent. interest upon their savings. Then I find that there are trust accounts and young children's accounts to the number of 5,500 and \$170,000, or \$31 each. It does seem to me that it is an advantage, and I know the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) will agree with me in that, because the other day he urged, in a very admirable speech, the importance of encouraging these children still further, encouraging them to collect postage stamps and to put a shilling's worth of them on paper and deposit that. Well, here is an opportunity for these children to take advantage of, with the encouragement of their parents, to collect their pennies and half-pennies and put them into the savings banks, a dollar at a time, under the encouragement of their parents, who become their trustees. It is, I venture to say, a way of encouraging thrift among children which is more valuable than that which the hon. gentleman suggests. And for this reason, that the child may learn not only the benefit of saving but that he may gather those savings at a time when he can get at his little bank and take them out, and it is a great advantage if you can get a little child to understand that, if he puts a penny into a bank, it is better to save it though if he likes he can take it out—that it is better to leave it there until a dollar has accumulated and then to go to the bank and deposit it. But they get their 4 per cent., and the hon. gentleman wants to give them only 3. Then there are 3,000 clerks with \$174 each; 1,600 tradesmen, with \$293 each. Probably these are almost the only ones, if they are tradesmen in the sense of small shopkeepers, who might perhaps keep their money in the ordinary banks. There are 1,470 farm and other male servants, with \$188 each, 1,572 professional men, with \$249 each. Miscellaneous, 1,680, with \$128 each. 12,000 married women, with \$196 each—women who

probably have made that deposit against a rainy day, if any misfortune should overtake the bread-winners; 10,500 single women, with \$120 each, and 3,240 widows, with \$214 each. That is the way in which that \$13,000,000 is distributed in the post office savings banks. It shows that these banks in no serious way interfere with the ordinary banking institutions of the country, and I venture to say that the hon. gentleman, when he undertakes to urge that the Government should reduce the interest upon these deposits, is not speaking in the interest of those workingmen, whose good opinion and whose votes at this moment he is so anxious to cultivate. I do not wish to detain the House longer, but, before I sit down, I desire simply to refer to one statement made by the hon. gentleman. After recapitulating all the iniquities of this Government, all the enormous expenditures which it had made, he made up his mind to go to an imaginary statist and find out what he would say upon the question. And he said:

"If I were to take those figures and place them in the hands of any statist of reputation, and if I were to say to him that, in a period of eleven years, or a period of six years, as the case might be, these figures exhibited the progress, the increase in population, the increase in exports, the increase in the total volume of trade, the increase in debt, and in the expenditure of a young country, having large fertile territories not occupied, why, Sir, that statistician would say to me: It is clear, on the face of it from those figures, though I do not know to what country you allude, that some great calamity must have swept over it; either there has been a fearful pestilence, or there has been a fearful war, or there has been a famine in the land; no ordinary causes would account for such an exceedingly slow progress in a young country having large resources yet untouched; there must have been some great misfortune. And, if I came to explain to him that for twelve years not a shot had been fired in Canada, that we had as good harvests and better than our neighbors—"

That is including five years of bad harvests that they had—

"that we had been free from earthquake and pestilence, then the statistician would have been perfectly unable to account for the fact of this extraordinary and unprecedented stationary condition of a country like ours, until I had further explained to him that, although Providence had spared us man had not, and that for the last six years this unhappy country had had a protective tariff, administered by a Government of practical politicians, presided over by a philanthropic Minister of Finance, who desires to increase the greatest happiness of the greatest number—and I do not doubt the hon. gentleman's desire to increase their happiness—by giving to a few hundred persons, influential political partisans, who had access to him, unlimited right to tax the millions of consumers who were not equally fortunate."

That is the picture of this country as stated by the hon. gentleman. Now what is the picture of this country as it really exists, as every gentleman in this House knows that it exists? What has been the progress of this country during the time that the hon. gentleman is pleased to refer to? If I were to go to the statist, to the same statist, Mr. Speaker, and if I were to tell him that here were four small Provinces, with hostile tariffs, with little or no prosperity among them, united together in a Confederation; that during the period to which the hon. gentleman referred, had succeeded in adding to that Confederation illimitable fields, the finest wheat field belts on this great continent; that they had secured an outlet on the Pacific coast, adding there a Province which, although formerly called a sea of inhospitable mountains, is fast developing into the condition which its friends believed it would occupy, that is, one of the most valuable and most prosperous of the Provinces of this great Dominion; that we had during that time bound these Provinces together by a railway, for the purpose of developing the trade of these several Provinces; that we had built up an interprovincial trade, which compensated for the loss of trade which had passed away because of altered conditions in foreign countries, in relation to the class of shipping, more particularly, which is used in the foreign trade of those countries; that we had managed to build a railway which we were just now completing, some 3,000 miles long, which would develop that enormous territory of ours, and united by one great band the two extremities of this Dominion; that we had a system of internal navigation, the like of

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

which the world does not possess, in our canals; that we had built through our great St. Lawrence, light houses and fog-signals until, from the time of entrance at Belle Isle until you got to the western end at Lake Ontario, it was almost like going through a street lighted by lamps at night; that we had adopted a system of marine telegraphy by which intelligence could be received in the commercial centres of any accident to a vessel entering that great St. Lawrence; that we had built up industries in the country which were prosperous, which were employing people, giving them a fair day's wage for a fair day's work; that we had great centres of population, enjoying all the advantages of old world cities—social, educational, commercial; that we had the freest institutions that are to be found on the face of the globe; that we had done all this without adding perceptibly one dollar to the burden of taxation *per capita* of the people—then, Sir, I would not be afraid to submit the facts as they exist to the statist of the hon. gentleman, and I venture to say the answer would be this: How can it be that, in a country so favored, there are men occupying positions in public life, pretending to be statesmen, who will undertake to deny the advancement, who will undertake, in the interests of a foreign country, because that is the actual fact, to belittle the land which gives them bread and affords them subsistence? Sir, I venture to say that the condition of this country fairly stated, as I said in my opening remark, the full truth told, all the truth told, will leave us, in the estimation of those who may choose to take an interest in our country, in a position of which every Canadian, every true-hearted Canadian, may well be proud.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Mr. Speaker, I will endeavor, in making a few remarks on the subject before the House, and on the statement made by the Finance Minister in reviewing the situation of the country, to do so within a limit that will not weary the House. I think my strength will compel me to be somewhat shorter, at any rate, than the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House, or the Finance Minister when he made his statement the other day. The hon. member for Cardwell has gone over a good deal of ground and gone over it at great length. He has shown himself capable of making two speeches on the same day, and he has also been able to do that after making a speech on the preceding day, which I noticed the correspondent of the *Montreal Gazette* has termed one of the greatest efforts ever made in this House, and one that effectually silenced the hon. leader of the Opposition.

An hon. MEMBER. And it is true.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not saying it is not true. I only regret I was not here to hear it; it is so seldom we see the leader of the Opposition in that situation, it would have been something worth seeing. But what alarmed me most was, that the article finally wound up by saying that, in fact, the speech left the Opposition without any possible answer. Well, I feel it is a little dangerous for me to follow a gentleman who makes his arguments so completely unanswerable; and yet it may be because I lack somewhat in appreciating the force of his arguments, and the accuracy of his statements, that I think perchance I might touch upon some of the subjects that he has touched upon, and arrive at a different conclusion. I was not surprised that the Finance Minister, in making his statement, colored it somewhat, and gave to it a rosy hue; because I have entertained a belief that the rumor we have heard from time to time that he may soon be elevated to a higher position in the service of his country, as the head of one of the Provinces, would lead him, in making his last Budget deliverance to this House, to take to himself, in his one last effort, all the credit that he had been claiming for himself for years past, though in the estimation of most people this last year has played sad havoc

with his reputation. But, if the hon. gentleman who succeeded him is to have his mantle fall upon his shoulders, he assumes a more difficult position and may, perhaps, in the future, be more embarrassed than the present Finance Minister. I do not know, however, that the Finance Minister even could afford to let some of the statements that he gave to the House go out to the people of the country, or go out to the people of England. No doubt his utterances will be read in England by the men who handle, we may say, almost the wealth of the world, who know the affairs of most Governments, who know how their affairs are conducted, their financial position and their strength. I hardly thought that he would have ventured to give us a table and endorse it, by which he pointed out that the Customs and Excise revenue—for that was the drift of his argument—the amount paid in that way by the inhabitants of the Australian colonies is from \$30 to \$40 per head per annum. I do not wish to enlarge upon that subject. We will endeavor to divide the work somewhat on this side, so that we may not unnecessarily weary the House. No doubt it will be dealt with more fully; and I just mention it as one of the tables he gave us that will bear a little investigation, and that, when properly investigated, and the real state of the case and the difference in the book-keeping are explained, will make him regret that he gave the people of the country to understand that the inhabitants of the Australian colonies were taxed by way of Customs and Excise from six to eight times as much per head as are the people of Canada.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not say so. I said five times the taxes. I did not say it was the taxes for Customs and Excise.

Mr. PATERSON. But it was the drift of the hon. gentleman's whole argument. He had just laid down the position in this House that the principle of taxation was what was paid in Customs and Excise, and it was in that connection the statement was made, and I believe it is on that very basis that he computes the amount of taxation that is levied upon the Canadian people. His utterance, of course, is before us, and while I was reading it over I understood him as conveying that meaning through his argument. There were some other statements of the hon. Minister, and the course he pursued was one that I think, perhaps, he would not have adopted had he expected ever to deliver another Budget Speech. He pursued the novel course of placing two or three good years along with the year 1884, which now they reluctantly admit to be a year of depression and of trouble; and by averaging his three or four good years with this one, he says: After all, you are not so very bad off; you have come out pretty well. But I do not understand that system to be a safe or a good one to adopt for a merchant at his usual stock-taking, nor do I consider it a good one for the Finance Minister to adopt at his annual stock-taking. Fancy a merchant who has had three or four prosperous years in business, who had accumulated a surplus, but who, elated with his success, should lavish on the right hand and on the left his savings, till he had nothing left. When he came to the end of the next year, which proved a disastrous one to him, he found he was not making ends meet, and lulled himself into security by putting the profits he had made the three or four years before in with the deficiency of this year, and said: Though it has been a bad year, yet, by putting in the profits of the last three or four years, I am worth so much—although he had not one dollar of that in his pocket, but had given it all away. Where is the difference between the two individuals? The twenty million dollars surplus the Minister boasted about, has he got it in the Dominion Treasury? Has it not been given to the Canadian Pacific Railway, as he told us himself? And have they not put it into an enterprise that is their own?

Have they not put it into an enterprise which, if we may take the tone of the organs of hon. gentlemen opposite at the present time as an indication, is an enterprise that perhaps may not redound to the benefit of Canada as much as at one time they thought it would. I will not allude at any length to the novel statement he made, that he had taken twenty million dollars surplus out of the pockets of the people of Canada by way of taxation, and that he had spent it, as I have said, in giving it to a corporation; and then he turns around and says: Because I gave that to the Canadian Pacific Railway, because I did not pay your Civil Service with it, because I did not use it in some other way in the public service, but gave it to that corporation, you did not pay it all; it never came out of you; it was no taxation. But he has done this, and it has opened up a suggestion to my mind. He has told us that by taking \$20,000,000 of surplus from the people of Canada and giving it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, he has by virtue of that lowered the interest that Canada had to pay on the loans in Britain by 1 per cent. I believe that the rate of interest on bonds and securities of other Governments, as well as of Canada, have fallen 1 per cent. on the London money market, and therefore a general cause has been operating. So the Finance Minister of Canada, by taking \$20,000,000 of extra taxation out of the pockets of the people and giving it to the Canadian Pacific Railway, has, according to hon. gentlemen opposite, lowered the rate of interest that all nations have to pay when they go on the London market. That is a sample of the rosy statements made by the Finance Minister. Upon those I do not desire to enlarge. There are a few points, however, which I desire to touch upon, and I will in doing so deal with most of the statements made by the hon. gentleman who last addressed the House. I will allude very briefly to expenditure, as a gentleman will follow me who will go into that subject very thoroughly. The Finance Minister at his annual stock taking finds the resources of the country not what they once were, and he finds that the surplus, although he did not lower the rate of taxation, is small, showing that the people have not been able to pay the taxation—\$150,000 he thinks it may be, though the present figures would not justify us in anticipating even that sum. A prudent business man would, on finding his business in that position, seek to retrench and economise, and he would lower his expenditure. Is that the course pursued by the Finance Minister? Is there any evidence of economy in framing the Estimates? No. The Estimates for the coming year, 1885-6, are framed on a basis even more extravagant than the expenditure for the year 1883-4; and we are proceeding with our resources diminishing and our expenditure increasing, till, instead of the surplus which the hon. gentleman anticipates at the end of 1885-6—unless there should be a change that he cannot at present predict—we shall stand in the position which those hon. gentlemen formerly affected to look upon with great alarm, that of being unable to make both ends meet. There have been comparisons made by the Finance Minister with respect to the expenditure under the Mackenzie administration and under the present administration. I look at it in a hurried manner, and I simply point to this fact, that those hon. gentlemen, since they have been in office, have increased the expenditure \$7,604,548 since 1878. Taking that part which is the ordinary expenditure, which those hon. gentlemen told us was controllable, and which Ministers could control, as well as they could control their own expenditures, there has been an increase during those years under their management of \$5,751,804. How has the increase taken place? The Finance Minister has alluded to it. The member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has alluded to it, and they have given explanations with regard to it, some of which hold good: nevertheless, the fact remains that such increase has taken place, and reasons might be pleaded by the Finance Minister for an increase, were

the increase twice as great as it is. But is it an excuse for the Finance Minister, who declared that twenty-two and a half millions was a sufficiently large sum with which to conduct the affairs of the country, and who denounced us for being extravagant when the Reform Administration took twenty-four millions with which to carry on the public business, to say that the public service has increased and he is therefore justified in taking seven millions more? How has this ordinary expenditure been increased? Take civil government. There you find an increase in the staff of 229, or an increase of 57 per cent. in the staff of the civil service since hon. gentlemen opposite came into power; and an increase in salaries of \$254,837, or 57 per cent. Grant increased population, grant increased work, will anyone tell me that there has been anything like 57 per cent. more work required to be done now as compared with 1878? Will anyone say that 57 per cent. more hands are required in the public departments than were required in 1878, when this Chamber rang with the denunciations of hon. gentlemen opposite with respect to the extravagance of the Mackenzie administration, and in having so many clerks that they were said to be running over one another in the corridors of the buildings. The hon. member for Cardwell has resurrected an old saying and applies it to the Opposition, and termed us an organised hypocrisy. What is the hypocrisy of those hon. gentlemen who found fault with the Mackenzie Administration for increasing the number of employes and increasing their salaries, and now stand up to justify an increase of 57 per cent. in the staff and 57 per cent. in the amount paid to it? I will now take up the subject on the discussion of which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) spent so much time, namely, the statistics with respect to the population of the country, with special reference to the increase of the population. First, as to the question of immigration. While I admit that under the Mackenzie Administration there was an expenditure for immigration purposes, I hold, as I held last year, that under the circumstances in which the people found themselves, there was no necessity, nay, more, that it was absolutely wrong to take money from the people of this country and expend it in bringing immigrants of the laboring and mechanical class to this country. We have, since the advent of the present Administration, spent \$2,000,000 on this work. What has been the result? That leads me to look at the present state of our population. I will not enter into disputed territory, but I will take the statistics of hon. gentlemen opposite, the census returns. I find, in 1881, in the four Provinces that originally made up the Confederation, there were 4,044,060 people, and in 1871, 3,485,761 people, or an increase in the ten years of 558,299. I take a very low estimate for the natural increase of the country. I take an estimate that the hon. member for Cardwell himself adopted, an estimate below one I would be justified in taking. I take the estimate of the natural increase at 2 per cent. or 20 per cent. in 10 years. But the increase of our population did not amount to 2 per cent., it only amounted to 1.61, according to the figure I have given. Had there been a natural increase of 2 per cent per annum it would have given a population of 697,152 more in 1881 than in 1871. The fact remains that we were short of our natural increase—taking the low basis of 2 per cent. per annum of 138,853, besides losing all the immigrants which an expenditure of \$2,000,000 brought into the country. Now, when this fact stares us in the face, what is our justification for spending, as we did last year, over half a million of dollars, in endeavoring to promote immigration? The immigrants that have come into the country, as they claim they have, if they remained in the country, remained in it, according to our own census returns, by the displacement of an equal number of our own Canadian people. These are not American figures, for I am taking our own census

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

returns. Then again, if you take the figures given to us by American statistics of the Canadians entering into the United States, and compare them with the figures of our own Minister of Agriculture, as to the number of immigrants brought into this country, you will find it tending to prove the unpleasant statement which our own census gives forth to the world. If you take the statistics of school population, as the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has done in Ontario—as I myself did last year for the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, they all point in the same direction, that we had not only not kept the immigrants that came into the country, but that we have actually lost 4 per cent. of our natural increase in ten years; and in this time we have been spending millions and millions of the people's money to promote immigration. It is quite time that the hon. Minister of Agriculture made the announcement that he has made in response to a question the other day, that one class of immigrants at any rate were to be discouraged, were not to be assisted in coming into this country, though he, in company with his colleagues last year, voted down the proposition offered from this side of the House that that should be the rule which should prevail. Now I wish to say a few words with reference to the rules which were laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite in days gone by, as to the means by which a nation should promote its prosperity; and to examine whether these rules have been complied with, and if they have, whether that has been the cause of the prosperity we enjoy. Now I remember very distinctly that the Finance Minister laid down as a proposition, firm and unalterable, as something which would follow as naturally as effect follows cause, that if the imports of the country exceeded its exports, that was a state that evidenced that the country was not in a prosperous condition; but that on the other hand, the nearer we could get the exports to approach the imports, a surer and more inevitable a sign was it that the country was prosperous. In case I should not represent him correctly, I will quote what the hon. gentleman said on this subject in his own words. In 1881, speaking in Toronto, and reported by the *Toronto Mail*, he said:

"During the last two years we find that we are equalising our exports with our imports. (Cheers). Whatever Free Traders may say, our people cannot understand the theory that the larger the excess of our imports over our exports the more prosperous is the country. We say that as with an individual, so with a nation, and that if he expends more than he receives, poverty stares him in the face. If, on the other hand, his receipts exceed his expenditures, his condition is hopeful. The latter is the condition of the Dominion, if we take into account our receipts for freight."

That was uttered during a year when there was poverty, when the people were unable to import as much as they had in days gone by. The hon. gentleman may say I have read that extract already. True, I have. I have no desire to read this old literature again, but I am forced to do so—Why? Because the Finance Minister laid that down as a rule which would work like cause and effect. And he has not rescinded it; he has not receded from it; he has never said he was wrong in that particular, and therefore he stands to-day in the same position, and that is the rule by which he is to be judged to-day. Now I will test the prosperity of the country under the hon. gentleman, and contrast it with its prosperity under Mr. Mackenzie, by the rule he gives to us himself. And in this matter we are not dealing with guess work at all; we have the accounts given to us by hon. gentlemen themselves, which reveal the facts in reference to this matter which I now read to the House. I take the last four years of the Mackenzie Administration and the last four years of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Why not take them all?

Mr. PATERSON. Why? Because you have been in power a little longer. And is it not, Mr. Speaker,

a very modest request for the Finance Minister to ask me to take certain years to please him, when he has tossed his figures about in every possible way in order to make out a case for himself. Am I not taking a fair way, because we are talking of things as they are at present; we must then take the present year and ascertain where we are now, and I do not want to leap over two or three years; and so I take this year, and I must take the three years preceding, and the last four years of the Mackenzie Administration. And what do they show? Surely according to the rule laid down by the Finance Minister, if when our imports exceed our exports poverty stares us in the face, four years is long enough to face that stern and gaunt poverty. Now, in 1876, the balance of trade, according to the Trade and Navigation returns, was against us \$12,243,911; in 1877, \$23,452,569; in 1878, \$13,758,120, and in 1879, \$10,473,172, or in the four years the balance against us was \$59,927,772. Compare with that the last four years of hon. gentlemen opposite. In 1881 the balance against us was \$7,040,017; in 1882, \$17,282,297; in 1883, \$34,168,218, and in 1884, \$24,990,547, or in these four years an adverse balance of \$83,481,079, against an adverse balance during the four years of the Mackenzie Administration of \$59,927,772. And will you believe it, during the last four years we were absolutely and relatively worse off than we were under the Mackenzie Government by \$23,553,307, and yet the hon. gentleman says we have been prosperous all the way through. Now, the hon. gentleman must either say that he was wholly and totally wrong when he laid that down as a rule, as he did in Toronto; or if he will maintain it, as he does maintain it, then out of his own mouth I convince him that the country is in a worse position, and is brought nearer to poverty under his management than under the management of hon. gentlemen on this side, when, according to the Finance Minister and his friends, the country was in such an unprosperous condition. I desire now to ask the Finance Minister what he thinks with reference to what he predicted a year or two ago, as to the length of prosperity this country would enjoy. The hon. gentleman said first, you know, that we were to have ten years of prosperity, and a year or two afterwards he modified his statement, though he stood to it that we would have seven years. Sir, at the very time he was making the prediction the banks were pursuing a conservative course; men who were authorities on this matter were beginning to curtail and draw in sail; and now the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has told us that by the conservative course which has been pursued by importers and others, greater depression than at present exists has been averted. What a commentary on the foresight, on the sagacity, on the financial intelligence of a gentleman entrusted with the finances of this country, that the only way the country was saved from greater depression than exists, was by flying in the face of the Finance Minister and doing the direct opposite of what he told us. And yet the ship of state is under the guidance of that hon. gentleman whose supporter has told us that only by disregarding his advice to put on sail, only by reefing the sail, have we escaped greater depression than the country suffers. Another matter that I have a little curiosity about is, to find some of the millions of dollars of capital that the Finance Minister said was going to come into the country immediately after the elections of 1882. Now, I think he has a right to take the House into his confidence, and to tell us just where that money has been expended—where those millions are to be found—where the happy employees who were coming are employed; because I notice that his commissioners who were sent to scour the country have failed to report that they have found any, and they would have reported had there been any. Now, what did the hon. gentleman tell us in May, 1882, in addressing a

mass meeting in this city? I am quoting the *Ottawa Citizen*, which I am sure reports exactly what he said:

"Gentlemen, if the people do as we have no doubt they will, as Ottawa will, record their votes in favor of the present Government, then we will find capital pouring in. When I have been in other parts of the country, in the United States and elsewhere, and have come in contact with capitalists in all directions, there is an uncertainty as to the course which this country will pursue. There are many industries that will be established the moment the question is settled."

Then he told us that he had been waited upon by two gentlemen within the last three months prior to the time of his making those remarks, one representing a capital of \$2,000,000 and the other a capital of \$5,000,000, and they wanted to invest in this country. We know, they said, that the thing is all right, and we are ready to put in our money, but we do not know whether this policy will last or not; we are not certain about that. The Finance Minister assured them that it would be permanent. He said, look at the bye elections; there have been a great many bye elections, and we have been sustained. He said to the people of Ottawa: That is the reason we have dissolved Parliament a year ahead of time, so that we could settle this question, and if this Government were returned to power, the millions would at once come into this country. I will give you his words:

"Another gentleman who came since Parliament opened, who represents a capital of \$5,000,000, is, I think, satisfied that this policy is going to be sustained, because the gentlemen whom he represents are purchasing property in this country to-day, and investing capital in erecting buildings; so that after the 20th June, next, they are prepared to put over a million of dollars in here to develop the country."

That was the 20th of June, 1882, when there was to be the general election. The day after they were going to put in a million. And the people cheered. I know that the people of Ottawa like to hear about millions coming into the country. Then, he said:

"Gentlemen, it is because we want this affirmed, and believe it will be affirmed, that we are ready and prepared to appeal to the people and ask them for their endorsement. If they do not endorse it, then I believe a public calamity will befall the country—that the millions of dollars about being invested in this country would be withdrawn, and that there would be a retrograde movement."

I want to know where the millions are. Will the member for Cardwell tell me? We have paid some hundreds of dollars—I do not know whether it will not run into thousands—for commissioners to go through the country to find evidences of prosperity. They have not found these men; they have not found these millions. And years have gone by since the Finance Minister told us that they would come in the day after the 20th of June, 1882. Well, I am little curious about another matter—about his declarations with reference to the grand effect of the National Policy, in his speech delivered in this House in 1882. I want to know whether the statement he made to this House then, standing in his place, with the responsibility upon him of leading, in a measure, this House, of controlling one of the most important departments of the Government, has been fulfilled. He made this statement:

"The hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright) imposed burdens on the people, but gave them no food to supply them with strength to carry them. We asked Parliament to give us such changes in the tariff as would not only protect the industries of the country, but give us an increased revenue. Was there a response? I stated at the outset that the response was ample, provided the money had been paid in for the year 1879 that belonged to that year. And the year that followed, what was the response? They gave us a surplus of \$4,000,000 and upwards, because we found employment for the people, because, by obtaining for them employment and higher wages, they were able to buy more than formerly. Men who were formerly working at half time and on low wages received higher wages and were working overtime. Farmers who had low prices and found sales difficult received high prices and prompt cash sales."

Well, the Finance Minister said that he did this. If he did it once, he is able to do it again. It is not for me to doubt the word of the Finance Minister; no, I must believe him; but believing him, I must arraign him for now being

recreant to the trust placed in his hands. He claimed that he had power to give men full time work and to increase their wages. He has not given them work, for idle men are crying for work. He has not given them higher wages, but has allowed some employers to cut down their wages 10 per cent. He claimed that he had power to bring the farmers higher prices for their grain. If I believe him, I must arraign him for being recreant to his trust, in that he has allowed the receipts of our farmers to dwindle down to a comparatively small sum, because he allowed the price of wheat to drop to 70 or 75 cents a bushel. No, I do not impugn the veracity of the Finance Minister; that would be wrong; but accepting his statement as true, I must arraign him for proving recreant to his trust. I call upon him to get the idle men the employment he promised, to get the working men the increased wages he promised, and to get the farmers the higher prices he promised. Why, he has failed most lamentably in everything. He told us, among other things, that he would secure to our farmers the home market for their perishable stuff, or the little articles that might be consumed on the spot, instead of allowing so much of it to be shipped away to foreign countries, where they could not get so much for it. We had not then received the Trade and Navigation returns for 1882, to ascertain what correctness there was in the statement he gave us, but we have since; and what is the fact? Has his promise to give the farmers a home market, avoiding the necessity of sending their produce out of the country been fulfilled? Let the returns speak. Instead of having this home market for all the butter and cheese that is made here, they had to export 2,000,000 lbs. 1,000,000 lbs. more than they did in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration; in cheese they had to export 12,000,000 more than they did under the Mackenzie Government; in eggs they had to export about \$1,000,000 worth more in 1882, when the Finance Minister was boasting of having given a home market to the farmers of the country, than they did in 1873; in potatoes, that ought to have been eaten at home by the operatives whom the Finance Minister was to have set at work, nearly \$2,000,000 worth more had to find a foreign market in 1882, when he claimed to have a home market, than during the last year of the previous Administration; and so on through all the list. Now the question may be asked what position did the Finance Minister, what position did the Government, take in the year 1882, that has not been overthrown, that has not had to be abandoned by them? The hon. gentleman may claim that he said he would benefit the manufacturers of this country; he may stand on that. Well, in order to establish that, he had commissioners appointed last summer to go through the country and prepare statistics relative to the various industries in the country and report to Parliament. I desire to comment on those statistics for a short time, but before doing so I will tell you, Sir, that I approach the investigation, or partial investigation, not prepared to place very implicit reliance in what I should find there; and I will tell you why. Because, in 1881, the Finance Minister took occasion to collect statistics, as he informed the House. What they were, we do not know; we never saw them; the source from which he obtained them, I do not know; but he gave to the House statistics to show that there had been a very great increase in the manufacturing industries of the country. He dealt in generalities, but in one or two items he came to particulars, and one of the branches he particularised was that of boots and shoes, and the statement of the hon. gentleman, in 1881, was that there was 25 per cent. more men employed in that industry and 25 per cent. more goods produced in 1881 than in 1878. Well, I had the curiosity to look up the census of 1871, because if we were making a certain amount of those articles in this country in 1871, we must, by the actual growth of the country, have been making more in 1878; but

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

when I compared the statistics which the Finance Minister gave, in 1881, with the census returns that his own officials took in 1881, I found that, instead of there having been an increase of 25 per cent. in the hands employed and 25 per cent in the quantity of goods produced, there were actually 125 men less employed in manufacturing boots and shoes in 1881 than in 1871. He may say the census returns were inaccurate, but if he does he is casting odium upon the administration of a Department of this Government. It is from his own census returns that I judge the statement he made, and as the statements he then made were extravagant, I claim that the report of the commissioners laid before this House is utterly misleading in character, and that the Finance Minister in giving them to the House in bulk as he did, in endorsing them as he did from his place here, is whether by design or not, misleading the country on a very important matter. Let us examine a little the statistics and see what they show, that we may ascertain if we can see whether there is any internal evidence of accuracy on the part of the statistics they contain, whether there is much reliance to be placed on them. They were gathered, I venture to say, for the purpose of enabling the Finance Minister to cover somewhat the position in which he stands before the people and the country to-day, that of having failed to implement the promise he made in 1882 to the people, when he asked them for a renewal of their confidence. The hon. gentleman appointed two commissioners. The commissioner he appointed for New Brunswick is a gentleman I do not know.

Mr. BOWELL. A very good man.

Mr. PATERSON. I believe he is a very good man. I understand he was a very good supporter of the Mackenzie Government all the time it was in power, and I believe he lost confidence in them shortly after they lost the confidence of the people of the country.

Mr. BOWELL. He was like a good many others.

Mr. PATERSON. And that in order to benefit the people of the country and maintain the interests of the country, and the prosperity of the country, he supported the present Government.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly.

Mr. PATERSON. And got some patronage, did he not?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. His newspaper continued in existence, so long as the former Government was in power, did it not?

Mr. BOWELL. We did not give him so much.

Mr. PATERSON. There appears to have been a disaster to an industry in that case, at any rate, under the hon. gentleman's own rule. It may have been a struggling industry under Mr. Mackenzie, but it did struggle and live; but when hon. gentlemen opposite came into power it was too much for them, and the *Morning News*, I think that was the name of the paper, succumbed. I only heard this, but the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Customs, vouches for its accuracy. Now that is saying nothing against the gentleman himself, because there are very good men who have failed in business and have been unsuccessful. But I am more pleased with him as a writer than as a statistician, though I believe, to do him credit, that when he started out on his work, and before he received subsequent instructions—for I fancy he got instructions after he got partly through his work, because he was doing it a little too thorough—that thorough work most effectually disproves the balance of his report as well as the whole of the report of the commissioners for Ontario and Quebec. He indulges in some general remarks. He tells us:

"With a view to thoroughness, I made my investigations in St. John and Portland embrace everything, large and small, that could be fairly considered industrial, except farming."

I want the House to remember that, because it is the only case in which the work was done thoroughly; and presently I will look at this portion which was done thoroughly and see whether it gives the extra production in that year claimed by the hon. Minister. He continues:

"I think I have gained not only accurate information as to the number of persons employed in connection with industrial pursuits during the two periods and the amount of the earnings of the class, but a pretty accurate idea of the general condition and of the industries at the present time and an insight into their perplexities and resources of encouragement. The information I submit in connection with this report and without embellishment and in the order and form in which it was gathered."

Then he says:

"The bad crops of the past two years, over-production, the diminished purchasing power of the industrial classes from this cause, the locking up of capital by investments in non-productive enterprises, over-production in certain industries, depression in the lumber trade, and the revolution which the substitution of steamers for sailing craft has brought about in the carrying trade of the world, are among the leading causes variously assigned for the troubles which have clustered around the year 1884."

There is their own commissioner admitting that troubles have clustered round the industries of the year, and he points out the causes which have led to it; and I want the House to remember that, in the Order in Council appointing these gentlemen, it is definitely stated that they are appointed to gather information to enable the Government to mould legislation in the proper direction to find out if there are any causes at work that are not working properly, if there are any defects that require to be remedied, so that they may apply the remedy. Well, he gives the cause. It is "the bad crops of the past two years."

Where is the legislation introduced to remedy that? Do I ask a foolish question? To say so would be to impute foolishness to the Finance Minister, for he has claimed credit for good crops and for the prosperity that flows from them. "Over-production" he gives as another cause. Has the Finance Minister taken any steps to stop over-production? I do not see anything in the tariff to lead us in that direction. He points out "the diminished purchasing power of the laboring classes." Has any legislation been introduced to increase their purchasing power. He points out "the locking up of capital by investments in non-productive enterprises." Has any scheme been devised or any legislation proposed to release this capital locked up? The Finance Minister might perhaps reply: How can I do that? It is not for me to answer. He claimed he could do almost everything; he claimed that he could give you prosperity, whether other countries were prosperous or not. His utterance are on record. I tell him to release the locked up capital. He points out "over-production in certain industries." Why does he not stop that over-production? Does he say that then these men would lose their capital? Then let him give it back to them in a more direct way. Let him give them a bounty out of the public funds. It would not be much more than he has done to some classes, not much more than he proposed in some cases when he introduced and carried through his tariff. These are pointed out as the causes which are operating to produce distress. These gentlemen were appointed—so their appointment shows—in order to find this out, so that proper legislation might be introduced. We ought to have had it. If we do not have legislation to remove these causes, then the labors of these men have gone for nothing; they have been appointed, they have been set to work, the information they have gathered has been set at naught, and no action has been taken in regard to it. Now we come to the city and county of St. John and Portland, and I ask you to bear in mind again the remark of this gentleman, that his work there was thorough work,

that he did not go into a few industries, but that he went into and examined large and small—the only thorough way in which this could be done. But, before giving us the table, he gives us a nicely written description of St. John and how it is situated. I do not know whether he thought the members of this House—and the information was gathered for the members of this House—did not know where the good city of St. John was situated, but he tells us:

"With reference to the city of St. John, the starting point of this investigation, it may be needful to say that for the benefit of some under whose eye this report may fall, that it is the commercial capital of New Brunswick, and stands at the mouth of the St. John river—that it has a fine harbor open at all seasons, and connection by the Intercolonial Railway east and west, and by the New Brunswick Railway and branches, and the Grand Southern Railway, with the interior and the west and that the districts known as St. John and Portland, although under two corporate systems, are really one in business and industrial life and unitedly form an important commercial and manufacturing centre. The chief staples of this community in a long period of years were ships and lumber. The competition of iron ships with wooden craft in the carrying trade of the world revolutionised the ship-building interests and destroyed the magnificent business which had made for many citizens of this place comfortable competencies, if not colossal fortunes. The demand for vessels of large tonnage is no longer what it once was, and the shipyards do not resound with the busy hum of industrial life."

Is there any proposition in the legislation introduced to this House to get up this hum in the shipyards? If there is nothing of this kind introduced, I declare that the appointment of this gentleman to ascertain facts in order that we may have legislation is a farce and has been set at naught.

"An occasional large vessel finds her way from the blocks in one or another of the almost silent shipyards to supply some special trade requirement of the builder or his friends rather than to find an eager purchaser. The prostration of this trade in wooden ships—how important can best be appreciated by those engaged in shipping ventures—had naturally a detrimental effect upon the prosperity and progress of the peoples of the two cities."

Then I consider that, according to the theories of the hon. the Finance Minister, he utters some doctrine that is very unsound.

"Commercial policies could not bring back the lost trade, Government edicts could not be made to shackle the wheels of progress, legislative enactments were unsuited to revivify waning industries, though capable of stimulating substitute employments."

Then he says, alluding to the fire that laid St. John in ashes:

"Prior to that time industries of various kinds had been struggling into life. A small cotton warp factory has been cautiously worked. Shoe factories are cropping up. Rolling mills, foundries, machine shops, rope walks, and what not, were fighting hard for position in the busy life of the place. But the fight with the competition from the United States superadded to the ordinary competition from Dominion communities, was too much for them. Striving hard they managed in most cases to maintain a fair position, but they did not move onward with the degree of celerity which their promoters and friends expected. They worked hard, but merely for an existence and without heart. The struggle was one of desperation, but there came a chance at last. The National Policy dawned in 1878, and, though not meeting with a cordial endorsement from the trading people of St. John, was not without a goodly host of ardent admirers and warm friends. The sturdy mechanic rejoiced at its adoption, and the struggling manufacturer bade its hearty welcome. The enforcement of the policy gave new life, new energy, new heart, to a people suffering from a trinity of calamities. New industries were started, and old industries were strengthened. The busy life of the place improved, and the prosperity, which seemed likely to last for years, loomed grandly up. In the rush of the time short-sighted people counted too much upon the helpful character of a policy which was only intended and could only be expected to furnish 'reasonable refreshments,' and they allowed themselves, partly by the stimulating influences of the policy and largely by the unnatural and transitory stimulation which business of every kind experienced during the hurried rebuilding of the fire-crushed city, to be carried to the verge of folly in many instances. This is not a new, nor yet an unnatural condition of things; it has been common, too, and is linked in with, the history of communities and peoples everywhere. Over-production in special lines was the result in the St. John community, and, to make the matter worse, the world's business got into confusion."

What right had the world's business to get into confusion; just at that particular time, too; and with the hon. gentleman at the head of the Finance Department, controlling the world's business? It was very unfortunate.

"To make matters worse, the world's business got into confusion and general business prostration was added to the injury and the agony thus caused. The St. John people, just gathering a little strength from the succession of calamities, felt the pressure, but they stood the shock, remarkably well, though, of course, not without many business trials and some disasters. Yet withal, the industrial life of St. John still stands in fair condition compared with its state a quarter of century ago."

He is somewhat like the Finance Minister. It suits him better to take one year sometimes than to take another, but he had to go a long way back, from the year 1878, the year he was sent to enquire about, in order to find what he says he found:

"The shipbuilding interest excepted, it contrasts as does the giant oak with the sapling juniper."

Then I can imagine with what a majestic wave of the hand he uttered ere he penned this sentence—"But a truce to mere words for the present; let facts and figures engage attention for a time." Now, then, we will look at the facts and figures. We are now considering the county and city of St. John and Portland that, he tells us, he investigated, in order to be accurate, and it is the only place that was thoroughly gone into. Now what does he find? He finds in the facts and figures that he wants to speak for themselves, that the total number of persons employed all over the city and county of St. John at the various industries was 8,855 in 1878, and 8,862 in 1884. There were seven men more employed in St. John. His work was thorough. He went into the matter, and there were absolutely seven men added to the 8,555 who were at work there in 1878. Who will say that the Finance Minister is not a success? Who will say he has not carried out all he agreed to? I give the Finance Minister credit, as he claims, for what he has done. Let us give him credit for adding seven men to the total number employed in the city and county of St. John in 1878. But I have a serious charge against him. He allowed the weekly wages of these men to fall \$1,769.16. We give him credit for adding seven men to the eight thousand odd, but to let their weekly wages fall \$1,769, I think, is rather too bad. "A truce to mere words, let facts speak for themselves." Now, I desire to say this, because, I think, in dealing with these matters we should be fair. He goes on to explain this fact, that in 1877 the city of St. John was, unfortunately, destroyed by fire. It was a calamity that, I am happy to say, was not without one compensating advantage, if I may use that expression. It is under calamities great as that that we are led to feel that we are one people. We are not drawn together as closely as we desire to be, yet when the telegraph wires flashed from one end of this Dominion to the other the fact that one of our cities, though its inhabitants were unknown to us personally, had suffered as St. John had suffered, meetings were at once called, resolutions were passed, money was poured in from the cities and towns of Ontario, to help our sister city repair the devastation caused by the fire. It had that compensating advantage. By the enterprise and energy of the men of St. John—and I say there is energy and enterprise in the city of St. John; it stands out prominently, as one must see, as I saw it myself this past summer for the first time—the enterprise of these men led them to go on and rebuild the city, and make it as beautiful as I have no doubt it was before. But, he says there were, in rebuilding that city, some more laborers and builders set to work than otherwise there would have been; they have not all gone away since 1878, and that raised the total number that were to be found in 1878 something above what it would have been under other circumstances. But I think you will find, if you look through the figures, that there was not so very many. We have no means of ascertaining how many of them left the city for other countries after the city was rebuilt, and how many remained; but I think, even if you take that into account, that you will find, from what he says, that there would be over a

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

thousand brought into the city through that cause. Now a thought occurred to me here with reference to the remarks this gentleman makes as to the destruction of the city of St. John, and I commend the Finance Minister's attention to it. On the face of it, short-sighted people would say it was an advantage to the city of St. John to be laid in ashes. Why, you would ask? Because it has given employment to extra men in rebuilding the city. But he would be a short-sighted man who would say that the capital that had to be used in this rebuilding had not been lost through the fire, and the people of St. John and the country that much poorer. The output of this capital and the locking of it up in real estate, capital that should have gone into commerce, though it gave a temporary impetus to some kind of business in 1877, nevertheless proved a loss to them because the capital had been sunk and was not productive. Has not the Finance Minister, by his policy, as effectually sunk and destroyed millions of the capital of this country? In 1882-83 he sees extra men at work, but were they not in the position of men employed at St. John who were building up that which, if it had remained, and had not to be rebuilt, would have left greater wealth to the country. The very fact that those men were employed during two or three years in making machinery and erecting factories that are now lying idle, gave the apparent prosperity that we had. The result of it is, that thousands of mechanics have since been out of work, and we are experiencing the depression that is mentioned here. Now, then, having finished with the city and county of St. John, I wish to look at what he says with reference to some other of the towns. He has told us that he worked more thoroughly in St. John than elsewhere. It was just after he got through with the city and county of St. John he, perhaps, received a hint that it was not necessary to go into particulars with respect to every place. He curtails his report. He says he has not time to go through every town; and I suppose we must accept that statement. So when he goes to Prince Edward Island he credits it, in 1884 as compared with 1878, with an increase of 255 hands and a yearly aggregate of products of \$44,102. And yet the fact remains that the yearly wages per hand in Charlottetown, in 1884, was only \$315, while in 1878 it was \$419, a decrease of \$104. In Halifax and Dartmouth the yearly wages per hand was, in 1884, \$330, as compared with \$327, an increase of \$3. At the Londonderry iron works he brings before us a very remarkable state of things, which, perhaps, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will kindly explain to us. He gives us the following figures—they may be correct, I do not understand them if they are correct.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not surprising.

Mr. PATERSON. I hear the Minister of Customs say it is not surprising. We will see if he can explain them, and if they are consistent with his ideas. Londonderry iron works are works I should like to see progress. I was very much pleased indeed to see such large works in our midst. I take the same ground that every hon. member on this side takes: that no men in this country desire or are more pleased than we are to see industries growing up and thriving, if they are doing so in a legitimate manner. The figures in regard to the Londonderry iron works are these: In 1878, 500 hands; yearly wages, \$171,600; capital invested, \$330,020; yearly product, \$440,150. 1884, 625 hands; \$234,325 yearly wages; \$1,460,000 capital; \$550,200 products. What I want the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to explain is this: How it occurs that there is an increase in capital equivalent to 442 per cent, while the increase in the number of hands and value of products is only 25 per cent. Such a state of things means sinking capital rapidly. I ask this House if the capital invested in 1878 was not more profitably employed than the capital in 1884. I ask if it is worth while to invest increased

capital to the extent of 442 per cent. when the increase in the number of employees and the value of the products is only 25 per cent., and if the country will not rapidly grow poorer under such a condition of things. I think hon. gentlemen opposite will agree with me in regard to this matter. I will now contrast the statements of the two commissioners in order to ascertain how the Provinces are prospering relatively under the tariff. I find that Mr. Blackeby, the Ontario and Quebec commissioner, places the increased number of hands, in 1884, over 1878, at 100 per cent.; yearly wages, 107; product, 126; capital invested, 85; while in the Lower Provinces the increase in the number of hands is put at only 46 per cent.; yearly wages, 32 per cent.; products, 62 per cent.; capital, 62 per cent. These are facts for the Finance Minister to consider, facts furnished by his own commissioners, appointed for the purpose of ascertaining facts, in order to guide him in legislation. Has there been any legislation proposed to increase the number of hands in the same proportion in the Maritime Provinces as in Ontario and Quebec? Why should the tariff be so arranged by that hon. gentleman—and as every blessing comes through the tariff, and so every ill must be ascribed to it—that the increase in the number of hands in Ontario and Quebec is 100 per cent., while it is only 46 in the Maritime Provinces; that the increase of yearly wages in the two Province is 107 per cent as against 32 per cent. in the Maritime Provinces; that the increase of product is 126 per cent. as against 62 per cent.; while the capital increase is 85 per cent. as against 62 per cent. These are matters to which the hon. Finance Minister should direct his attention. He appointed the commissioners for the purpose of ascertaining how the National Policy was working, in order that legislation might be introduced, and he has these facts before him. He has accepted them; I do not accept them. Not only do I consider the information and statistics furnished as worth nothing, but I consider them as absolutely worse than nothing, because I hold they are misleading in their character; and if the Finance Minister were to pay any attention to them and be guided by them, he would land the country in still worse difficulties than those which at present encompass it. Let us look at some of the figures given by the Ontario commissioner. He gives us as the increase in the agricultural implement business: Factories, 46 per cent.; number of hands, 87 per cent.; yearly wages, 90 per cent.; product, 106 per cent.; capital invested, 90 per cent., in 1884, as compared with 1878. I will not dispute the accuracy of this statement, but I have chosen that table for this reason: It is claimed by the Finance Minister that in regard to boots and shoes, ready-made clothing and other articles of that kind, the increased consumption is on account of the increased number of operatives in other factories who require those articles. I call attention to the fact that operatives in factories do not buy reaping and mowing machines and agricultural implements, yet here is an increase in agricultural implements as great as in any other branch of industry. The hon. gentlemen has never yet claimed that he has brought in agriculturists through the operation of his tariff; if he did so it would be stupid, for he has been unable to benefit the agriculturists in the slightest degree. Yet, as I have pointed out, there has been as great a degree of progress in the agricultural implement manufacture as in any other industry, which shows that the claim that there is this extra consumption of manufactured goods, from the fact that articles manufactured in certain branches are purchased by operatives engaged in other lines of manufacture. We come now to a branch of manufacturing of which I know a little about myself, which fact will enable me to furnish the hon. gentleman with some ideas. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) has already shown, from information obtained directly from different towns, that

the accounts here given of their business are wholly misleading. A certain few factories were visited. I suppose the commissioner went in and asked what number of hands is now employed, what wages are paid, what is the value of the product, what is the capital employed, and how do these compare with 1878. As the statement was given, so it was put down. But the member for South Huron pointed out that while 15 factories were visited in Chatham there are 50 there. Thus, an erroneous idea was given respecting the industry. So it is in respect to other towns and cities. Yet in these statistics, furnished by the hon. gentleman's commissioners, endorsed by the Finance Minister, we are actually forty-four millions better off under his National Policy than we were before. Take confectionery and biscuit manufacturers—which I know something about—and I find that they have increased 12 per cent. in the number of factories, 55 per cent. in the number of hands, 58 per cent. in the amount of wages, 56 per cent. in the value of product, and 54 per cent. in capital invested. The increased factories he gives as 2. In looking over the manuscript I saw the names of these two, and one of the two he mentioned is, according to information I had, to be sold under the sheriff's hammer to the highest bidder, the proprietor making an offer of 25 per cent. on the dollar. The other is not a large one, and then he says:

"In 1877 two or three firms, which were largely engaged in this business, succumbed to the pressure of the hard times then prevailing, and as no one, at that time, felt inclined to invest money in manufacturing pursuits, the trade of these firms became divided amongst those that remained."

I think he is wrong in that—I think this took place in the year 1879, after the National Policy came into operation—though I speak subject to correction. Now then I come to a test which the Finance Minister must accept, which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) must accept, because they have used it in this House as a test to prove the positions they have taken in previous years, that the industries of the country have thriven, and therefore I say they cannot fairly take exception to it. They have been in the habit of proving, from the increased imports of raw material, that there has been an increase, as they claimed, in the manufactured goods in the country. Let us look at some of the lines. One of the lines which they have been found comparing is hides and pelts. Of hides and pelts imported in 1884, \$1,431,848 worth, and in 1878, \$1,207,300, or an increase in the importation of hides and pelts, in 1884, over 1878, of only \$224,548. I want you to remember the figures, and yet the statistics furnished by this commissioner to the Finance Minister, and which he has himself endorsed, show that there has been \$3,835,000 worth more of boots and shoes alone made in 1884 than in 1878, though we only imported \$224,000 worth of hides more. But that does not represent it at all, because they did not visit all the factories, and you must add, the Finance Minister said, 50 per cent., and therefore you have of that article of leather alone over \$5,000,000 worth of goods made out of \$224,000 of raw material.

Mr. SPROULE. The supply is found at home.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend from East Grey says that the supply is found at home. Well, I think that we have exported of live cattle—and I believe live cattle have their hides on—a greater number of late years than before. We come now to woollen factories, and as the Finance Minister told us of that fairness which he said was part of his nature, that desire to be so accurate, I am bound to suppose that he entirely overlooked the importation of wool this year, that he did not designedly do it, but that he just accidentally missed it. In previous years he did not overlook it. I remember him talking about the imports of wool and pointing to them as a proof positive, as something that could not be denied; that there must be a greatly

increased manufacture of woollen goods from that fact. He cannot recede from that position. What do these statistics give us, with reference to woollen factories? There was an increase of 54 per cent. in the factories, of 91 per cent. in the number of hands, of 94 per cent. in the yearly wages, of 104 per cent. in the value of the product. There was an increase of 19 factories, of 1,623 hands, or \$404,050 extra wages, and of \$2,108,900 in the increased value of the product. As I said before, you must add 50 per cent., as they only visited two-thirds of the factories, and thus the statistics presented to the Finance Minister and endorsed by him state that over \$3,000,000 worth of extra product came out of the woollen mills of Canada in 1884 than came out of them in 1878. It seems to me that it must have required the importation of a good deal more wool in order to have accomplished that. What were the imports of wool relatively? In 1878 we imported 6,230,034 pounds; in 1884, 6,189,096; in other words we imported absolutely less in 1884 by 40,998 pounds than we did in 1878, and yet we produced \$3,000,000 worth more goods with 40,998 pounds less wool. Now that is certainly enough to convince anyone as to the value, as to the accuracy, of the figures we have here. Now I hear my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) trying to find out from his neighbor some solution of this problem, and he wants to know if there is not a duty on wool. Evidently the same idea is running through his head with regard to sheep as he gave utterance to with regard to cattle. I know he will find that the home-grown wool exports in 1878 were greater than in 1884 by \$397,259, but even that amount would be very well invested if the woollen factories had taken it and turned out \$3,000,000 worth more product, especially as all these mills are said to be selling their goods from 10 to 20 per cent. lower than in 1878, but it is a fact that in 1878 the average export price of wool, according to the Trade and Navigation returns, was 29 cents per pound, while the average export price in 1884 is only 20 cents per pound. I tell the hon. gentleman what he will not deny, that under the fact that wool has averaged lower under this Administration than it did before, men have gone out of the business of raising sheep and growing wool, because it would not pay. But that is not all, because we have another table here with reference to knitting factories, and I think knitting factories use wool, if I am not mistaken—not wholly, but largely. Let us see what they have done. They are credited with an extra product of \$1,174,000 worth, and adding 50 per cent. to that, and we have a product of woollen and knitted goods of nearly \$5,000,000 extra, with a less importation of wool.

Mr. SPROULE. They got supplied at home.

Mr. PATERSON. I think I answered that by alluding to the export, and if the hon. gentleman will find from the census or any other means that there are more sheep produced, I think it would be well if he would ascertain that point. The Finance Minister himself has paid no attention to the report of the commissioners, further than to use it for a purpose, which I hold is wrong, because it is misleading. He has not used it for the purpose of moulding his legislation; why? Because, as near as I can remember, after looking through the manuscripts, his commissioner from the Maritime Provinces pointed out that what the manufacturers in the Lower Provinces want, in order to enable them to do a more successful business and to compete, is that the Government shall take off the duty on flour; and the Finance Minister has not proposed to do that and he is thus disregarding the information given to him and which he sent the commissioners to get in order to enable him to act. There are other interests that might be taken. In 1881 there was an industry in the country called flour and grist milling. I remember that the mills numbered about 2,000, employed over 6,000 hands, had

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

over \$13,000,000 of capital invested, and showed a product of over \$40,000,000 a year—the largest industry, I believe—regarding the capital invested and the value of the product—in this country, next to the saw mills; and yet the commissioner who went through the Province of Quebec, apparently by his report, never saw a grist mill, never saw a flour mill, did not know that there was any such thing, and therefore we are bound, according to his report, to assume that there can be no desire or necessity to look after them. The only representation the Finance Minister has with reference to the article of flour, from his own commissioners, sent to make enquiries in order to enable him to bring about legislation, is that certain manufacturers desire that the duty may be taken off flour in order that their business may succeed. Has he given his attention to that representation? Now I come to the charge made against the Mackenzie Administration, that manufactures were languishing under their policy, and were in danger of being wiped out. Let us apply this test of the importation of raw material to these enterprises, and see what is the result. Take the article of cotton. These gentlemen gave a very graphic account of the increased production of cotton. One would think that it was owing to their tariff that we have cotton mills in the country at all. We are not indebted to the present Administration for having cotton mills in this country; we are not indebted to them for that at all; but we are indebted to them for this: that we have cotton mills in this country, in which millions of dollars of capital have been invested, to-day lying idle. I will prove it conclusively. If the cotton mills in this country had been languishing and dying under the Mackenzie Administration, the importations of the raw cotton would have been growing less year by year; but what are the facts? In 1874 we imported 3,514,287 pounds of raw cotton; in 1875, 3,778,109 pounds; in 1876, 5,527,428 pounds; in 1877, 5,578,222, and in 1878, 7,243,413 pounds. Every year of the Mackenzie Administration was increasing the importations of raw cotton, proving that we had cotton mills in the country, and that these cotton mills were doing well and increasing their output year by year. The difference between the importations in 1878 and 1874 was 3,729,126 pounds, or 106 per cent.; and yet these hon. gentlemen talk as if we were indebted to them for the cotton mills we have in the country. I repeat that cotton mills in this country were brought into existence under the Mackenzie Administration; that they were thriving, which the Finance Minister cannot deny, and that the cotton mills are indebted to the present Administration, not for bringing them into existence, but for bringing more mills and more machinery into the country than the country required, causing millions of dollars of capital to be idle, and which may lead to a combination, so that the consumer will have to pay more for his cotton than he would pay in the open market, in order that these men may get some return for the money they have invested. The Finance Minister, touching on this question, said: No man who believes in the National Policy but would like to see these men get a fair return. I can tell him that there is no man who does not believe in the National Policy but desires every man to get a fair return in a fair way; but the Finance Minister knows that these cotton men are not getting a fair return on the money invested to-day in mills which are lying idle. Now, let us apply the same test to the importations of woollen materials. To hear these gentlemen talk, you would think we had no woollen mills in the country prior to their advent. What are the facts as to the imports of wool? In 1874 we imported 3,756,558 pounds of wool; in 1875, 7,947,879 pounds; in 1876, 3,621,296 pounds; in 1877, 4,608,325 pounds, and in 1878, 6,230,084 pounds, an increase in the imports of wool in 1878 over 1874 of 2,473,496 pounds, or 66 per cent. Does that not prove that woollen mills were in existence and were thriving under the Mackenzie Administration long

before these gentlemen came into office at all? What then are the woollen mills indebted to hon. gentlemen for? Not for their being brought into existence, not that they were a new industry established in this country; but they are indebted to them for this, and this alone, that they have multiplied mills that there was no room for in this country, and have caused millions of capital to be sunk in enterprises that do not pay. They are not indebted to them for establishing the woollen industry in this country, but for bringing misfortune to that industry and to the men who put their capital into it. Now, with regard to the subject of cheapening goods to the consumer, I wish the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was here, because he was unable to understand why the leader of the Opposition added 50 per cent. to the Customs and Excise duties which he said did not go into the Treasury in fixing the burdens on the people. The hon. gentleman made the statement that sugar was as cheap under the present tariff as it would be under the Cartwright tariff. He made the broad statement about cottons and woollens and sugar, that they could be bought as cheaply now under the National Policy as they could be bought under the Mackenzie tariff. And now I want to go into that sugar question; and if any hon. gentleman here, if you, yourself, Mr. Speaker, should desire to follow me in it, I think you will agree that it is not as difficult a question to understand, and to arrive at a definite conclusion upon, as some of the hon. gentlemen opposite would have us believe. I think I can make the matter sufficiently plain and can give figures that any hon. gentleman can work out for himself, and ascertain the accuracy of the statements of the Finance Minister, that under this tariff of his the people are getting it as cheaply as under the Mackenzie tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite have a favorite way on the public platform, though they do not adopt it in this House, of putting the question in such a shape before their audience as to lead them to imagine that the imposition of the duty had actually lessened, instead of increasing, the price; and, as a proof of this, they say: Look at your sugar of to-day; it is cheaper than before the tariff was imposed—seeking, in fact, to make the people believe that sugar has actually been cheapened in value by the imposition of extra taxation. I will say this, and I may be pardoned if I illustrate it by a statement which I made a short time ago, when addressing an audience at Belleville, and which has since been taken up by the press and commented on. I was alluding to the fact that Government supporters put the case in such a way as to endeavor to lead the people to believe that by the increase of duty the price of sugar had been lessened, and I told them what had occurred at a meeting which I had addressed at a place not far from Kingston, a night or two previous, when I had also occasion to touch upon this sugar question. A friend of ours, who occupies a seat in another place, had been there the night before, and I was told he had used, with some force, this sugar statement. There happened to be a large sugar dealer from Kingston present, whom I knew very well and with whom I had been discussing the subject of sugar and other material as we drove to the meeting. I had pointed out to him that good bright yellow sugar, about No. 13 Dutch standard, a sample of which I had in my hands a few days before, had been bought at the rate of 9s. 3d. sterling per 112 lbs. in England, or as near as might be, 2 cents per lb. He said: I have sugar, about No. 9 Dutch standard, that I bought for 8s. 3d. sterling per 112 lbs. I then suggested we should make a calculation of the cost. We sat down and made a calculation; we added the freight, and all charges incurred before the sugar could be placed in bonded warehouse, and the result was, that we found the sugar cost him, laid down in his bonded warehouse, about \$2.15 per 100 lbs. You can sell that, I said, for 2½ cents per lb. and do well. He answered: Yes, I wish I could sell all the sugar I can shovel out at

that profit for a year, and then I would soon retire. At the meeting, in the course of my speech, and after referring to the way in which this sugar question had been placed before the people the previous night by a Conservative speaker, I asked the audience, At what price can you get your sugar to-day? A gentleman in the audience—whom, I presume, was a friend of the Government, because as he replied there was a ring of triumph in his tone—said, I can get 20 lbs. good yellow sugar to-day for \$1. Yes, I answered, sugar is very cheap; I believe you can, but all I have to tell you is this, that here, on this platform, is a gentleman, well known in Kingston, with whom many of you have traded, and he is prepared to-morrow, if you will go to Kingston, to give you 40 lbs. of brown sugar for \$1, provided you will pay the duty. Is that correct? I asked the merchant. He answered: You can have all you want at that rate. Some of you, I said to the audience, have been indoctrinated by some of your Conservative friends with the belief that it is not the man who buys the article who pays the duty, but the man who sells it. If you have faith in that, and if it be true, you will find that you can get 40 lbs. for \$1, but I fancy before you can get it out of the bonded warehouse Her Majesty's officers will demand from you a very large sum per lb. Now you can see how the case stands. That statement was published in a Belleville paper. The *Mail*, a day or two later, said this—

Mr. BOWELL. I would ask the hon. gentleman if he accepts the report of his speech in the Reform paper at Belleville as correct?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I will say this to the hon. gentleman, which he will understand, that substantially, as a condensed report—

Mr. BOWELL. Figuratively speaking, I would say—

Mr. PATERSON. It cannot necessarily report all the explanations I gave.

Mr. BOWELL. I accept that.

Mr. PATERSON. The *Mail* newspaper, and I allude to this, because sometimes our friends wonder how it is that their Conservative friends in the country cannot really see things in the same light as we do. Yet, when you remember the fact that the great bulk of them take but the one newspaper, and that a newspaper of their own political stripe, and that it gives to them, not only its own version of the affair, but actually at times misrepresents what is said on the other side of the question, their blindness is not to be wondered at. Now, the *Mail* newspaper said this:

"Mr. Paterson told a Belleville audience the other day that if it were not for the high tariff he could import granulated sugar from Great Britain, and sell it here at 2½ cents per pound."

I have told you, Sir, what I did say, and here is the *Mail* newspaper deliberately misrepresenting what I did say. Then the writer goes on to argue on that statement, which I never made, and which is wholly and absolutely false. The fact I mentioned is to be found in the Belleville paper, and the Minister of Customs can see whether I was not speaking of yellow sugar or not.

Mr. BOWELL. I read the speech carefully.

Mr. PATERSON. Is it not yellow sugar I mentioned?

Mr. BOWELL. I will tell you some other time.

Mr. PATERSON. If you have read the speech carefully you must know, and I ask and demand of you to state whether I am not correct in saying that it was yellow sugar of which I spoke?

Mr. BOWELL. I am not in your confessional just now.

Mr. PATERSON. After making this false statement the writer goes on to base an argument upon it. The very statement to any business man carries with it an evidence that the writer must have known better, because, if we import granulated sugar, we do not import it from Great Britain but from the United States. He goes on to say that the lowest price in Glasgow was $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound. We have then the confession of the editor of the *Mail*, that sugar which was $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents here was $3\frac{1}{2}$ cents in England. It is almost worth while to have an untruth put about you in a paper in order to get out that much. Then the article goes on to show how wrong I was, after quoting this statement which, as I have said, was wholly without foundation. Now, Sir, there is a Conservative paper published in Belleville, called the *Intelligencer*, which was owned for years by the hon. Minister of Customs, and it is supposed that he still has a sleeping interest in it.

Mr. BOWELL. Do not make insinuations.

Mr. PATERSON. No; I will not say that; but he knows the editor of the paper, and would not desire, I am sure, to have that paper do anything but what was right and proper.

Mr. BOWELL. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. The editor of that paper was in the meeting. He heard my speech. He says, in his article, that he was there and heard part of my speech. If I remember correctly, he remained in until I reached that portion of my speech where I was laying down what the essential principles of Toryism were: that if you find thirteen Ministers striving to get from Parliament the power which the people placed in their hands and to centre it in themselves—that is Toryism. Could the king take from Parliament, from commoner as well as from noble, the power and centre it in himself, you would have Toryism in its essence. I had spoken so far—

Mr. BOWELL. And he left then?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes; then he went out.

Mr. BOWELL. I think it was time.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not sure whether it was after or before I spoke in reference to the sugar that he left. At any rate, he was in the meeting, and he saw the *Belleville Ontario* in his office, and saw what I said. The next day in an editorial he stated that Mr. Paterson had addressed some sixty or seventy young men of the Liberal club in Belleville, and added: "We may have occasion to refer to some of his remarks in a day or two, perhaps." He let some four days pass, and never alluded to any of my arguments or attempted anything of the kind; and when the *Mail* newspaper published its article, that editor, who was in the meeting, who heard what I said, who knew that what was in the *Mail* article was untrue, positively untrue, would not write it down himself in his own paper, but copied bodily the lie from the *Mail* and gave it to his readers for their benefit. That is the way in which the thing was done, and after copying the *Mail* article, knowing it was not true, he said, editorially:

"We had the pleasure of listening to a portion of the address delivered by Mr. Paterson on the occasion referred to. Mr. Paterson enjoys—and we believe deservedly—the reputation of being one of the fairest men of his party, but whether, from inadvertence, or in order to win the applause of his hearers, he tried to leave the impression that were his party in power such sugar as he made reference to—

He will not write granulated sugar. He was bold enough to publish the *Mail* article, which said granulated, but he would not say it himself—

"would be sold in Canada for $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound. Had he desired to tell the truth he would have stated the price at which the article could have been sold under the old tariff. As he did not try to make any such comparison we can come to no other conclusion than that stated above."

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

I was talking on one point, and showing what the price of yellow sugar would be were there no duty on it, and it was no part of my duty to do in that connection what he asks. But I have alluded to this in order that in Parliament the Minister of Customs, or anyone else, may controvert the statement I made to the audience. I do not attempt to deceive an audience when there is no one to answer me any more than I do here, and I am claiming nothing for myself that I would not give credit for to other members of the House. I have repeated the statement here; let them answer it if they can. Now, I will consider what granulated sugar, which I was not speaking of, could be laid down for here now under the Cartwright tariff, and will see if the Finance Minister stated correctly that it had been as cheap under his tax as under the Cartwright tariff. It is not such a difficult matter for people to understand. You can figure it out yourselves; you need not take the word I say, or the word that anybody else does. The *New York Herald*, of 27th February, gives the price of granulated sugar in New York at $6\frac{1}{2}$ cents; the *Monetary Times*, of 27th February, gives the cost here at $6\frac{5}{8}$ cents; the *Journal of Commerce*, of 27th February, gives it as $6\frac{5}{8}$ cents; the *Montreal Gazette*, of 5th March, gives it as $6\frac{5}{8}$ cents to $6\frac{3}{4}$ cents. I have given you authorities there as to the Canadian price that hon. gentlemen cannot question? The *New York Herald* quotations for New York will not be questioned, and there is a half cent per pound that the Canadian consumer has to pay more for his granulated sugar than the American consumer does; and the fact, I think, is known to the Minister of Customs, that the New York refiner has to pay about $\frac{1}{2}$ cent more per pound duty for his raw material than the Canadian refiner. Add that to the $\frac{1}{2}$ cent less that he sells his sugar at, and you find a difference of 1 cent a pound between the price in New York and the price in Canada. Under the Cartwright tariff, if we were buying at $6\frac{1}{2}$, \$2.82, less 1 per cent. of a drawback, would be allowed to the Canadian consumer, or a net drawback of \$2.79. The net price to the consumer would, therefore, be \$3.34 per 100 lbs. for sugar from New York. To that would have to be added, under the Cartwright tariff, a duty of 1 cent a pound and 25 per cent. *ad valorem*, amounting to \$1.83 $\frac{1}{2}$. The question of freight is left out of consideration, because the freight on sugar to nearly all points in Canada from New York is about the same as from Montreal. Thus granulated sugar from New York under the Cartwright tariff could now be laid down for \$5.17 $\frac{1}{2}$ without freight, while the Montreal sugar without freight was \$6.62, less $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. cash discount, which I take off in order to give them the benefit of all, and that leaves their price without freight \$6.45 $\frac{1}{2}$ per 100 pounds. Thus, the price of granulated sugar under the Cartwright tariff, by the quotations of last week would be \$1.28 per 100 pounds less than it is under the tariff of the hon. gentleman opposite. I have desired to give these figures. They challenge investigation. This is not a mere statement, such as the Finance Minister has made, staking his reputation upon the fact that sugar could be bought as cheap now as then. These are the data upon which this can be worked out, and no other conclusion can be arrived at than that you are paying \$1.28 per 100 pounds, or $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound more for granulated sugar than you would do if the Cartwright tariff were in force and the same prices prevailed. Let us see what that figures up to. We had more than a 170,000,000 pounds in all imported last year. About one-eighth is wasted in turning that into granulated sugar, and we have to take granulated sugar, because that is a standard sugar, and all the others are nondescript sugars. The 170,000,000, allowing for the waste, would make about 150,000,000 pounds of sugar; 150,000,000 pounds at \$1.28 cents per 100 pounds would be just \$1,920,000, the extra price for a year's consumption, if it were all granulated sugar; and that one fact bears out the

statement of the leader of the Opposition, that it is not the taxes only that go into Her Majesty's coffers, by way of customs, that the customer pays, but that he pays a large amount indirectly that does not go into the Treasury, and is a loss to the consumer. Now, then, some people will say: then there is so much extra money that has gone into the Treasury. Not at all. On that same quantity of sugar, under the Cartwright tariff, you would have got a revenue of \$2,752,500 for it, but under the present tariff we only get a revenue of \$2,581,549. You absolutely get \$171,351 less duty, though you pay nearly \$2,000,000 extra for your sugar. There are several tests you can apply to this, in order to prove its correctness. You may take the extra duty that the New York refiner pays and you can take the lower price at which it is quoted, and you find that it amounts to 1 cent a pound. Now, I just wish to call attention to one other point. I have pointed out that the Finance Minister has totally misapprehended and misunderstood the causes of the prosperity that this country enjoyed during the first two or three years of this Administration. It is my duty, having stated that he has misapprehended and misunderstood it, to give you what I think to be the secret of the prosperity that was enjoyed by this country during the past two or three years, except this year, of course, the depression of which we have now entered upon; and in doing that, I ask the attention of the House for a moment. There are certain things that I hold no man would care to risk his reputation by seriously affirming, and one of them is that the National Policy in any way helped the fishing interests. I say no man who cares for his reputation would dare to affirm that the National Policy had benefited the fishermen, had enabled the fishermen to make larger catches, or had enabled them to get larger prices in the United States. I hold no reasonable man would risk his reputation on the statement that the National Policy raised the price of lumber in the United States market or the English market. I do not think that any man who cares for his reputation would care seriously to affirm that the National Policy gave us Heaven's rain or Heaven's sun, and the bountiful harvest that we have had. I do not believe any man who would care for his reputation would seriously affirm that our tariff, enacted in the Canadian Parliament, raised the price of wheat in Liverpool. I do not believe any man who cares for his reputation would affirm that the National Policy had enabled us to raise more cattle, had enabled us to produce more butter and cheese, or had raised the price of our cattle or the price of our butter and cheese in the English markets. I say there are four great interests that no man would care to risk his reputation by seriously affirming that the National Policy in the slightest degree could help. Sir, I want to speak for a moment or two with reference to these four industries. In doing so I take the period of five years as challenged by the Finance Minister; I take the five years that the Mackenzie Administration were in power, and leaving out the year 1878-79 as a neutral year, and taking the five years from that period until now, what do we find? I find that our total exports during the five years from 1874, to 1878, were \$342,884,506; and the total exports during the last five years that the hon. gentlemen opposite have been in power have been \$402,478,067. During the latter five years Canada exported \$59,593,561 worth more goods than she did in the five years of the Mackenzie Administration. There were \$60,000,000, in round numbers, extra brought into the country and circulated in the country during the latter period of five years. Any hon. gentleman can see what a vast benefit this would be. Now, to what extent is the National Policy to be credited for this extra export of \$60,000,000 worth? We have all agreed, I think, that with reference to the fisheries, and the forests, and agricultural products, and animals and their produce, the National Policy can claim no credit, and yet in these four lines there was an extra

export of \$65,009,711 during the five years these hon. gentlemen have been in power, over and above that of the five years of the Mackenzie Administration. There is the secret of the prosperity and the success that Canada had in the years 1881-82-83, and it can be easily seen, by any man who examines for himself, that this period gave us increased export in goods that the National Policy was powerless in the slightest degree to affect. But, while we had \$65,000,000 extra wealth brought into the country as a result of increased exports of those lines over which their National Policy could have no beneficial influence, there are two lines of exports that the National Policy can operate upon, and that is the mine and manufactured goods. We had legislation in order to promote the mining, and in order to promote the manufacturing industry, and our friends, the Government now content themselves with claiming power alone to benefit these two industries, and these they claim they have benefited. Well now, there is this strange fact in reference to the two industries that they can benefit by legislation, as they said. The industries that they could not help brought in \$65,000,000 extra wealth during the past five years, and in reference to the two industries they could help, we absolutely exported \$6,262,056 less of them than we did before during the five years of the Mackenzie Administration. Of the two lines that their policy can increase, we have had \$6,000,000 less come into the country, as the result of their export, than we had in the five years of the Mackenzie Administration. In these four other great lines which their policy could not affect, we have benefited by \$65,000,000 worth, which Providence gave to the country, and which these gentlemen could not give. The industries that these gentlemen can operate upon gave us \$6,000,000 less in decreased exports of the mine and manufactures. I wonder how much the mines have been developed under this policy, judged by the increased output of coal. The fact has been ignored that, from 1874 to 1878, wood was largely used as fuel, whereas coal is now consumed, and the increased output and increased consumption of coal are the result. The railways in those years were largely using wood, while they are now using coal almost wholly. But it will take a large increase of the output and consumption of coal to make up for a decrease of \$3,170,000 in the exports during the five years as compared with the exports during the administration of the late Government. I have pointed out what I consider the causes of the prosperity which the country has enjoyed and the sources from which it came, and I have shown, I think conclusively, that it is not to any legislation that has been initiated or carried out that we are indebted for it. I come now to speak of the condition of the country, a subject on which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) touched. I wish he were present; but it is not my fault that he is not present.

An hon. MEMBER. You have scared him away.

Mr. PATERSON. An hon. member says I have scared him away; he is not so easily frightened. I suppose that that hon. gentleman, who is able to extinguish the leader of the Opposition and defeat him in single combat, and rout the whole Opposition, so that it is impossible for it to get up even a combined answer to his unanswerable arguments, would not be frightened by one humble member of the Opposition. But I think an hon. member who makes such a charge on the Opposition, should, if it is all convenient, be in his place to get his answer in regard to it. He admitted that the situation in the North-West was not as prosperous as he would desire. He stated there were causes operating, and he boldly charged upon the Opposition that one of the great factors which brought about the destruction of their hopes of a greatly increased population in the North-West was that the Opposition had decried the country and endeavored to stop emigrants from going into that country. That was his statement, I believe. I

wanted him in his place, so that I might hurl back to him the statement. I deny it. The hon. gentleman having made the statement should have given some proof as to its truth. The charge is too serious for an hon. gentleman to make, in regard to any body of men, even if they are in the Opposition in the Commons, without being prepared to substantiate it. No proof was attempted. We have heard at other times allusions to remarks made by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), to remarks made by the leader of the Opposition, who, in speaking on the Canadian Pacific Railway, when the Government came forward with their airy schemes and statements, that bore on their face evidence of the actions of men who were building castles in the air instead of doing business in a business-like way and making prudent calculations, told them they must not overlook certain difficulties that were connected with the opening up and development of that country; reminded them that emigrants from the old country were not forced to go to our North-West, there being other lands to receive them; pointed out to them that some of the American States were still offering free homesteads and free lands to settlers, as we are doing in the North-West; told them they must not calculate upon getting all the immigration that was coming to this continent, and not to ignore the fact that they had formidable competitors for the incoming immigration in many of the States of the Union. That we have heard hon. members on this side of the House say. More than that we have not heard them say. It was a wise and a prudent statement for them to make, and it would have been wise and prudent if the Government had recognised that fact and pursued a course in harmony with it, whereby they would have done more for the benefit of the country. They have failed in their North-West policy as they have failed in their National Policy, and they are not manly enough to acknowledge it, but seek to cover their own shame in the matter, speaking in a parliamentary sense—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Speaking figuratively.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, speaking figuratively; but it is not a nice figure for the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been endeavoring to throw the blame on the Opposition for what they themselves have done. Do hon. gentlemen not see that when they make that misstatement—and outside of the House it would be put in the form of falsehood—when they bring that charge against the Opposition they are not writing dishonor on our brows but upon their own brows. And why? Because it does not take five years for the people to understand if statements are lies, and had their statements been true and those of the Opposition false, we would have been discredited by the country. We hold that the North-West is a good country, but we recognise the fact that there are other lands and other countries as well as this. I am glad to say, notwithstanding what has been stated by the hon. member for Cardwell, that there is beginning to dawn upon the organs of the party the fact that it will no longer do to deny that the statements made by the Opposition in regard to this matter were true. And it would have been a good thing for the country if those statements were given heed to. The *Toronto Mail*, the chief organ of the Government, in its issue of February 27, 1885, just a few days ago, contained an article on this subject; and I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, I ask the hon. member for Cardwell, to point to utterances made by hon. members on this side of the House, containing as strong language, language that might be construed to be so adverse to that country as that language which is printed deliberately in the chief organ of hon. gentlemen opposite. What does that article say. It points out the fact that the sales of land in the North-West during the last year have been rather discouraging. He goes on to say that we have

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

some comfort in the fact that, though the sales have dropped off, there has been a falling off in Dakota and Minnesota as well. Then he adds:

"Thus the decrease in settlement in these American territories was 39.56 per cent., and in the Canadian North-West 39.92 per cent. Considering the start Minnesota and Dakota have had in the race, and the help they have received from the Opposition in the Dominion Parliament and from the anti-immigration patriots in Manitoba, the wonder is not that our North-West should have suffered as much as they, but that it did not suffer more. The effects of the boom—the headache after the debauch—must also be taken into account as a factor operating temporarily against Manitoba. Then again, while the frost of September 7, 1883, did some damage throughout the American North-West, in Manitoba it wrought wholesale destruction."

We all remember well how hon. gentlemen opposite denounced us on this side because there had been an allusion, a necessary allusion, to the fact that some of the wheat had been touched with the frost in Manitoba. But here is the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite speaking of wheat being touched with frost in Dakota and Minnesota, while in Manitoba wholesale destruction took place—

"And the panic that followed the cry that early frosts would always menace wheat, inflicted grave injury upon the country, which nothing but a series of good harvests can repair. These, in our opinion, are the true causes of the depression in the North-West. The Government probably did commit mistakes; few men are infallible; but the marvellous energy they have displayed in developing that region, and the care they have taken in securing for the settler fair rates and free competition for his produce, stand out infinitely beyond the sum of their short comings."

Then he uses this language with reference to colonization companies which the Government chartered:

"The *Globe* says, however, that the Ottawa people encouraged speculation, and instances the formation of hundreds of bubble colonization companies under the Dominion Land Act. No doubt, the colonization companies have suffered. Many of them deserve to suffer. Their projects attempted to make money without working for it—an offence against the economies which is within a measurable distance of stealing. But the Government is in no way responsible for the collapse in that quarter."

We have here an article stating that many of the promoters of these colonization companies, which were chartered by the Dominion Government by the score, were within a measurable distance of stealing, or in other words, that they were within a measurable distance of being thieves. The article concludes:

"It is only fair to add, however, that in all probability the Government now in power has taken too sanguine a view of North-West development. It has been the habit, in making up calculations of future progress, to ignore the fact that Minnesota and Dakota offer to the poorer class of settlers advantages fully equal to those held out by Manitoba; while the western, south-western and southern States present to the well-to-do immigrant who can afford to choose his climate, an infinite and incomparable variety of attractions. Nothing but a loyal and united effort on the part of the Canadian people could, under such circumstances, prevail against the array of American influences in the emigration fields of Europe; and while the Opposition continues in its present frame of mind we may expect to be distanced."

Rank heresy. Listen, Mr. Speaker:

"While the western, south-western and southern States present to the well-to-do immigrant, who can afford to choose his climate, an infinite and incomparable variety of attractions."

That is the language of the *Toronto Mail*, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to find any statement as strong as that ever uttered by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now we have the chief organ of the Government admitting that these facts which were pointed out by leading men on the Opposition side, if they had been heeded at the time, it would have tended to secure the better development of the North-West, and that the Government made a great mistake in ignoring the facts so pointed out to them. Yet the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has the assurance to rise up in his place and denounce the Opposition as unpatriotic because their leaders gave the warning which, according to the *Mail*, was requisite, and for not heeding it the Government were recreant to their duty and have brought about the sad results that have followed. Now about the future of the country. I am not one of those who think that the

country must necessarily perish and be ruined because the present Administration are in power. I think they can do it a great deal of injury, and I think they have done it a great deal of injury. But we have a good deal of recuperative power, and I think perhaps the country will be enabled, after it has shaken off hon. gentlemen, in a constitutional way, to recover itself under the management of gentlemen who conducted the affairs of the country once before, during a severe financial crisis, and brought it through with a low rate of taxation, by economising expenditure and keeping the interests of the country in as healthy condition as possible. Then we come to speak of the future of the country, and I have some more articles to read. The future of the country, according to the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite, is intimately bound up with the success of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But what does the *Montreal Gazette*, of the 20th, say in an article headed "The Canadian Pacific Railway."

"Rumor has been busy for some weeks past with the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company is reported to be seeking further assistance from Parliament, to have incurred a floating liability of a considerable amount, and to have failed to raise a loan in the money market, and it is no longer a secret that these reports are substantially correct."

There we have, from the *Montreal Gazette*, the statement that the Canada Pacific Railway, notwithstanding the loan of last Session, is in an embarrassed position, and the whole tone of the article is in the direction of showing that Parliament is to be appealed to again to add to the millions upon millions which it has already given to the company. Two or three days earlier the *Toronto Mail* had an article on the same subject, in which it pointed out:

"The rumor that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company is about to ask for further aid from the Government has excited the violent wrath of the Reform party. Whether the rumor be true or false we do not know. It is evident, however, that unless Canada is to be involved in financial ruin the road must be completed either by the present company or by the Government."

It goes on to speak of the financial prospects of the company, and compares it with the Northern Pacific, and then makes this statement with reference to it—one which is eminently unpatriotic from the standpoint of those hon. gentlemen. It says:

"If our land subsidy of 25,000,000 acres be worth \$2 an acre, the Northern Pacific lands must be worth much more. For while the population of the whole territory through which the Canadian Pacific runs, from Callander to the Pacific, does not at this hour exceed 200,000, the smaller and more compact region traversed by the Northern Pacific is comparatively well settled."

Farther down it says—and I call hon. gentlemen's attention to it as a most unpatriotic utterance:

"If it be said that the mountain section of the Northern Pacific was more costly than the mountain section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that in the case of the Canadian Pacific the heavy work on the Pacific slope has been assumed by the Government, the answer is that the Northern Pacific had no rock division, 650 miles long, such as that which stretches in unbroken desolation between Port Arthur and Callander."

There is the statement of the *Mail* newspaper, the leading organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, that on the north shore of Lake Superior, where last year Parliament gave to that company \$22,500,000 to enable them to build that line, the whole 650 miles traversed by the road is a country which "stretches in unbroken desolation from Port Arthur to Callander," and I suppose the description they would give to the part between Port Arthur and Winnipeg—or a large portion of it—would be in much the same language had they required to touch upon that point. It goes on further:

"Another demand for help would without doubt involve the gravest consideration. But, as has been said, the completion of the road, either by the present company or by the Government, is a supreme necessity. The collapse of the Northern Pacific in 1873, in the very early stages of

its career, shook the United States to the centre. The abandonment of the Canadian Pacific within a year of its completion, involving the sacrifice of the \$47,500,000 which the Government has already paid the syndicate, of the \$11,000,000 sunk in Onderdonk's contract, of the \$17,000,000 spent on the Port Arthur and Winnipeg division, would be a catastrophe upon the far-reaching effects of which it would be idle to dwell. It is too late for Mr. Blake to rise now and oppose the completion of the line. Such a course was possible in 1873, when he took office with Mr. Mackenzie. Some surveying had been done at that time, but the scheme might have been indefinitely shelved without any loss to the country more serious than the secession of British Columbia and the North-West. Now, however, its abandonment would mean not only the disruption of Confederation but the financial ruin of the older partners, unless indeed they preferred suicide by repudiation."

That is the statement of the *Toronto Mail* with reference to the condition of the Canadian Pacific road, showing how intimately the Government of the country and the prosperity of the country are bound up in that road. The argument is that it is so near its completion that it must be completed or financial ruin and the disruption of Confederation must take place. Who is responsible for the rapid completion of that road? Who urged it? Who put it through in spite of the protests of those who advocated the adoption of a wiser course? If financial ruin and the disruption of Confederation are involved in it, hon. gentlemen opposite will have to answer for it. The Opposition have declared their views; they have declared that the only safe policy with reference to that work was to push it over the prairie as fast as settlement required it. Even in advance of settlement, to open up branch lines everywhere, and by-and-bye, when the interests of trade should require it, and the resources of the country warrant it to build the 650 miles through the unbroken desolation that the *Mail* speaks of. The responsibility, if there be anything serious involving the financial standing of this company at present, rests upon the Government. The people of this country will recognise that fact, and will deal with these hon. gentlemen accordingly when the proper time comes. Now, I have only to notice one more point touched upon by the hon. member for Cardwell. He intimated that if it was desirable in the interests of the Maritime Provinces that steps should be taken to secure reciprocal trade relations with the United States, the Government did not intend to move in that direction, but would wait until advances were made from the other side, and if the proposition were made, they would entertain it. All I can say is, that it is a matter of great importance to our friends by the sea that a reciprocity treaty should be negotiated, and they desire it; and I say that when they desire it, and when the interests of the country are bound up in it, it would be for the welfare of this country if gentlemen were sitting on the Treasury benches whose policy it would be to make an effort to secure fair trading relations and reciprocal arrangements with the United States. I believe the remedy for our present depression is to enlarge our foreign market, not only for our natural products, but for our manufactured goods, and thus to relieve ourselves of our surplus production. I see that the Government have placed a vote of something like \$12,000 in the Estimates for commercial agencies in different countries. I will support them in that. I would desire to see our foreign relations extended and new and important markets opened up to Canadian producers. But I have little faith in foreign markets being opened up by hon. gentlemen opposite. Their whole theory is to limit trade with other countries. I would say this to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), if he were present, that some of the commercial agents, whom they will appoint and send to other countries in order to promote the foreign trade of Canada, may be gentlemen who entertain views like the hon. member for Cardwell himself—views of their country so vast and so grand that, as he told us the other day, upon the motion made that we should be properly represented at the exhibition about to be held in one of the countries of Europe, and upon the remarks that followed by the hon. leader of the Opposition in

reference to a motion of his made some time ago for Canada to secure to herself the right to make her own commercial treaties—the hon. member for Cardwell, said: Make your own commercial treaties. Fancy Canada going to negotiate a treaty with another nation; the first question asked would be. Who are you? That is the sentiment the hon. member for Cardwell holds with reference to his own country—that if we went to negotiate a treaty on our own account with a foreign nation, it might be expected that the question asked by the nation we approached would be, who are you? I say that the interests of this country are not to be promoted, its resources are not to be developed by men being in power who hold such small ideas of their own country as that. Canada is a country that ought to be known among the nations of the world. I was glad an hon. member brought up the question of our being properly represented at the exhibition to be held at Antwerp. I have heard, and I believe I am correctly informed, that at the last exhibition at which Canada was represented, I think it was at Paris, the medals which the Canadian exhibitors received had to come to them through the English representatives, and Canada's individuality was lost in the matter. We want a Government in power that will give to this country a large prominence; we want to be known among the nations of the world; we want the right to negotiate our commercial treaties; we want men in charge of our affairs who will strive to secure for us that right, and having got it, we will go to the nations of the world and ask them to open trade with us. We want a Government that will give this country a start towards her great destiny. But we have not much faith in hon. gentlemen opposite. True, we shall have to put up with them for a time, until there is another appeal to the people; what the result of that appeal will be I cannot tell; there will be an opportunity then for the people to pronounce upon their policy. But I cannot but view it as an unfortunate thing that at this juncture of our affairs we should have at the head of the Government a gentleman whose judgment of constitutional law on almost every important question that has come up lately has been set aside by the highest tribunal of the land—that we should have the misfortune of having, in the control of our financial affairs, a gentleman who has failed in almost every one of his promises and violated nearly every rule laid down by himself. Meantime, we, on this side of the House, will continue to raise our voices in favor of what we conceive to be the best interests of the country, pointing out the course that we think ought to be adopted; and having done that, we shall feel that we have discharged our duty. We shall send forth from this place the sentiment, that we do not believe the power of the present Government is being used aright to administer the affairs or to develop the resources of this country; but that, though our affairs are thus crippled for the time, there is hope for the country, there is a bright prospect ahead. The cry must go out that the destiny of Canada is in the hands of the people of Canada; and the message I send forth is this: Up, men of Canada, and assert your rights! Strike off the bonds they are placing upon you, shake off the shackles with which they are endeavoring to fetter your prosperity, and give our country an opportunity to go forward and fulfil its grand destiny.

Mr. TUPPER moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12:10 a.m. Saturday.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 9th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DAVIS DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved the first reading of Bill (No. 84) for the relief of Amanda Esther Davis from the Senate.

Motion agreed to on a division.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) moved that said Bill be read the second time on Wednesday next.

House divided :

YEAS.

Messieurs

Abbott,	Hay,	Reid,
Allen,	Hilliard,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Barnard,	Innes,	Robertson (Hastings),
Beaty,	Irvine,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Blake,	Jamieson,	Rykert,
Bowell,	Kilvert,	Scott,
Burpee (Sunbury),	King,	Shakespeare,
Cameron (Huron),	Kinney,	Small,
Cameron (Victoria),	Kranz,	Somerville (Brant),
Carling,	Lister,	Somerville (Bruce),
Casey,	Livingstone,	Springer,
Charlton,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Sproule,
Cochrane,	Mackenzie,	Stairs,
Cockburn,	Mackintosh,	Sutherland (Oxford),
Davies,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Temple,
Dickinson,	McCallum,	Townshend,
Dundas,	McCarthy,	Tupper,
Edgar,	McCraney,	Vail,
Fairbank,	McLellan,	Wallace (Albert),
Farrow,	McMullen,	Wallace (York),
Ferguson (Welland),	McNeill,	Watson,
Fisher,	Mitchell,	Weldon,
Foster,	Mills,	Wells,
Gault,	Moffat,	White (Cardwell),
Gillmor,	Mulock,	White (Hastings),
Gordon,	O'Brien,	Williams,
Guillet,	Orton,	Wilson,
Hall,	Paint,	Wood (Brockville).—86.
Harley,	Pruya,	

NAYS.

Messieurs

Armstrong,	Dawson,	Labrosse,
Auger,	De St. Georges,	Landry (Kent),
Bain (Soulanges),	Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),	Landry (Montmagny),
Béchar,	Desaulniers (St.M'rice),	Langelier,
Bergeron,	Desjardins,	Langevin,
Bergin,	Dugas,	Laurier,
Blondeau,	Dupont,	Macdonald (King's),
Bourassa,	Forbes,	McDougall (C. Breton),
Burns,	Fortin,	McGreavy,
Cameron (Inverness),	Gagne,	McIsaac,
Caron,	Gaudet,	Patterson (Essex),
Casgrain,	Geoffrion,	Pinsonneault,
Catudal,	Gigault,	Platt,
Chapleau,	Girouard,	Pope,
Colby,	Grandbois,	Ray,
Costigan,	Guilbault,	Trow,
Coughlin,	Gunn,	Valin,
Coursol,	Hackett,	Vanasse,
Cuthbert,	Jackson,	Wright,
Daly,	Kirk,	Yeo.—61.
Daoust,		

Motion agreed to.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MULOCK, in moving for leave to introduce Bill (No. 90) to amend the Fisheries Act, said: The object of the Bill is to enable the Department of Fisheries to grant permits for fishing in waters that have been set apart for the propagation of fish. The practice has heretofore prevailed of placing permits in the hands of the fishery overseers in

the neighborhood of these waters, and the overseers have, I suppose, using proper discretion, given these permits to people in the vicinity of these waters allowing them to fish for their private use, thus to no material extent interfering with the object of the Order in Council which has set apart these waters. During the last winter, applications were made to the Department of Fisheries by a great many of the people living on the waters of Lake Simcoe for permission to fish through the ice. The permission was not given, the reason assigned being that the point had been referred to the Department of Justice, and the Minister of Justice had given it as his opinion that, where waters were set apart under the Act for the propagation of fish, the Department had no power, so long as the Act was in force, to allow fishing of any kind in those waters. If that opinion is adhered to by the Department, it prevents fishing in the winter, and it will prevent fishing in the summer as well, even in the restricted way allowed under a permit. I hope the Government will see its way to allow this Bill to become law, or to rescind the Orders in Council or to some extent if possible to modify them, in order to get over the difficulties in question. The Bill at present is to give the Government power to grant permits to fish in waters set apart substantially for the propagation of fish.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

UNAUTHORIZED COLLECTION OF DUTIES.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to call the attention of the Government to a statement which has been made to me, and which I think requires some information at their hands. Our custom, and as I understand the custom of the Imperial Parliament, has been to recognise the right of the Executive Government, after a change in the tariff has got to such a stage that the proposals of the Administration have been reported by the Committee of Ways and Means, to act upon them in a temporary manner; and instructions, I believe, are customarily given to the Collectors of Customs, from the time the report of the committee has been made to the House, even although no further action has been taken by the House, to enforce the new tariff provisionally, the understanding being that, if the duty should not be ultimately agreed to by the House, there should be a refund of the excess. In that view, which I understand to have been the common and ordinary view, the hon. gentleman opposite asked us the other evening to allow that portion of the proposals of the Government which they thought important to go into immediate effect, to pass through the Committee of Ways and Means; and they did pass through the committee—I refer to the duty on cigars. We understood the reason for the hon. gentleman's proposal; but, although no other proposals of the Government have been submitted to the House otherwise than by the speech of the Minister, although they have not been discussed by the Committee of Ways and Means or reported upon, I am informed that others of the resolutions have been ordered to be enforced at the Custom House. That is a departure from the practice, and demands some explanation.

Mr. BOWELL. The practice referred to by the hon. the leader of the Opposition I believe to be quite correct, but it has not been acted upon on the last two or three occasions when changes have been made in the tariff. The object of the House, when the leader of the Government asked that the resolutions relating to cigars, tobacco and snuff should pass through committee on the first night of their introduction, was to enable the Department to issue orders for the collection of the increased duties imposed upon those articles. The commissioner at the time, instead of confining his orders exclusively to the collection of duties upon those particular articles, issued a general order for the collection of duties upon all articles which would be affected by the proposed resolutions.

Mr. BLAKE. They had not been proposed.

Mr. BOWELL. They had been, because they were laid upon the Table. Well, I will withdraw that word if it is any advantage to the hon. gentleman. As soon as the attention of the Government was called to the fact that we had issued that order, it was withdrawn, and the duty now is only collected upon that portion of the resolutions which affects cigars, and not upon any other article contained in the resolutions which were laid before the House.

DELAYED RETURNS.

Mr. MILLS. I would ask the Government when we may expect the correspondence relating to the question of Indian titles in Ontario. It is desirable that we should have that correspondence at a very early period. Several weeks have elapsed since it was ordered and it is not yet laid on the Table. I would also like to ask the hon. gentleman when we may look for the correspondence relating to the northern boundary that the hon. gentleman promised to bring down. A considerable part of the Session has gone by and it has not yet been brought before the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will bring it down as soon as I can.

Mr. CASEY. I would like to call the attention of the hon. Secretary of State (I suppose it should be) to the fact that the return brought down on Thursday last, in answer to an Order of the House for a copy of the case submitted by the Governor in Council and the opinions given by the counsel consulted by the Government as to the amount of damage awarded to the contractors of Section B, Canadian Pacific Railway, is incomplete. The return, as brought down, consists of a letter from the Department of Justice to the counsel consulted, stating that they enclosed certain documents for their consideration; also the opinion given by the counsel on those documents; also a letter from the Department of Justice to the Department of Railways stating the opinion given by the counsel; but it does not contain the documents submitted by the Department of Justice to the Governor in Council which were asked for by the Order of the House. I will make a memorandum of the documents which are wanting and will hand it over to the Minister, and I hope that he will bring them down at an early date.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. If the hon. gentleman will send me a note by one of the clerks I will attend to it.

Mr. BLAKE. I do not know whether the returns in reference to the Short Line have been brought down.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two Short Lines.

Mr. BLAKE. It is a long time to bring down a return about a Short Line.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are two lines commonly called the Short Line. One is the shortest and best line, and the other is the snow line.

Mr. POPE. I think that return is not ready. As soon as it is I will bring it down.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I made a motion on the 5th of February last for a return of the number of employes, and their salaries, under the Liquor License Act, and the amount of money received by the Board of Commissioners, and how the money was disposed of. I am anxious to know when the return will be brought down. I would also call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that I have given notice of a resolution which I propose moving in regard to that subject. It is a very important motion, in which a good many members would like to discuss. Perhaps the First Minister would fix some date, so that we may definitely know when we can discuss it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We cannot well do that.

Mr. COSTIGAN. In reference to the return asked for by the hon. gentleman, I may say it involves a great deal of work. It is now in course of preparation and will be brought down as soon as possible.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I would also call the attention of the Government to the fact that on the 15th of February last I introduced a Bill concerning Elections of Members to this House, and it has not yet been printed in French. The same thing happened last year. I introduced the Bill at an early date last Session, and my recollection is that it was not printed in French at all; therefore, I could not move the second reading of the Bill. It is an important Bill, and I have no doubt the Ministry will likely assist me in carrying it through the House. I would like to have it printed in the French language. The hon. gentleman will find that fifteen Bills introduced after this Election Bill of mine, have been printed in both languages, and some of them have been moved in the House.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As far as I am concerned I never enquire about those matters. I think the officers of the House will see that the parliamentary contractors perform their work.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I think the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated the other day that the printing contractors had not anything to do in their Department—I understood him to say so. This Bill was introduced on the 15th of February last, and I would like to know why the printing is delayed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. This is great neglect on the part of the contractors, and they should be called to account. It may be the translation.

EVIDENCE IN DIVORCE CASES.

Mr. JACKSON. When members of this House are expected to vote on Divorce Bills I think we should have the evidence before us so that we may know what we are voting upon. As far as I am concerned I want to see the evidence, and I think the members of this House should be supplied with the evidence in regard to every Bill that comes before us.

Mr. SPEAKER. The evidence is on the Table of the House, and any hon. member can see it who wishes to. It is not customary to have it printed, and after the second reading of Divorce Bills they are referred to a Select Committee who examine the evidence.

Mr. IVES. I would ask if the exhibits are also to be laid on the Table.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 10) to reduce the capital stock of the Federal Bank of Canada, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Small.)

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 69) respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt.)

Bill (No. 80) to incorporate the Fort McLeod Rancho Telegraph Company.—(Mr. McCarthy.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association, Limited.—(Mr. Curran.)

WINNIPEG AND PRINCE ALBERT RAILWAY.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved second reading of Bill (No. 82) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

Mr. BLAKE. It does not seem to me that the Bill should be read the second time. Section 7 contains this clause:

"The company, in aid of the construction, equipment and maintenance of the said railway, shall receive from the Government of Canada a grant of six thousand four hundred acres of agricultural land for each mile of railway constructed, along the line of railway, such land to be laid out in alternate sections on each side of the railway; and if sufficient area cannot be obtained in such manner, then the complement shall be made up in sections within the district of Saskatchewan, subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, together with such additional lands as may be granted or leased from the Provincial Government of Manitoba, or other Provincial Governments."

This is not an enabling clause, but an absolute, positive parliamentary declaration, alienating 6,400 acres of the public domain for each mile of railway constructed. This cannot be done by the proviso in question. There must be a committee and the assent of the Crown must be given.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. In this case the assent of the Crown has not been given. My attention has just been called by one of the officers of the House to the fact that this section is beyond the power of a private member, and the assent of the Crown must be given. The Bill might be sent to the Railway Committee, and this circumstance would, of course, be borne in mind.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree to the proposal of the hon. gentleman. I understand two things are required in such a case—the assent of the Crown and a preliminary committee. It is a very dangerous practice to allow Bills to pass through two stages without these preliminaries having been complied with. This Bill should be treated as a Bill out of Order.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Suppose the objectionable clause should not be expunged by the Committee, in what position would we be placed.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Perhaps it would be well if the mover were to withdraw the motion, and if the Bill were allowed to remain on the notice paper, so that the mover might consider what course he would adopt.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the Order should be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I was not aware that the Bill contained the provision to which the leader of the Opposition has referred; but if the motion is allowed to stand I will look into the matter and consider what course I should pursue.

Mr. SPEAKER. I suggest that the Order be discharged, and the hon. member can then introduce another Bill, with the objectionable clause omitted.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved that the Order be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

Motion agreed to and Bill withdrawn.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for the month of January, 1885?

Mr. POPE. The earnings of the Intercolonial Railway for the month of January, 1885, were \$159,848; working expenses, \$175,760; deficiency for that month, \$15,912. For January of last year the working expenses were \$159,000; earnings, \$166,000, or a deficiency of \$22,000.

LONGUEUIL AND LEVIS RAILWAY.

Mr. VANASSE (Translation). Enquired, Have the Government issued orders, or do they purpose issuing orders, for the making of an instrumental survey of the line starting from the town of Longueuil and passing along the south shore of the River St. Lawrence through the counties of Chambly and Verchères, to the town of Sorel, and thence through the counties of Yamaska, Nicolet, Lotbinière and Lévis to the town of Lévis, with a view to selecting that line for the extension of the Pacific Railway to the Canadian ports on the Atlantic?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, I have the honor to state that the Government have not caused that survey to be made, because the line of which the hon. gentleman speaks goes through a country which is perfectly known and the distance could be easily obtained without making that instrumental survey.

WOOD SUPPLIES FOR DEPARTMENTAL AND PARLIAMENTARY BUILDINGS.

Mr. McCRAVEY asked, Is the wood used in the Departmental and Parliamentary Buildings supplied by contract or otherwise? If by contract, who is the contractor, and how much is he paid per cord? If not by contract, from whom is it purchased, and at what price per cord, and how is it measured?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The wood for these buildings is always supplied by contract. The present contractor is Mr. McEachren. The prices are \$5.50 per cord for maple, and \$5.25 for mixed hardwood. The contract calls for 128 cubic feet per cord. The measurement is made as the wood is delivered at the buildings, and in every instance by two officers, in the presence of the contractor. The present contract is about finished and new tenders will be called for without delay.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE LICENSE ACT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has the Government taken any, and if so, what steps to secure a reference to the Privy Council of the question of the constitutionality of the License Act of 1883; and if so, when? Has the Government communicated to the commissioners or inspectors its action or intentions in the matter; and if so, when?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the decision being certified to the Government it was referred to the Minister of Justice, and on his report he has been instructed to prepare a case and to apply to the Colonial Secretary for a reference to the Privy Council. The action or intention of the Government has not been communicated to the commissioners or inspectors.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—PROGRESS ESTIMATES FOR FEBRUARY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What is the amount of the progress estimates of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the month of February, transmitted to the Government? Was any sum paid in respect thereof up to the time of answering the question? If so, how much and when?

Mr. POPE. On the eastern section, central division, subsidy, \$38,256; loan, \$57,500; total \$95,756; western section, central division, subsidy, \$73,646; loan, \$110,500, total \$184,146; eastern section, eastern division, subsidy, \$96,394; loan \$132,700, total \$229,094.

Mr. BLAKE. This is the whole progress estimate?

Mr. POPE. Not the whole, there is one certificate which is not made yet.

ENGINEERS' REPORTS—SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, When will reports of the engineers respecting the Short Line be laid on the Table of this House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They are now being prepared and will be brought down as soon as possible.

MR. J. A. CHENEVERT.

Mr. LAURIER asked whether Mr. J. A. Chenevert, managing director of *Le Sorelois*, is employed by the Department of Public Works? If so, since when and at what salary.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There is a gentleman of the name of Chenevert employed in the public buildings at Sorel. I do not know whether he is managing director of the paper mentioned by the hon. gentleman or not, but I am informed by officers that he is a man of about 60 years of age and is a joiner by trade. I understand that his salary is \$2.50 a day. He has been employed since some time last summer when the buildings began.

APPLICATION FOR WATER LOTS IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. TUPPER asked, Have applications for water lots in Nova Scotia been made to the Dominion Government? Has any action been taken by the Government upon such applications, if any made? Have any of the applications been granted? If not, why not?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There have been some applications made to the Dominion Government for water lots in Nova Scotia. In one case—I think it is at River John—the case was decided and the application granted. I understand that there are one or two other applications and they are now being considered.

MR. ALPIN GRANT.

Mr. FORBES asked, What position does Mr. Alpin Grant, of the City of Halifax, hold under the Government or in the Department of Railways? What are his duties, and what salary or allowance does he receive for the duties he performs?

Mr. POPE. Mr. Alpin Grant is the gentleman in charge of the elevators and other matters connected with the terminus. His salary is about \$160 a month.

CHIEF JUSTICESHIP OF SUPERIOR COURT OF QUEBEC.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, Can the Government inform the House when the Superior Court of the Province of Quebec will be provided with a Chief Justice?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes; the Government can inform the hon. gentleman, and we will. The chief justice has been appointed.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH JAMAICA.

Mr. BURPEE (Sunbury) asked, Have any steps been taken to procure free trade relations between Canada and the Island of Jamaica and with what result? Has any correspondence taken place regarding the same and with whom?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Steps have been taken with respect to trade relations between Canada and the British West Indies, and there has been some correspondence on the subject with Her Majesty's Government. It is not in the interests of the public to bring down that correspondence just now.

WESTERLY BOUNDARY OF ONTARIO.

Mr. RYKERT moved for :

Copy of the short hand notes of the argument before the Privy Council in the late dispute between Manitoba and the Province of Ontario, as to the westerly boundary of the Province of Ontario; also copy of the claim as presented by the Attorney General of Ontario before the Privy Council; also a statement of the reasons given by the Attorney General of Ontario for abandoning his claim to that part of the territory lying between the Lake of the Woods and the Rocky Mountains; also a copy of all correspondence between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of Ontario in reference to the arbitration and award, and also in reference to the decision of the Privy Council not already moved for or brought down.

He said: I am desirous, Sir, that this House shall be possessed of that information relating to the argument before the Privy Council in this case, which will enable it to judge whether or not the attitude assumed by the Parliament of Canada has been the correct one, and whether or not this Parliament has shown any hostility to the Local Legislature. It is necessary, in order that this House may arrive at a full understanding of what has taken place, that I should refer briefly to some of the actions of the Local Legislature and also to the course which has been adopted by this Government on that important question. The attitude of hostility which the Parliament of Ontario has assumed towards the Dominion Parliament, and towards the representatives of the people in this Parliament, has been such that I for one, as a member for the Province of Ontario, do not feel justified in allowing the remarks which are constantly made in the Local Legislature to pass by without entering my protest against them. Before 1882, Sir, before the motion was passed in this Parliament in favor of referring the whole question to the Privy Council, charges were hurled against the Ontario portion of the members of this Parliament, that we were traitors to Ontario, and that we were in alliance with the Blues of the Province of Quebec for the purpose of injuring Ontario and depriving her of her rights. The position assumed by the Local Government before 1882 is still assumed by them. They are continuously and systematically attacking this Parliament for its course upon that question, and as a representative from the Province of Ontario, I do not feel justified in allowing those attacks to be made daily in another Parliament without showing to the people of this country that they are unfounded. Previous to the last general election we were told in this House by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) that unless this Parliament ratified the award, we were the enemies of Ontario, and as such would be punished at the polls. We were told, Sir, in a certain memorandum which was sent by the Hon. Mr. Mowat and his Government in answer to one from the Secretary of State of this Government, that unless we adopted some other course than the one we proposed to adopt, namely, to refer the question to the Privy Council, that we should receive the condemnation of the people at the polls. Well, Sir, if we look at what has taken place in the last election we will find that the course we pursued met with the approbation of the people. We shall find that the position we then assumed, namely, that the whole question should be referred to the Privy Council, was fully and fairly discussed by the people—in fact, that was the great and important question discussed during the general election by hon. gentlemen opposite, in order, if possible, to draw the attention of the country away from the question of the National Policy. It was hoped by the representatives of the people in the Province of Ontario, who are in alliance with our friends on the Opposition side of this House, that they would make the people of Ontario believe that their representatives in this House were traitors to the Province. The people were told in almost every school-section in the Province of Ontario that we did everything we could do, to spoliolate Ontario of her just rights and to rob her of her territory; and yet the great majority, in fact nine-tenths of

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

those who voted in favor of the resolution to refer the question to the Privy Council, were returned at the polls. The Hon. Mr. Mowat, in answer to the memorandum of the Secretary of State, stated that the resolution of this House did not reflect the opinions of the majority of the people of Ontario. He assumed that we, representing the Province of Ontario in this House, did not speak for the Province of Ontario, and therefore had no right to act as we had done, but declared that our duty was to at once confirm the award. But, as I say, the people fully and fairly discussed that question, and by a large majority said that we were right; and now again we are told, Sir, that we are traitors to our own Province. The course pursued by those gentlemen previous to 1882 is now being pursued by them in the Local Legislature. No later than the 29th of January last we were told by Mr. Mowat and his friends of the Ministerial party in the Province of Ontario that this Government and this House were acting in deep-seated hostility towards the Province of Ontario, and that we were determined to form an alliance with the Blues of the Province of Quebec, and with the members from the Maritime Provinces, in order to rob the Province of Ontario by delaying the settlement of that question. To draw away the attention of the general public of the Province of Ontario from the reckless and extravagant conduct of the Mowat Government, they are now endeavoring to draw a red-herring across the trail, to make the people of the Province feel that there is a more important question than the financial question to be considered, namely, the question of the spoliation of the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, as I said before, our action in this Parliament was justified by the electors at the polls. We were told that we were then right in the course we pursued, and that it was right and proper that the whole question should be settled by the Privy Council. The people of the Province of Ontario by a large majority declared that we were right in the course we then pursued, and that the Mowat Administration was wrong. The position in which this Parliament found this question in 1882 was simply this. They found that an award had been made by certain gentlemen, which award was held by the highest legal authorities to be illegal and not binding. They found that the question referred to that arbitration was, where was the true legal boundary? When this Parliament discovered that the true legal boundary had not been found, that the award was not a true and binding award, that the whole course pursued by the Ontario Government was an inconsistent one; when we discovered that the Premier of Ontario had openly declared that the award had not done justice to Ontario, we felt the question had not been legally and properly decided and that our only recourse was to have it decided by the highest tribunal in the land. A resolution was moved by the late member for Niagara (Senator Plumb) asking that the question be referred to the Privy Council. That resolution was sent to the Ontario Government who refused to consider it. We contended, as representing the Province of Ontario, that the award was not legal and binding, that justice had not been done to Ontario, that, according to the authoritative statements made over and over again by the Premier of Ontario and by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) the boundaries of the Province of Ontario went to the Rocky Mountains and that the arbitrators had only given to Ontario one tenth of the land claimed by her; and we felt therefore that the question should be finally set at rest. We were told then that the award was not legal and binding, and at the same time were told that the late Government, had it been in power, would have recognised the award; we also discovered that the Ontario Government had passed an Act of Parliament ratifying that award in advance, and that it was then understood between Mr. Mowat and his Government and the Mackenzie Administration, that the latter would also pass an Act of Parliament

ratifying the award in advance. This Parliament being possessed of that information, and seeing that the award could not possibly be maintained, decided the better course would be to pass a resolution, referring it for final adjudication to the Privy Council. This Parliament found that they were the trustees for the general public; they found that this question had not been settled and that it was their duty to find some solution of the difficulty; they found why the question was kept open,—and I think I will be able to show, before I sit down, why it was kept open for many years and why it is now being revived, I think I will be able to show that the object was merely to obtain an electioneering cry. We found also that Mr. Mowat and his Government had rejected proposals made by this Government to refer the award to the Privy Council; we found that they rejected a fair and reasonable proposition for the final settlement of the question; we found, not only that this reasonable and fair proposition made by the First Minister in 1872 and afterwards repeated by him in 1882, was rejected on both occasions, but that Mr. Mowat in the end was compelled to accept terms not so favorable at the hands of the Attorney-General of Manitoba; we find that while Mr. Mowat contended that there should be no joint authority in the disputed territory, as proposed by this Government, he when cornered by Mr. Miller, the Attorney-General of Manitoba, yielded and went before the Privy Council on less favorable terms than those proposed by this Government, and consented to a joint authority. Knowing all these facts, it is our duty to place them on record, in order that intelligent people may be able to decide whether we were right or wrong in the course we took. I propose not to quote anything except from the official records of the Mowat Administration; I propose to quote from certain documents which I find in the Sessional Papers of 1882, from the speeches of Mr. Mowat himself also from his organ, the *Globe*, in which certainly I have no confidence, in order to show that these gentlemen have been acting inconsistently, that they never intended to ratify the award, that when Parliament passed an Act in 1874, agreeing to ratify the award, in advance, the Government had no intention to carry it out. On a former occasion I quoted from the *Globe* of 1882, to show that the Mackenzie Administration never intended that the award should be ratified unless it were favorable to the Dominion, and that Mr. Mackenzie had reserved to himself the right to accept or reject the award as he might think proper. I want to show the House that the course of the Mowat Government has been vacillating, inconsistent and hostile to the interests of the country, and I hope the House will pardon me while, in order to do so, I read from the official documents of the Local Legislature, so that an intelligent public may understand the position taken by this Parliament and that which was taken by the Local Government, and decide which was the right one. I stated a few minutes ago, and I shall refer to this again, that this Government and its supporters were charged with being controlled by the Province of Quebec. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was particularly vicious towards his Lower Canadian friends in this House, and we find that his organ and Mr. Mowat with the leading lights of that party were certainly not very stinted in their strictures as regards the allegiance of the Bleus of Quebec to the present Government. In order that our friends from Lower Canada may know in what light they are regarded by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their supporters in Ontario, I shall quote from several of these authorities. I propose to show from papers and documents not favorable to my own party, how hon. gentlemen opposite are endeavoring to set up sectional feelings and sectional cries against our friends from the Province of Quebec. I find one quotation from the *Globe* of February 14, 1882,—I had reference to the earlier

portion of this article a few moments ago, and on a former occasion in this House I read it. The *Globe* says:

"As a matter of fact the other Provinces were not protesting. We know not what private pressure the Bleus of Quebec, ever the enemies of Ontario and of progress, may have sought to bear on the Premier, knowing themselves to be the right arm of his power, but no public objection has been made, no open, manly protest uttered by any Province in this Dominion."

Then we find on February the 16th, this language:

"The report concerning Ontario boundaries which were published yesterday is very fully accredited to the Hon. J. A. Mousseau, a conspicuous representative of Blue interests, in the Ottawa Cabinet. It contains all that the animosity to Mr. Mousseau, aided by the ingenuity of Sir John can find against the rights of this Province. Sir John wishes to please the Blues by robbing Ontario for their benefit and insulting her for the gratification of his own and their spite."

Then we have another choice bit from a prominent gentleman in the Ontario Government, that is, the Hon. Mr. Pardee. We find in the *Globe* of January 21st, 1882, this choice language:

"Everything pointed to this conclusion, that the Dominion Government, influenced by animosity to Ontario, and pressed by a feeling of jealousy which prevailed in another Province, had determined to shirk the responsibility by changing the venue, making the quarrel between Ontario and Manitoba."

And, during the debate on the Address in the Local Legislature, one of the distinguished gentlemen in that House, a prominent member of the Reform party, spoke also in very strong terms. Mr. McLaughlan is reported to have said:

"He ventured to say that the member for Glengarry was the only member of the Opposition who had been sent pledged to stand up for the rights of Ontario. He imagined the people of Glengarry addressing their member as a native of Glengarry to the manner born, but reminding him that he was a long time out of Ontario and under the influence of the Mousseaus, the Chapleaus, the Carons, the Langevins of Quebec, who had not the kindest feelings towards the Province of Ontario. They recollected when Upper Canada paid the taxes and Lower Canada spent them."

Then we have another choice article from the *Globe* newspaper. As I said, I only intend to quote from the organs of the hon. gentlemen and their official documents. We find in the *Globe* of February 1st, 1882, this language:

"To the everlasting disgrace of the Dominion Government and their slavish majority in both Houses of Parliament, no similar Act was passed at Ottawa."

Again, on 4th February, 1882, we find this language:

"Do they mean simply that Sir John Macdonald, having for a long time been obliged to find the chief source of his power in the spirit of reaction which is still unfortunately so strong in Quebec, is determined to make use of that power to the utmost? Is he playing the double but dangerous game of pandering to the prejudices and the dread of progress of our French fellow citizens, at the same time that he is using them to check and punish the Opposition? It would be not only discouraging but exasperating to Ontario in particular to find the politician, whom she had herself repeatedly repudiated, and who holds his seat in Parliament by the grace of a purchased constituency at the Pacific, converting the heavy inertia of French Conservatism into a force for the punishment and humiliation of his own Province."

Then we find again another choice article in the *Globe* of February 14th:

"He (Sir John) disregarded the call of honor at the dictation of the French Bleus, and by way of punishing Ontario for supporting Mr. Mowat." In case Mr. Meredith were successful, "then, in that case, the Bleus would of course direct the policy of a Tory Government at Toronto as they direct the policy of the Tory Government at Ottawa."

It must be very flattering to these gentlemen to know what power they really have. I think it important to let them know what the opinion of the leading men of the Reform party in Ontario really is on this question. Then we find that a certain gentleman now in this House, but who got the go-by at the polls, on April 3rd, 1882,—I refer to the hon. member for Bothwell.

Mr. MILLS. I did not get the go-by.

Mr. RYKERT. Oh! yes, you did.

Mr. MILLS. No.

Mr. RYKERT. If the hon. gentleman did not get the go-by, he had a very narrow escape, for his enormous majority of several hundred was reduced to a small majority of 16.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all. A majority of 295 the other way was converted to—

Mr. RYKERT. I hope I am not making him uneasy. He said, according to *Hansard* of that year, page 690:

"There is not a man from one end of the Province to the other who does not know that the Prime Minister has been driven on in this policy of spoliation by his Quebec colleagues."

I heard him say "No, no," a little while ago, but if he consults that page of *Hansard* he will find that language. He goes on to say:

"They refuse to recognise that we are one Dominion, and that the growth and prosperity of any Province is an advantage to every other part of the Dominion. They envy us our rights, and they would filch from us a portion of our heritage."

That is the language which the hon. gentleman used towards his friends from Lower Canada. So you will see that, as far as the Grit orators in this House are concerned, as far as the Grit members in the Province of Ontario are concerned, they have shown a deep seated hatred to the Province of Quebec; on every occasion which has been afforded them they have shown the same hostility to that Province, and have pointed out the fact that the hon. the Premier controls this Dominion by the support of his Lower Canadian friends. Further even than that, they have pointed out over and over again that this Government is dependent upon, and controlled by, the members of the several Provinces irrespective of the Province of Ontario. It is my purpose to show that the real traitors to Ontario are the men now holding the reins of power in that Province. In order that these gentlemen may be able at their leisure to study the real history of this case, and that the people of the Province may know who are really acting in their interests, I shall occupy the attention of the House as briefly as possible in referring to what has been done in this case since 1872, when the question of the western boundary of Ontario was first mooted by the present Government. The House will recollect—it has been referred to upon more than one occasion—that the right hon. the leader of the Government in the year 1872, expressed a strong desire for the settlement of this question upon a legal basis, for its settlement by a satisfactory tribunal, one which would meet with the approval of this country. On the 1st May, 1872, the hon. gentleman recommended that a certain course of procedure should be adopted. He recommended that the question should be referred to the Privy Council, and that, in the meantime, a commission should be appointed in order that the Government of the disputed territory might be properly carried on. Then, in his report of the 16th May, 1872, I find, at page 232 of the Sessional Papers of 1872, this communication from the Hon. Joseph Howe:

"I am, at the same time, for reasons set forth in the memorandum, to invite the Government of Ontario to concur with the Government of Canada in a statement of the case now in dispute between the said Governments respecting such boundaries, for immediate reference to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, with the view to a settlement, by a judgment or a decision of that tribunal, of the western and northern boundaries of Ontario. I am also to urge upon the Government of Ontario the necessity, in view of the facts stated in the last paragraph of the accompanying memorandum, of arranging with the Government of the Dominion for some joint course of action as to the granting of land and of mining licenses, reservation of royalties, etc., in the portion of territory in controversy, and for this purpose I have to request you to move your Government to appoint a commissioner to meet the Hon. J. C. Aikins to arrange such joint system on the understanding that any such arrangement, when ratified by the two Governments, shall be held to bind both, and shall be subject to the decision of the judicial committee of the Privy Council upon the question of the boundaries, and that, after such decision, titles to lands or mining rights shall be confirmed by the Government, whether of Canada or of Ontario, as shall, under the decision of the Privy Council, be the proper party to legalise the sale."

Mr. RYKERT.

That was signed "Joseph Howe, Secretary of State for the Provinces." So, from the very outset, the present leader of the Government was desirous to have the question settled, and settled forever, by a proper tribunal recognised by everyone, and, in the meantime, in order that that disputed territory might be properly governed, he urged that a commission should be appointed to arrive at a decision satisfactory to the Dominion and to the Province of Ontario, and he placed that proposal before the Government of Ontario. Now, instead of accepting that proposition, you will see at once that Mr. Mowat went off in a different direction. No, I beg his pardon; it was then the present leader of the Opposition; because I think, if I recollect rightly, that he only resigned on the 21st August of the same year, although his hon. colleague I find was paid to the 1st October. I find on the 31st of May, 1872, at page 233 of the documents to which I have referred, this communication from the clerk of the Executive Council of the Province of Ontario, addressed to the Dominion Government:

"EXECUTIVE COUNCIL CHAMBER, 31st May, 1872.

"With reference to the proposed submission to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, this committee begs to observe that the solution of the boundary question depends upon numerous facts, the evidence as to many of which is procurable only in America, and the collection of which would involve the expenditure of much time; and upon the whole, the committee is of opinion that the more satisfactory way of settling the question, should the Government of Canada still decline to negotiate for a conventional boundary, would be by reference to a commission sitting on this side of the Atlantic, and the committee recommends that, without for the present dealing definitely with the proposal of the Government of Canada for a reference to the judicial committee, this counter suggestion should be made to that Government. The committee of Council entertains a strong conviction that it is the duty of the Government of Ontario to retain, in the meantime, the control of the lands within the boundaries claimed by it; but as it is anxious that the policy of the Government with reference to the disposition of these lands should, so far as practicable, conform to the views of the Government of Canada, the committee agrees that an effort should be made to avoid the possible difficulties arising from the claims put forward by that Government, and with this view the Committee recommends that the Hon. R. W. Scott should be requested to confer with the Hon. J. C. Aikins, as proposed by the dispatch of the 16th of May.

(Certified,) J. G. SCOTT,
Clerk E. C."

Now, Sir, I wish particularly to refer to the communication from the Dominion Government, because Mr. Mowat has repeatedly declared on the floor of the Legislature and published in his organ, that up to 1852 he had never heard of a reference to the Privy Council. I want to show that he knew of it from the very commencement, and that at first he appeared to be favorable to it, provided he would not be obliged to search through the papers referred to in the extract I have just read; he was at the time favorable to leaving it to the Privy Council or some other tribunal. I wish the House to keep this in mind, because I intend to show how he deceived the members of the Ontario House and endeavored to deceive the people of the Province of Ontario, by saying that up to 1882 he had never heard of a reference to the Privy Council. Well, Sir, the Government, then led by the right hon. gentleman at the head of the present Government, went out of office in October, 1873; and we find that even the Mackenzie Government was in favor of a reference of the matter to the Privy Council, and so much were they in favor of it that the very first act of that Government was to direct their Secretary of State to demand from the Ontario Government why they had not answered the communication I have referred to, of the 16th of May, 1872, that is, from the Hon. Joseph Howe, Secretary of State, to the Hon. W. P. Howland.

Mr. MILLS. That was not the Mackenzie Government? Joseph Howe was not a member of the Mackenzie Government.

Mr. RYKERT. I did not say he was. I stated that when the Mackenzie Government came into power their very first

act—and a very hurried one it was—was to compel their Secretary of State to ask for the answer of the Ontario Government to Mr. Howe's communication of the 16th May, 1872, which is based upon the report of a gentleman whom I see here called "J. A. Macdonald," and I assume he is now the present gifted and honored leader of this House. On the 26th of December, 1873, I find, at page 242 of this same document—I do not know whether the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will deny its authenticity; perhaps he will—I find this letter:

"OTTAWA, 26th December, 1873.

"SIR,—I have the honor to invite your attention to the letter addressed to your predecessor on the 12th November, 1872, covering a copy of a report of His Excellency the Governor General in Council, on the subject of the northern and western boundaries of the Province of Ontario. May I request that you will have the goodness to bring the matter under the early notice of your Government, with a view to their coming to a decision on the proposition contained in the Order in Council in question, to submit the question of the boundary to the decision of the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

"(Signed), D. CHRISTIE,
"Secretary of State."

So you see, Mr. Speaker, I was right when I said that the members of the Mackenzie Government were favorable to referring that matter to the Privy Council. They asked for an answer, they urged an answer, but that answer was not given, as you will see; it was entirely evaded. I think I shall be able to show what caused the delay and what has been the cause of all the difficulty in settling this important and vexed question. I find the next act of the Ontario Government was to place in the hands of the Lieutenant-Governor certain language to be used in opening the Legislature of Ontario, on the 8th of January, 1874, which I find at page 242:

"The collection of evidence with respect to our North-West boundary is still going on; and the evidence for and against our claims will soon be in a position to be referred to some tribunal for adjudication. I have no apprehension as to the result. Meanwhile, informal negotiations have taken place for the adoption of a provisional line, so that the settlement of the important territory in dispute may not be delayed for a decision as to the true and permanent boundary. Resolutions on the subject will probably be submitted for your consideration."

Now, as I said a few minutes ago, we find the statement repeated in the Local Legislature, by the members of the Government that the question of reference to the Privy Council was never decided, never broached to them, never thought of. Let me show how truthful that statement is by referring to the resolution moved by Mr. Mowat on the 24th of March, 1874. He is evidently either at fault in his memory, or rather economical of the truth. I find, at page 242, this resolution:

"Resolved, That this House approves of the reference of the question of the western boundary of this Province to arbitration, or to the Privy Council, according as the Lieutenant Governor in Council shall see fit and approves, likewise, of the adoption of a provisional boundary line in the meantime; on such terms as may be agreed upon between the Government of the Dominion and the Government of this Province."

You will see that up to 1874 Mr. Mowat was in accord with the right hon. leader of the present Government, as regards the importance of having the question settled by an important tribunal, and that one of the important tribunals that he recognised was the Privy Council. Then we go on further and we find, in 1874, an extract from the speech delivered by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, in which he looks forward hopefully to a settlement of the question in a very short time. I shall presently show where the delay has been and what has been the cause of the delay. Instead of its being the fault of the present Dominion Government, I shall show that it has been caused entirely by the Ontario Government, and is entirely a difficulty of their own creation. On 12th November, 1874, I find the Lieutenant-Governor used the following language:—

"In accordance with a resolution passed at your last Session, with respect to the westerly and northerly boundaries of the Province, my Government and the Government of the Dominion have agreed on a provisional line—"

55

I wish the House to bear in mind that fact—that they had agreed upon a provisional line—in order that I may further show the misstatements made by the Premier of Ontario:

"to be assumed as correct for the purpose of land grants by each Government, until the true and permanent boundary shall be ascertained and determined, and have agreed to leave to arbitration the question as to the permanent boundary. Two distinguished gentlemen have been selected for the office of arbitrators, and they are soon to enter upon their duties, and will probably finish their work in the early part of next year."

That states that they had come to some agreement, and you will find that the Province of Ontario had agreed to refer the matter to an arbitration, and at the same time recommended that the Legislatures of Ontario and the Dominion should take joint action upon that question and pass Acts by means of which the territorial award should be recognised whenever it was made. I find, on the 10th of November, 1874, at page 246 of this document, that Hon. Adam Crooks, then one of the Ministers of the Province of Ontario, referred to the resolution passed in the Local Legislature, as follows:—He said:

"By a resolution of the Legislative Assembly, passed on the 3rd day of March last, the House approved of the reference of the question of the western boundary of this Province to arbitration or to the Privy Council, according as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council should see fit. It is considered by Your Excellency's Council to be expedient that the question of the northern boundary of this Province should be determined at the same time as the western boundary, though the determination of the northern boundary is not of so pressing importance as the other. In view of these objects, the undersigned, before his late visit to Ottawa, on other public business, was authorised by the other members of Your Excellency's Council to propose (subject to Your Excellency's approval) to the Government of the Dominion that the question concerning the northern and western boundaries of the Province of Ontario should be determined by a reference to arbitrators to be mutually agreed upon, and whose standing and ability might readily be expected to secure for their decision the confidence alike of the people of Ontario and the people of the Dominion."

I wish to direct the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to this passage:

"The undersigned recommends that the Province agree to concurrent action with the Dominion in obtaining such legislation as may be necessary for giving binding effect to the conclusion which may be arrived at."

I wish the House to notice the words "may be arrived at," because I shall show what kind of Order in Council was passed, and that they left a loophole through which they could crawl.

"And for establishing the northern and western boundaries of the Province of Ontario in accordance therewith."

That communication was sent to the Dominion Government, and I point this out particularly, because I find that the *Globe* and Mr. Mowat have both stated publicly that Mr. Mackenzie never intended to pass an Act of Parliament ratifying and confirming the award before it was made. I find that on 12th November, 1874, the following memorandum was sent by the Dominion Privy Council:—

"On a memorandum, dated 12th November, 1874, from the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie, stating that he recommends concurrence in the proposition of the Government of Ontario to determine, by means of a reference, the northern and western boundaries of that Province relatively to the rest of the Dominion.

"That the Ontario Government having named the Hon. Wm. Buell Richards, Chief Justice of Ontario, as one of the referees, he submits the name of the Hon. Lemuel Allan Wilmot, formerly Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of New Brunswick, to act in conjunction with him, and advises that authority be given them to agree upon a third person, not being a resident of Canada, and that the determination of a majority of such three referees be final and conclusive upon the limits to be taken as and for such boundaries respectively.

"He further recommends that the Dominion agree to concurrent action with the Province of Ontario in obtaining such legislation as may be necessary for giving binding effect to the conclusions arrived at, and for establishing the northern and western limits of the Province of Ontario in accordance therewith."

That memorandum was signed by Mr. Himsforth, clerk of the Privy Council. Hon. members will see that while the words used by the Ontario Government were, "conclusion which may be arrived at," Mr. Mackenzie used the words

"conclusions arrived at." So hon. members will see that by playing with words the Mackenzie Government escaped the responsibility of passing an Act of Parliament, which they solemnly declared they would do, and which Mr. Mowat declared over and over again it was the intention of the Dominion Government to pass. The Lieutenant-Governor stated that the arbitrators would complete the award in 1875. We do not, however, hear anything more of the matter, until action is taken by the Local Legislature. On 21st December, 1874, the Local Legislature passed an Act in accordance with the recommendation of Mr. Crooks, and with the agreement made with the Mackenzie Government, which Act recites:

"And whereas, subject to the approval of the Parliament of Canada and the Legislature of Ontario, it has been agreed by the Governments of the Dominion of Canada and the Province of Ontario, that the questions which have arisen concerning the said boundaries should be determined by reference to arbitration."

It goes on to say:

"The Legislature of the Province of Ontario consents that the Parliament of Canada may declare that the boundaries, which, by the award of the arbitrators aforesaid, or of any two of the arbitrators aforesaid, may be decided to be the northerly and westerly boundaries respectively of this Province, shall be declared to be the northerly and westerly boundaries thereof; or, in case the award shall be as to the westerly boundary alone, the same may be in like manner declared by the Parliament of Canada as aforesaid, and that the Parliament of Canada may thereby increase, diminish or otherwise alter the northerly and westerly limits of the Province of Ontario, so that the same may be in accordance with the award."

So the Mowat Government, by passing that Act, determined to ratify the award, no matter what it might be, whether it gave 1,000,000 square miles to Ontario or 100,000 square miles; and Mr. Mowat told the Legislature, in his speech, that they had agreed with the Dominion Government to secure concurrent action of the Dominion Parliament; but nothing was done by the Dominion Government, although the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) was a leading spirit in it, until sometime in 1878. I will point out presently the reasons why such a course was adopted, and show there never was any intention on the part of the Mackenzie Government to ratify the award, unless they found it to be very favorable to the Dominion. We find that an agreement was entered into by the Dominion Government and the Ontario Government in regard to the government of that territory. A line was agreed upon. A provisional arrangement was made between Mr. Laird and Mr. Pardee, the former representing the Dominion and the latter the Ontario Government. That agreement was approved by Order in Council, so that in the event of the question not being decided for any considerable length of time, the Government of the country should still go on, lands should be sold, and everything, except leases, should be granted; and the agreement as regards the last named was afterwards amended, on the recommendation of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), so that leases were actually made a portion of the agreement as well as grants of land. We find that in 1875 the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario again refers to the question in a communication to the Legislature, in which he says:

"Since the dissolution of the last House the question of the northerly and westerly boundaries of the Province has continued to receive the attention of the Government. Informal negotiations have taken place, with respect to both a compromise line and the arbitration which the Legislature authorised, but no final result has been arrived at; meanwhile, steps have been taken for obtaining some additional evidence, expected to be of value."

Nothing was done except the passing of the Act of Parliament, and the reference to the question in the Governor's speech, until some time in 1877. Then the Lieutenant-Governor announced that everything was ready for the final settlement to be made in a few months. That was in January, 1877, but no decision was arrived at until a year and a-half after that time. Again the Lieutenant-Governor makes an excuse for not having the arbitration carried out, and

Mr. RYKERT,

we hear nothing more till after August, 1878, when the award was made. In December of that year the Mowat Government were very anxious to have the award ratified. During the four years nothing was said in regard to the Mackenzie Government passing an Act of Parliament, nothing was said about that Government ratifying the award and carrying out, in good faith, the agreement; but so soon as Sir John A. Macdonald came into power, hon. gentlemen opposite wanted the question settled and the award confirmed. We find that on 20th January, 1880, a communication was sent by this Government, in reference to an Act disallowing a certain Bill. To this communication Mr. Mowat made reply, and on the 3rd March, 1880, he induced his majority in the Local Legislature to pass a resolution, agreeing that the award should be sustained, and that the matter should neither be compromised nor carried further. This the Government of the Dominion refused to do, on the ground that, as they set out in a communication of the Minister of Justice, the award was not a legal and binding award; that the arbitrators had not found as they were ordered to find, namely, to ascertain the true legal boundary. In answer to that despatch Mr. Mowat sent a communication demanding that the award should be ratified, and stating that he would accept nothing else. Then we find that on the 27th of January, 1882, the Secretary of State, Mr. Mousseau, acting on behalf of this Government, sent a communication to Mr. Mowat, offering to refer the matter to the Privy Council, and offering at the same time to make a provisional agreement for the government of the disputed territory, and he endeavored to have the question settled in a satisfactory and legal manner. I find that at page 468 of these same Sessional Papers we have the communication of Mr. Mousseau. He refers to the fact that an understanding had been made to refer the matter to the Privy Council; that he offers still to refer it, and he points out, in reply to the objection, that if it went to the Privy Council there was no provisional arrangement between the two Governments, that the provisional agreement between them was still in existence. He asks to have the same joint authority maintained; he asks that the country shall be governed in the meantime in a certain specified manner, and he simplifies the whole question, so that there would be no difficulty here while the matter is pending before the Privy Council. In paragraph 24 I find this:

"They heartily wish that the proposal urged by the Dominion Government in 1872, for a submission to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, had been accepted by Ontario, and they cannot but attribute much of the inconvenience and delay alleged in your despatch to have occurred to the refusal of Ontario to unite in such a submission."

Every word of this was true. Then he says in paragraph 25:

"To the arbitration of 1874 His Excellency's Government was unable, for the reasons assigned, to give their adhesion; but, with Ontario, they believed it to be of the greatest importance that the dispute should be settled, and they will be anxious to further in every way in their power the submission of the question either to the Supreme Court of Canada or to an eminent legal functionary, to be mutually agreed upon; or, if it be preferred by the two Provinces of Ontario and Manitoba, to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, although His Excellency's advisers would prefer that it should be decided in Canada, either by the high legal functionary, as suggested, or by the Supreme Court, with the right of applying to the judicial committee of the Privy Council for an appeal to the Queen from any decision which may be arrived at, should either Province desire it."

So you see that they still continued to desire to have the question settled by the Privy Council. Then, in paragraph 29 of this report, we have this:

"The assumption, in your despatch, that the conventional boundary terminated on the 3rd August, 1878, the date of the award referred to, seems to be without foundation: but if the conventional line is to be considered as having been then abrogated, it must be considered as at an end for all purposes, leaving both parties to assert their own rights in reference to all the questions involved."

So, you see that this Government, through its Secretary of State, offered to continue to enforce the agreement between Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Mowat in all its details, and they

further desired that the country should be governed by the appointment of certain judicial officers, so that the excuse which Mr. Mowat made, that they could not agree on any arrangements, was a flimsy answer to a document which showed clearly what this Government desired to do on that question. It finally winds up in this way :]

"As regards the government of the country and the enforcement of law and order in the mean time, it was intimated to Mr. Mowat, at the interview above referred to, that the Government of the Dominion would be ready to agree to such measures as were necessary to prevent confusion in these important respects. The suggestion was then made, that all justices of the peace residing in the disputed territory should receive commissions from both Ontario and Manitoba, and that all the judges of Ontario and all the judges of Manitoba should be put in a joint commission as regards the disputed territory. The laws of Ontario and Manitoba being alike in most respects, no confusion would probably arise. That in criminal cases the Act 43 Vic., chap. 36, had made, it was thought, satisfactory provision; or if there was anything deficient the Government of the Dominion would be ready to ask Parliament to supply it. That where there was found to be a practical difference between the laws of Ontario and those of Manitoba, the Government of the Dominion would use its good offices with the Government of Manitoba to induce them to consent that the law to be administered should be that of Ontario, as regards all matters of provincial jurisdiction, until the legal limits of both Provinces should be finally ascertained."

I have shown that the Government of this Dominion, the present Government, not only desired to bring the matter before the Privy Council, but met Mr. Mowat on fair and reasonable terms, in order to have that question settled finally and forever. What answer was given to that proposal? The answer was given by Mr. Mowat in a very petulant manner. The concluding portion of the report which was sent to this Government on the 18th of February, 1882, contains the following language, which goes to show that the course which the Ontario Government wished to pursue was, only to have the award ratified. They would agree to nothing, except to take the award, bad as it was, and bad as it was pronounced to be by the leader of the opposition in 1882. Mr. Mowat says :

"But I am advised that no provisional arrangement would be so satisfactory, or so beneficial to the development or settlement of the territory, the maintenance of order, and the due administration of justice therein, as the just course of obtaining, without further delay, by proper legislation from the Federal Parliament and the Legislature of Manitoba, the recognition of the award as the final adjustment of the boundaries of this Province. The evils already endured are beyond recall, but the continuance or aggravation of them from this time forward is in the hands of your Government."

That, Sir, was the answer made by Mr. Mowat; he was determined to take the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government by the throat, and to say: Unless you agree to my terms and ratify the award unconditionally, I will have nothing to do with you. This Parliament, in 1882, as I have already said, passed a resolution agreeing to refer the whole matter, and to make conditional arrangements in the meantime. On the 4th of April, 1882, Mr. Plumb moved the following resolution:—

"That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that the western and northern boundaries of Ontario should be finally settled by reference to, and an authoritative decision by either the Supreme Court of Canada, or the judicial committee of the Privy Council in Great Britain, or by the Supreme Court in the first place, subject to a final submission to the judicial committee, as the Province of Ontario may choose; that such decision should be obtained either on appeal in a friendly action brought for the purpose, or by reference to the said courts, or either or both of them, by Her Majesty, under the powers conferred upon Her by the Imperial and Canadian Parliaments, as the Government of Ontario may prefer; and that the said reference should be based on the evidence collected and printed, with any additional documentary evidence, if such there is, and that, pending the reference, the administration of the lands shall be entrusted to a joint commission, appointed by the Governments of Canada and Ontario."

So you will see that having ascertained that Mr. Mowat's Government refused to accept the proposition contained in the document of the Secretary of State, of the 27th January, 1882, that Government having refused to accept the proposition to establish the conventional agreement made between Mr. Mowat and Mr. Mackenzie, having refused to entertain any proposition whatever, this House, knowing

that the award was illegal, knowing from so high an authority as the leader of the Opposition, that the award was not a legal and binding award, and having heard from all who knew anything about the question that the award was not a legal and binding award, this House, in the exercise of its discretion, in the exercise of its rights and privileges as the trustee and guardian of the people of the Dominion, passed a resolution declaring that they were desirous of having the question settled finally and forever by a tribunal, and in the mean time that the disputed territory should be left untrammelled and unencumbered. But to that proposition Mr. Mowat turned a deaf ear. Then, we find that a communication was sent on the 2nd September, 1882, from the Hon. Hector L. Langevin, for the Secretary of State, to the Government of Ontario, in which he encloses the resolution passed by this House, and points out that it was carried by a large majority of the House, 116 yeas against 44 nays, and goes on to say :

"His Excellency desires me to invite the attention of your Government to this unmistakable expression of opinion of the representatives of the people of the Dominion, and further to state that his Ministers are not only prepared but anxious to make all necessary arrangements in connection with the Government of Ontario, for giving effect to such resolutions with all convenient speed."

So, I think the House must be satisfied, so far as this Government are concerned, that from 1878 down to 1882 they were desirous of having the matter fairly settled by the Privy Council. The Government of Ontario were asked to give an answer to this communication. Well, what do we find? On the 2nd of September, 1882, Mr. Mowat replies, and in a very petulant manner, says: What do I care about your resolution? It was passed by a majority from the different Provinces; you had not a majority of those who alone should properly vote on that resolution. In that communication he held by the statement made by him on the floor of Parliament, that Ontario had not got her just deserts, and that the boundary ought to extend to the Rocky Mountains. He says :

"The despatch further mentions, that the resolution was passed by a large majority of the members of the House of Commons (116 to 44); and the despatch invites the attention of this Government to this unmistakable expression of opinion on the part of the House of Commons."

"The undersigned would respectfully recommend that the attention of the Federal Government be in turn invited to the fact, that resolutions on the same subject were passed by the Ontario Assembly in the Legislative Sessions of 1880 and 1881, with but one dissentient voice on either occasion, and in the Session of 1882, by a majority of two to one; and that the attention of the Federal Government be called to the 'unmistakable expression of opinion' on the part of the representatives of the people of the Province which is shown by the votes on these resolutions. The resolutions were promptly communicated to the Dominion Government, and have received no attention from that Government."

Why, Sir, who voted for that resolution in this Parliament? We find that 47 from Ontario voted in favor of it, and 23 against it. Surely, Sir, those gentlemen representing Ontario constituencies in this Parliament must have known that they had just as much right to look after the interests of the Province of Ontario as the members of the Provincial Legislature. Mr. Mowat pointed to the fact that his resolution was carried by a vote of 50 against 25, and he says: Unless you accept my proposition to ratify that award, I shall advise my Government to resist and to take possession of that territory. These, Sir, are the documents to which I wish to refer, showing the course pursued by the Ontario Government upon this question—documents which, when they are perused by the people of Ontario, will show that the Dominion Government have acted consistently throughout. Now, we find that in 1879, Mr. Mowat ratified that award by an Act of Parliament. Mr. Mowat first claimed that the Province of Ontario had not got her just deserts, that she was in fact robbed by the arbitration, but he next asked the House to ratify the award. The preamble of that Act says :

"And whereas the effect of the said award is to give to this Province less territory than had been claimed on behalf of the Province, and more territory than the Government of Canada had consented to be within the limits of the Province or than was contained within the provisional boundary line aforesaid; and whereas by chapter 28 of the Acts of Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, passed in the Session held in the 34th and the 35th years of Her Majesty's reign, and intitled 'An Act respecting the establishment of Provinces in the Dominion of Canada,' it is enacted that the Parliament of Canada may, from time to time, with the consent of the Legislature of any Province in the Dominion, increase, diminish, or otherwise alter the limits of such Province, upon such terms and conditions as may be agreed to by the said Legislature, and may, with the like consent, make provisions respecting the effect and operation of any such increase or diminutions or alteration of territory in relation to any Province affected thereby; and whereas it is proper that the boundaries determined by the said award be adopted and confirmed—"

The Bill then enacts that the boundaries as declared by the award shall be accepted by the Province of Ontario as the true boundaries of the Province. That, Sir, concludes the documentary evidence which we have before us in reference to this question. Now, Sir, I have shown what was the position of the Dominion Parliament by the records of the Ontario Legislature, and I think that hon. gentlemen, after a careful perusal of what I have brought forward, will come to the conclusion that this Government acted in the best interest of the Province of Ontario. Now, Sir, it was contended, in 1882, by myself and other members of the Province of Ontario, as one reason why the award should not be ratified, that that award had not done justice to the Province of Ontario. We based the conclusion we arrived at, not only on the Act of Parliament, in which Mr. Mowat declared that justice had not been done to Ontario, but on statements made by him throughout the Province on different occasions, in the Local Legislature, and in his manifestoes sent to this Government, all showing clearly and conclusively that the Province of Ontario had not been fairly dealt with; and, knowing that to be the fact, we, representing the Province of Ontario, in this Legislature, felt it to be our duty, if that award was not a legal and binding award, to see that justice should be done to Ontario, and that it should be ascertained clearly and conclusively whether or not her western boundary did not extend to the Rocky Mountains, or how far west it did extend beyond the point found by the arbitrators. Now, we find that Mr. Mowat, in 1873, declared in his place in Parliament that the westerly boundary of the Province extended still farther west than what was found subsequently by the award; and Mr. Caldwell, in moving the address in answer to the speech of the Lieutenant-Governor, used this language:

"The north-western boundary question was of the highest importance, it being whether our western boundary was at Thunder Bay or somewhere between the Lake of the Woods or Lake Winnipeg, or even farther west, perhaps as far as the Rocky Mountains. He thought that anyone who looked into this question could not fail to see the arguments for the farther lines were correct."

I point this out in justification of the course we pursued, and in order to show that Mr. Mowat placed in the mouth of the mover of the address his opinion that the westerly boundary extended as far west as the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Mowat followed that up by the same contention before the arbitrators. He pointed out that the previous Minister of Crown lands, the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, the Hon. Mr. Draper, and other eminent authorities, had concluded that the western boundary of the Province extended to the Rocky Mountains; and in the case before the arbitrators, as published by himself, at page 267, he says:

"In the present dispute, the claim of Ontario is to the boundaries which were officially insisted upon by the Province of Canada before Confederation, and by the Dominion afterwards. It is submitted that the demand so made was just and well-founded."

Therefore, you will see, running through all his communications and his state documents, his declaration is that the western boundary of the Province of Ontario extended to the Rocky Mountains; and one object I have in making this

Mr. RYKERT.

motion, is to see what position Mr. Mowat took in his argument before the Privy Council; because I am prepared, from his own documents, to show that he was in favor of a boundary farther west than the Lake of the Woods.

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

After Recess.

Mr. RYKERT. When the House adjourned I was endeavoring to show one reason why this Legislature was justified in not accepting the award of 1878. I was endeavoring to show that Mr. Mowat and the Ontario Government had always contended that the boundaries of Ontario extended to the Rocky Mountains; I pointed out that, throughout all documents submitted by Mr. Mowat to the arbitrators, according to every official document submitted by the Ontario Government to this Government and the resolutions passed by the Ontario Legislature in 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, the fact is clearly pointed out that the western boundary of Ontario extends to the Rocky Mountains. If such be the case, if Mr. Mowat and the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) were justified in their contention, in 1882; if the hon. member for Bothwell took the right view of the case in the reports submitted by him to the Mowat Administration, and in the pamphlet he published—if they were correct, this House was amply justified in refusing to accept an award which they knew to be illegal. I quoted from a paragraph in the speech made by Mr. Caldwell, in moving the address, in 1873, in which he pointed out the fact that the boundaries of Ontario extended west of the Rocky Mountains. I find also that in the case submitted to the arbitrators, as published in these official documents, that Mr. Mowat used the following language:

"In the present dispute the claim of Ontario is to the boundaries which were officially insisted upon by the Province of Canada before Confederation and by the Dominion afterwards. It is submitted that the demand so made was just and well-founded."

I find also in a report of the proceedings before the arbitrators, in 1878, as reported in the *Globe*, that Mr. Mowat used the following language:

"He argued that Ontario had the same limits as Upper Canada, and the same limits as, west of the division line between Upper and Lower Canada. The Province of Canada had and the Dominion of Canada had before its purchase of the rights of the Hudson's Bay Company. In the present dispute the claim of Ontario is to the boundaries which were officially insisted upon by the Province of Canada before Confederation and by the Dominion afterwards. It is submitted that the demand so made was just and well-founded."

Then he quoted from an official paper of the Hon. Mr. Cauchon, Commissioner of Crown Lands, in the year 1857, in which he claimed:

"That the westerly boundary of the Province extended as far as the British territory, not otherwise organized, would carry it, which would be to the Pacific."

Then we find that in the speech he made in the town of Woodstock, in addressing his constituency, Mr. Mowat there contended for the same boundary. On 18th December, 1878, he used this language:

"Little progress has been made towards the solution of the problem (the western boundary) before the Blake Government came into power, but immediately upon his assuming the reins of office (1874) he took steps for the settlement. I succeeded him in the work. Some of the questions involved in controversy had been in dispute for centuries. * * * Among the important questions which the Government of Ontario had to deal with since Confederation, none was of greater moment, to us, as regards our future welfare, than this question of the boundary between the Provinces."

Mr. Mowat, having expressed those views in 1878, still adhered to them throughout all the official documents he sent this Government. At page 307 of the official documents which contains the argument before the arbitrators, he said:

"But I shall show, that if I had no presumption in my favor, the conclusion, which I desire the arbitrators to arrive at are the conclusions which they cannot but arrive at in view of all the facts."

That shows that Mr. Mowat still continued to be influenced by the opinion that the western boundary of Ontario extended to the Rocky Mountains; and in every one of his official despatches you will find, in one clause or another, reference to this fact. You will find, in an official despatch of 23rd September, 1879 :

"Further, the territory so awarded to Ontario is less than was comprised in Upper Canada, according to the true intent and meaning of the Quebec Act (1774), as shown by its recitals, and by its known objects and its history, including the proceedings thereon in the House of Commons, as reported in Cavendish's debates, and as set forth in the letter of the Right Hon. Edmund Burke, dated 2nd August, 1774, to his constituents, the Province of New York, whose agent he was at the time. All these documents are to be found among the printed documents already mentioned."

Then we find, in a resolution moved by himself, moved in the Local Legislature, 3rd March, 1880, and among the recitals of that resolution are the following :

"That on the 16th January, 1869, the Government of the Dominion, through its representatives, contended before Her Majesty's Imperial Government, that the western boundary 'extended to, and included the country between the Lake of the Woods and the Red River,' and that the northern boundary included 'the whole region of Hudson's Bay;' that the boundaries then claimed by the Government of the Dominion, on behalf of Canada, as against the pretensions of the Hudson's Bay Company, would, on the same grounds, be the boundaries of the Province of Ontario, and would give to Ontario a territory vastly in excess of that embraced in the award of the arbitrators."

In 1882 we find also one of his resolutions declaring :

"That the award has assigned to Ontario less territory than His Excellency's present advisers as well as previous Canadian Governments, had, in other contentions, invariably claimed to lie within this Province."

Every thing points to the fact that Mr. Mowat, from the commencement, was of the opinion that the western boundary would extend to the Rocky Mountains. Now, I propose to discuss very briefly the question as to who is responsible for all this delay. It has been frequently charged in this House, and more frequently in the Ontario Legislature, that the Dominion Government, under the leadership of the right hon. member for Carleton (Sir John A. Macdonald) has been and is responsible for all the delays which have occurred. I think those hon. gentlemen who recollect the quotations I made before recess will come to the conclusion, after a careful analysis of them, that the delays were due to Mr. Mowat's Administration. I think I can show, by a recapitulation of what I have placed before the House, that Mr. Mowat alone is responsible for the delay. The first official document between the two Governments was on the recommendation of the right hon. gentleman, the Premier, in May, 1872. That document was formulated by an Order in Council of 16th May, 1872, which urged strongly upon the Ontario Government the advisability of referring the question to the Privy Council; in December, 1873, as I have shown, the Government of Mr. Mackenzie asked Mr. Mowat's Government for an answer to the question submitted by the preceding Dominion Government, as to whether the Ontario Government would consent to a reference to the Privy Council, but no answer was obtained; in January, 1874, the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, in a speech from the Throne, promised to give the matter his careful consideration, and during the Session of 1874 a resolution of Mr. Mowat's was passed by the Ontario Legislature agreeing to refer the whole matter to the Privy Council or to an arbitration, as the Governor in Council might think best; in June, 1874, an agreement was made between the two Governments, providing for proper government of the disputed territory pending the decision. In November, 1874, Mr. Crooks offered to refer the matter to arbitration. Mr. Mackenzie agreed to this, and an Order in Council was passed, also agreeing that there should be concurrent legislation. I have shown the difference between the two Orders in Council, the one agreeing to ratify the award to be made, the other to ratify an award when made. In 1874 the

Government promised the Legislature that the whole matter should be settled by 1875; in 1875 nothing was done. Who was responsible? The Government of Ontario was in accord with the Government of the Dominion. In 1876 the same two Governments were in power, but still nothing was done. In 1877 a change of arbitrators was made, and the Lieutenant-Governor tells us the whole matter will be settled in a few months. In August, 1878, the award was made—so that between September, 1873, and August, 1878, nothing of consequence towards settling the question of the western boundary was done either by the Mackenzie Administration or the Mowat Government. Thus, for a delay of nearly five years, the Mackenzie Government and the Mowat Administration are responsible, while this Government is charged for the delay in enforcing the award, because they chose, in 1880, to enquire into the whole case and ascertain whether the award was legal or not. Now, if Mr. Mowat had been sincere in the agreement which he made with the Mackenzie Administration, he would have insisted upon an Act being passed here simultaneously with his own Act of Parliament, in accordance with the provisions of the Orders in Council. If he had been sincere he would have told the House why the Mackenzie Government did not sanction that award in advance. Mr. Mowat invariably kept that from the Legislature; he kept them in ignorance, and very few persons except those who were in Parliament knew anything about it. Almost every one else believed that concurrent legislation had taken place, but we now know why it did not take place. We know that Mr. Mowat, in 1882, refused to accept a proposition made by the right hon. the leader of the Government. That proposition, as I have pointed out to the House, was a most reasonable one. It not only endorsed and ratified the agreement made with the Mowat Government by the Mackenzie Government, while the question was being decided, but in every way the Dominion Premier offered to meet Mr. Mowat half way. But that the latter refused to do. He passed resolution after resolution, affirming the decision of his Government, that the award should be ratified and nothing more. He would not consent to any reference, and upon flimsy pretexts of one kind and the other, he tells Parliament that it is humiliating to the Province of Ontario to agree to a second reference, because it would be giving to the leader of this Government an opportunity of crawling out of it. But I think the whole question is answered by a dispatch from Mr. Mowat, which we find at page 464 of this official document. This also is in keeping with and accords with the views expressed by the hon. member for Bothwell, in which he declared that we were acting as the enemies of Ontario, and that we would get the enemies' reward. He anticipated the general election. He looked to that tribunal of the people which was to destroy the present leader of the Government. And Mr. Mowat, anticipating, of course, the same result, got a little bold in one of his documents, and refused, after various pretexts of one kind or the other, to be bound by any proposition made by the Dominion Government, and he finally lets the cat out of the bag by showing that he anticipated a change of Government. Referring to the provisional agreement, he says :

"A reference to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, or to any other tribunal, would involve much loss of time; and meanwhile the advices received from the territory indicate that the timber therein is being destroyed; that enormous quantities of it are being practically lost to the Province; and that the development of the territory is arrested, to the permanent injury of this Province, by the continued absence of undisputed authority to enforce order, administer justice, and grant titles."

Now, when he penned that document, he showed how economical he was of the truth. He knew right well that the leader of this Government had officially declared that they considered the agreement then in force which Mr. Mackenzie had made with Mr. Mowat, and Mr. Mousseau's

dispatch points out that the Government desires that agreement to be still enforced, and in the meantime to give to the Government of the Province some joint authority satisfactory to the Governments of both Provinces. He goes on further :

"Without such provisional arrangements, this Province may as well wait for the confirmation of the award, which (so far as concerns the rights and powers still remaining to the Dominion), my Government confidently expect from another Parliament, as go to the expense and have the unavoidable delay of a second litigation."

There he anticipated a defeat of the present Government. That was predicted by the present leader of the Opposition. He was anxious to appeal to the tribunal of the people; he did appeal to the tribunal of the people, and there is the result. Anyone who will carefully peruse these official documents must come to the conclusion that the delay has been occasioned by Mr. Mowat himself. Mr. Mowat, upon several occasions, as I said, made statements in the Legislature which are not corroborated by his own official documents. Whether they were made designedly to deceive the people, or in ignorance of the true state of the facts, I am not prepared to say; but I may safely say that he forgot what his official documents contained, what the true record, as laid before the people, was. On the 27th January, 1882, the *Globe* gives Mr. Mowat's speech, and I have the *Globe* itself in my desk, if anyone doubts the truth of what I assert, for I have come charged and primed with official documents. Mr. Mowat, in his speech in the Legislature, says :—

"A reference to the Privy Council has not been proposed to us yet. It is true Ministers have expressed opinions in favor of that mode of settlement, but a reference to the Privy Council cannot be had without a consent as to the facts and the material on which they would decide the question."

He says that no reference was ever yet proposed to him. I have read the official document of the leader of the Government, of the 16th of May, 1872, and I have also read—and perhaps it will do no harm to read it again—a resolution moved by Mr. Mowat himself, to see if it is true that no proposition had ever been made to them. On the 23rd March, 1874, Mr. Mowat moved :

"That this House approves of the reference of the question of the western boundary of this Province to arbitration, or to the Privy Council, according as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council shall see fit."

So you will see that Mr. Mowat states, in reference to the proposed reference to the Privy Council, what is, in my opinion, quite at variance with the fact. He also puts in the mouth of the mover of the Address language which shows conclusively that Mr. Mowat was mistaken when he said that no proposal of the kind had been made to him. Mr. Caldwell, in moving the Address, on the 10th January, 1873, said :

"He felt satisfied that, when the question was further ventilated by a perusal of the archives in Paris and London, we could not fail to succeed before the Privy Council, before which the case would, he hoped, soon come."

It is generally understood that the mover of an Address, in speaking in Parliament upon the Address, speaks authoritatively, and Mr. Caldwell said this would shortly go before the Privy Council. He must have spoken by the authority of Mr. Mowat. I am justified in that statement, because, on the 23rd March following, Mr. Mowat moved a resolution to refer it to the Privy Council, and yet he tells us that the question had not been submitted to him. I do not know if this House wants more evidence upon that point to satisfy it that Mr. Mowat knew that the Dominion Government was in favor of going to the Privy Council, before he was forced at last by Mr. Miller to come to terms. We have also some other references which will go to show in what an extraordinary manner these gentlemen have acted. We find, in January, 1883, the *Globe* made use of these words :

Mr. RYKERT.

"Mr. Mowat, long ago, consented to have the boundary question submitted to the judicial committee of the Privy Council."

And yet Mr. Mowat said that he never heard of it, and that no such proposition was made to him. On 3rd January, 1883, according to the *Globe*, Mr. Mowat, at the Reform convention in Toronto, made use of this extraordinary language, which shows that his memory was at fault :

"The suggestion has been made that the matter should be left to the Privy Council. That proposition has, to some persons, a look of equity and reason which is on the surface only. If I were to accede to a proposal to leave the matter to the Privy Council, not only would I be acceding to that which it was unjust to demand, not only would I be putting this Province to an expense to which it ought not to be subjected, but I would really be enabling the Dominion Government to delay indefinitely any settlement at all."

So you will see that he always refers to the Privy Council, notwithstanding his plea made upon the floor or Parliament. Those who know anything at all about the affairs of the Province of Ontario will recollect that in the Session of 1880 Mr. Mowat voted the sum of \$10,000 for the purpose of paying the expenses of a trial before the Privy Council. Then, Sir, no later than the 29th January, 1885, Mr. Mowat delivered one of those beautiful diatribes of his against this Government, endeavoring to stir up a feeling of Province against Province, and raising the animosity of the people of Ontario against the people of Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, in his anxiety to create capital for his party at the next general election, and he made another violent speech, an extract from which I will read :

"The question of arbitration was accepted by the people's representatives and they were never called upon to express an opinion in regard to leaving that to the Privy Council."

Now, Sir, this speech was made no later than six weeks ago, wherein he affirms that no proposition was ever made to leave it to the Privy Council, that Parliament never considered it, and that, too, in the face of his own resolution that I have read. Yet I suppose hon. gentlemen opposite will applaud that kind of thing; I suppose they will say that it is all right, but I say it is consistent with Mr. Mowat's whole course of vacillation throughout, a determination to throw the odium upon the present Government, to stir up a feeling of antagonism against the Province of Ontario, in order by that means to affect the seats of members from that Province in this Legislature. That is his whole desire and hope, and I think any impartial mind will come to the conclusion that Mr. Mowat has displayed an unusual amount of hypocrisy upon this whole question. Now, I will ask, did Mr. Mowat or Mr. Mackenzie ever intend to ratify the award? We have seen, in the quotation from the *Globe*, which I read before recess, and which I read two years ago in this Parliament, that Mr. Mackenzie reserved to himself the right to accept or reject the award, as he thought fit. Mr. Mowat had himself contended that legislation of a concurrent character should be passed, and that both Governments should be bound to accept the award, no matter what it was. Mr. Mowat led Parliament to believe that both Legislatures were agreed upon that point. They went through the miserable formula of passing Orders in Council, they procured an Act of Parliament ratifying an award to be made, and yet Mr. Mackenzie quietly sits by and allows the arbitration to go on. For what reason, Sir? Because he felt the importance of being able to accept or reject the award. I quoted a short time ago what they had agreed to do, and pointed to the Order in Council by which there should be concurrent legislation. Now, I find, as I pointed out to the House, that there is a discrepancy between the two Orders in Council; the one refers to the award that may be made, and the other to the award when made. If any person wants to be satisfied as regards the position which those gentlemen occupied, they have only to refer to the debates in the Local Legislature, and also to an editorial in their own organ. In a speech

made by Mr. Meredith, on the 27th January, 1882, he made this statement:

"An important admission had been made by the member for North Brant (Mr. Young) who was in the confidence of the Government at Ottawa. This member had said the Government (Mackenzie) were either afraid of being embarrassed by the votes of the representatives of Quebec, or that they did not think it was proper to bind a subsequent Parliament by the ratification in advance of that award."

That is the statement made by the leader of the Opposition, in the presence of the leader of the Government, and not a single word was said in opposition to it. The *Globe* of 10th July, 1883, says:

"Mr. Mackenzie, however, decided to wait until he knew what the award was before it was confirmed."

And yet, in the face of that opinion of their own Government, these gentlemen contend that this Government should ratify the award immediately, no matter what the award was. And again, on the 8th March, 1882:

"Mr. Meredith charged Mr. Mowat and his party with delay, and openly told them that he (Mr. Mowat) had admitted that he requested Mr. Mackenzie, when in power, to pass an Act in advance of the ratification of that decision, and Mr. Mackenzie had refused to do so."

But, Sir, Mr. Mowat never submitted that fact to the Parliament of Ontario. He never told them that he asked Mr. Mackenzie to pass an Act ratifying the award in accordance with the proposition of the Order in Council. Now we have a report of the speech made by Mr. Mowat upon that occasion, which, I think, will satisfy any unprejudiced mind—and which, I hope, will satisfy some of the prejudiced minds opposite—that Mr. Mowat never intended that Mr. Mackenzie should pass an Act of Parliament ratifying the award; that his passing that Order in Council was a mere empty sham, and that he was shamming when he passed an Act of Parliament confirming the award, because he knew Mr. Mackenzie never intended to do so. Now, I have here a speech of Mr. Mowat. I think it is important that we should know exactly what Mr. Mowat's opinions were upon this question, how fairly he acted towards the Province of Ontario, and how he treats this Government and this Parliament. He said:

"My hon. friend (Mr. Meredith) is willing to lose half of our Province rather than resist the illegal acts of the Dominion. The hon. member (Meredith) had said that Mr. Mackenzie was to blame for not passing an Act confirming the award prior to the conclusion. He had also said that the award when made was subject to the sanction of Parliament. He thought he was reduced to hard straits when he took such ground as that. Governments did not pass Acts to confirm awards yet to be made, but they always did immediately after the award was reached."

It seems rather novel that Mr. Mowat should make such a speech, in the face of his own Act of Parliament, of 1879, which confirmed the award. The Act of Parliament of December, 1874, conclusively shows that Mr. Mowat did ratify the award in advance. Yet he says, in his speech, that "No Government ever does pass an Act of Parliament confirming an award to be made." He goes on to say:

"In point of fact, it was submitted for the sanction of Parliament, but good faith and all precedent required that awards should be submitted for the sanction of Parliament. No one would for one moment say that a great question of this kind, involving 100,000 square miles, should depend upon the willingness of one of the parties to accept it or reject it at pleasure."

And yet he passes an Act of Parliament which accepts it. He does not propose to reject it, but he allows Mr. Mackenzie a loophole out of which he can crawl. He says again:

"Had there been any ground whatever for suspecting that the award was in the slightest degree too favorable to Ontario, the Dominion Government might have been justified in delaying or refusing to be bound by it. Not Mackenzie, with his usual caution, reserved the right to do so for cause."

I do not see why it was a more unusual course for the Dominion Parliament to take, than it would be for the Local

Legislature, in which he did pass an Act of Parliament confirming it in advance. Mr. Meredith interrupted Mr. Mowat in the course of his speech to ask him the question:

"Did not the hon. gentleman ask the Dominion Government to pass a confirmatory Act?"

"Mr. Mowat said that there had been some conversation about it, and no doubt there were reasons given for not passing a Bill at that time."

There you see how deceitfully he was acting. He was asked a question about concurrent legislation; both Governments had passed Orders in Council; Mr. Mowat knew that and kept it in the dark. If he had told Parliament that order had been passed, Parliament would have said: Why did you not have an Act passed? But no; it pleased Mr. Mowat and his friends to keep that in the background. He goes on to say:

"It must be remembered that it was not 100,000 square miles that Ontario claimed, but 1,000,000. The Province of Manitoba was afterwards established and that Legislature (Ontario) made no objection to it, though they did not feel at liberty to withdraw any portion of their claim previously set up."

He goes on to say further:

"If Mr. Mackenzie had proposed to pass an Act confirming the result of the arbitration, which might give this Province one million square miles of land, it would have been binding."

If so, why was not the Act passed. He continues:

"But the friends of the hon. gentleman complained of a difficulty when the amount was only 100,000 square miles. The hon. member for London said that the reason for the Government of the Dominion withholding its assent to the award was the jealousy of the other Provinces. But if they found that objection insuperable what would have been other objections before the award was made, and when an Act would have committed the Parliament to the sanctioning of Ontario's free claim for 100,000 square miles? Therefore, that unusual procedure of ratifying the award prior to its declaration would have involved the Dominion Government in ten times the difficulty which the present Government thought insuperable."

Sir, if it was difficult for Mr. Mackenzie to ratify an award of this kind, it was equally difficult for this Government to ratify it, especially as it was not a legal and binding award, especially when Ontario always contended that the western boundary of the Province extended to the Rocky Mountains, and especially when that question was not finally decided by the arbitrators. I will give one more proof to show that the Mackenzie Government never intended to ratify the award, but intended simply to keep it afloat for political and party purposes. We have been told over and over again that the Mackenzie Government were in favor of ratifying the award. But we find, from the declarations of Mr. Mowat and those of the organ of the party, that there was no such intention. We find in the *Globe* of 17th February, 1872, the following passage in an editorial:—

"It is true that the House did not sanction the award in advance, and true also that he could not have reasonably asked Parliament to ratify it by anticipation. There was a reasonable possibility, and more, that Manitoba, or a large portion of it, might be brought into Ontario by the determination of the western boundary. Obviously there would have been practical necessity for compromise between the Dominion Government and Ontario in that case. Hence it would have been folly on the part of the House to ask Parliament to ratify the award in advance. The consent of the Dominion Parliament to accept the award, in case Ontario were not so extended as to make it necessary for her to cede it some of her territory, was implied by recognising the impropriety of the arbitration by asking money for it. The Dominion was therefore in honor bound to accept the award if it were found practicable to yield to Ontario all defined as legally hers."

This Government felt it could not ratify, in the face of the evidence of Mr. Mowat himself and in the face of these public utterances, an award which they knew was not legal or binding. We find that Mr. Mowat repeatedly made all kinds of excuses for not going to the Privy Council. He repeatedly declared that unless Ontario had full possession of all that territory it could not possibly go to the Privy Council. Mr. Mowat had, however, previously entered into an agreement by which all difficulties that could possibly occur would be settled; but when Mr. Mowat's attention was called to the fact, he said that that agreement was not legal and binding, and

that unless Ontario was at once placed in a more favorable position he would not go to the Privy Council. Mr. Mowat even declared what his idea of a reasonably favorable position was. He said that if the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald would make a reasonable agreement, they, the Ontario Government, would go to the Privy Council. Mr. Mowat, speaking in the Legislature, on 8th February, 1882, said :

"Whether or not they could agree to go to the Privy Council he could not say (January 27, 1882, said it had not been proposed) but he believed it could be done if the Dominion Government would consent to a reasonable arrangement. What would be a reasonable arrangement would be that the same materials should be laid before the Privy Council which were before the arbitrators, with any additional documents which it might seem material to add. If both parties are anxious to go to the Privy Council, there was nothing in the constitution of that Council that would prevent a case of this kind going before them on such material as would be reasonable for both parties to agree to lay before them for that purpose."

So that Mr. Mowat showed that his desire was that the case should be heard on the official documents as printed, and that they should be laid before the Privy Council, together with any later facts that might be necessary. Yet in the official documents he refused to enter into an agreement of that kind. In fact, the only reason for the inaction of Mr. Mackenzie's Government was stated in this House in 1882, by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who said :

"And the man from Ontario who upholds the policy of the Government, no matter what his views may be on the question of the Tariff, will be regarded as an enemy of his Province, and when the day of election comes, will receive at the hands of the people an enemy's reward."

That extract shows what his views were—that all they desired was a change of Government—and when that took place they thought they would be able to settle the matter to suit themselves. What position has the arbitration assumed? We find that Mr. Mowat always contended that the western boundary of Ontario was the Rocky Mountains; that Mr. Mowat went to the Privy Council with Mr. Miller, Attorney-General of Manitoba; that Mr. Miller had made Mr. Mowat accept terms which he, Mr. Mowat, would not accept at the hands of the Dominion Government, terms less reasonable than those offered by the Dominion Government; and that Mr. Mowat, before the Privy Council, took the position that the western boundary of the Province was the Rocky Mountains. I think the documents will show that Mr. Mowat urged for a day and a-half that Ontario's boundary was at the Rocky Mountains, and it was only when the Lord Chancellor said that Mr. Mowat was talking nonsense that he abandoned that claim. I should like to know if the Dominion Government, in view of all the facts, was not justified in refusing to ratify the arbitrators' award, especially when so much doubt prevailed as to where the boundary really was. I think I have shown, by documents which this House cannot controvert, and by quotations I have made from hon. gentlemen themselves, and by their own official paper, that it never was the intention of the Mackenzie Government to ratify the award, unless they were satisfied it was in the best interests of the Dominion. I have shown that to be the case by quotations from statements made by Mr. Mackenzie and Mr. Mowat. I have been induced to make these lengthy observations and place on record such extracts from the public documents as I deem necessary, in order that there may be a proper elucidation of the whole question by an intelligent public. I have endeavored to show to the House and the country that the leader of the present Government was justified in the course he pursued in not advising this House to pass on that award and make it valid and binding, in view of the fact that he knew what the contention of the Ontario Government always had been, and his knowledge that the award was illegal and not binding, and that the arbitrators had not done what they were instructed to do,

Mr. RYKERT,

viz., find the true legal boundary. Under those circumstances, I say, the right hon. gentleman was justified in endeavoring to have a proper solution of the question obtained, by having it referred to the Privy Council; and the House will sustain him in that course. Those of us from Ontario who support the leader of the Government have already been told by our constituents that the right hon. leader of the Government could have adopted no other course. That declaration was made to us at the last election. It was one of the issues placed before the people, and they justified the course which the Government pursued. This Parliament can justify itself in the estimation of the public, that the course they pursued was the only one open to it, I do not think this Government requires any justification. The leader of the Government has shown himself to be consistent throughout; while I have shown, by documents, that Mr. Mowat's course has been inconsistent. The leader of the present Government (Sir John A. Macdonald) desired to have the question referred to a proper tribunal; he endeavored to have Ontario placed in a right position, and have her rights fully protected. The whole public career of the right hon. gentleman has been one in the interest of the country, and if he required any further testimony he can point to the opinion of the Marquis of Lorne, who had so ample an opportunity of judging of his great qualifications and his devotion to Canadian interests. A few weeks ago the Marquis of Lorne, who presided at a banquet to the hon. gentleman, concluded a speech in these terms :

"In conclusion, the chairman expressed a hope that for many years Sir John Macdonald would be able to give advice, not only to his own countrymen, but to the mother country also, in all matters relating to their common interests, and that he would long continue to take that part in public life which for forty years he had led, illustrated and adorned."

I think he can have no better justification for his course than that he should have received such a tribute at the hands of a nobleman who knew his worth so thoroughly. And yet, we find he is depreciated by men of the stamp of Mr. Mowat, and others who follow in his wake, and insult the intelligence of this Parliament, men who are Lilliputians compared with the leader of the Government; and when I find them stirring up feelings of animosity and antagonism between one Province and another—coming as I do from the Province of Ontario, and knowing the course this Government have pursued in the past, I have felt, as a representative from that Province, and having its interests at heart, as one who is here as a trustee of the Dominion, that it was my duty to place before this Parliament the true facts of the case.

Mr. DAWSON. I have no intention of making any lengthened remarks on this occasion. I may say that I am glad the hon. gentleman has made this motion, because I am sure it will be very satisfactory to this House, and above all satisfactory to the counsel who appeared for the Province of Manitoba and the Dominion respectively, before the Privy Council; and for this reason, that the reports of the pleadings before that body, as given by the newspapers of both parties at that time, are certainly not such as we could have wished them to be. In fact, it is impossible to conceive that these learned counsel argued the case before the tribunal at which they appeared as they are reported in the newspapers to have argued it. Of the two counsel who appeared for Manitoba, one took one position and another took another position. Mr. McCarthy took the ground that the entire Hudson Bay watershed—at least so he was reported in the papers—was covered by the Hudson Bay Company's territories, but in doing that he ignored the French occupation. He claimed that the French occupation had not existed in fact previous to the advent of the Hudson Bay Company, and if he did that, it is certainly not surprising that one of the Lords of the

Privy Council should have said that he was endeavoring to prove a negative. In fact, if the report of his pleadings, as given in the newspapers, be correct, he certainly gave the whole case away at the very outset. He said, in setting out that the line along the Mississippi, according to the Act of 1774, extended northward beyond the source of that river to the territory of the Hudson Bay Company at the very moment that he was claiming that the Hudson Bay territory covered the whole watershed of Hudson's Bay, and the opposite counsel, of course, immediately took him up. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who was there, saw the point, and took hold of it, and said approvingly that the commission to Sir Guy Carleton declared that the western boundary followed the Mississippi River to its source, and then extended northward to the possessions of the Hudson Bay Company. The commission did nothing of the kind; but the Privy Council are very careful to say that they decided the case on the evidence submitted to them. If evidence of that kind was submitted, as it appears to have been, it was incorrect evidence, and that is a very important point as regards the question of the Hudson Bay Co.'s territories occupying the whole water-shed of Hudson's Bay. Mr. Robinson took for his argument the due north line from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi, and I must say that that gentleman showed some little knowledge of the question; but it is a matter in regard to which the most able lawyers, no matter how eminent, can gain but little knowledge by reading it up in a trip across the Atlantic. Mr. Robinson, I repeat, made the most of the due north line, but when he came to speak about commissions to governors, maps, and things of that sort, he was completely at sea. At the close of last Session I made a few remarks on that subject, which I hoped would convey some useful hints about leading points that would keep these gentlemen from going very far astray. I said at the time:

"The high tribunal—the very highest in the Empire—to which the question is to be submitted can, I apprehend, only decide on the case as submitted, and it behoves the Government of the Dominion to see that it is properly submitted. The Government of Ontario has, for the last eight years, had the ablest counsel to be found engaged in getting up a case for their Province. Volume after volume has been produced, until now they have no less than five volumes of arguments and documents upholding their views, together with the most elaborate and carefully prepared maps, in readiness to submit, while the Government of the Dominion, in so far as I know, have nothing of any consequence to meet these documents with, except the report of the select committee of this House, appointed in the Session of 1880 to enquire into all matters connected with the disputed boundaries. That report contains a great deal of valuable information, no doubt, but it is not in a form to render it easily understood, for it was sent to the printers in rather a disconnected shape, at the very close of the Session, when the committee had no opportunity of supervising its publication, and the documents in the appendix—many of them very valuable—are huddled together in rather a disconnected way, without even so much as an index. Moreover, maps are quite as necessary as written documents, to elucidate and explain the different phases of the dispute, and of these there is not so much as one accompanying the report; so that, as matters now stand, Ontario will have a great advantage. In view of all the circumstances, I think it would be well that the reference should be postponed, to allow time to arrange documents and meet Ontario on equal terms."

Now, Sir, there is one very important point in this discussion which has never been brought very prominently forward, and which the counsel whom we sent to England, seem to have lost sight of altogether—that is, the position of the Indian territories. Those Indian territories are declared by two Acts of the Imperial Parliament to be beyond the boundaries of the Provinces, and there was a separate jurisdiction provided for them. It has been claimed by those supporting the Hudson Bay Company's contention at one time, and by those supporting Ontario's contention at another time, that there was a doubt as to the locality of those territories. But the instructions of 1816, to the then Governor General, the proclamation very carefully prepared by the Imperial Government in England, and sent out to this country to be proclaimed by the Governor General, and the subsequent action under that proclamation, in sending commissioners to the territories and in trying cases

that arose under that proclamation, leave no doubt as to where these Indian Territories were. They were neither in Upper nor in Lower Canada, but are described as adjoining the Provinces, and they unquestionably came up to the height of land. All those who have studied this question agree that this question of the Indian Territories was the very strongest point in the Dominion case. In the pleadings, as they appeared in the newspapers, those Indian territories were not once alluded to; and therefore I think it is highly necessary for us to have the pleadings, so that we may see whether a matter of so much importance was utterly lost sight of before the Lords of the Privy Council. There is no person who can rejoice more than I at any good fortune that befalls Ontario. I could wish, of course, that the Province in which I live, and in which my lot is cast, should grow and flourish. At the same time, I must say that I believe it is a great misfortune to Ontario that this great territory should have fallen to her, because she has not the means of properly developing it. It is claimed to be 100,000 square miles in extent; it is nearer 130,000 square miles, so far as I can judge from an examination of the maps. If this vast territory were administered by the Dominion Government, and railroads constructed and settlements opened up throughout its extent, it would be worth far more to Ontario than it could possibly be under her jurisdiction. Ontario's limited revenue is absorbed in the various works in which she is engaged, in the administration of justice, in providing for her prisons and asylums, and in opening up the roads required; so that the Province has really no spare revenue to expend on this territory, and for a great many years it will not furnish revenue in itself. It has been the custom to cry down that territory as a region of rock and swamp and general desolation; but let me tell hon. members of this House that that territory possesses a great deal of excellent agricultural land; that it is traversed by rivers navigable for hundreds of miles, and that along the banks of those rivers there is as fertile and as level land as is to be found along the shores of Lake Erie, and with a climate where cereals will grow. To talk of such a country as a desolate wilderness is a great mistake. It is true, there are rocks and mountains in it; but there are rocks and mountains in England, Scotland and Ireland, and it is a country in great part susceptible of settlement, and it will in course of time support a great population. As part of Ontario, it would, when it became peopled, destroy the balance of this Confederation. You would have one Province overshadowing the rest, and I do not think that would be to the advantage either of the Dominion or of Ontario itself. There is no danger of that occurring, however, for many years to come, for so long as the North-West remains to be settled, we cannot of course expect many settlers in that region. But, Sir, I will detain the House for a few moments while I make a few remarks on the decision of the first tribunal in the realm on this question. I am afraid, Sir, that when you come to analyse that decision you will find that it has left the matter worse muddled than it ever was before. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I will show them presently that it is contradictory in itself, and I believe it cannot be made right without a reference back to the high tribunal from which it emanated. Now, I will just read it over, and you will see whether I am correct or not. It sets out by describing the western boundary of Ontario as extending along the international boundary to the Lake of the Woods, and from the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, by a line drawn due north until it strikes the Winnipeg River, or as the case may be, the English River, thence eastward, along the English River, Lonely Lake and Lake St. Joseph, and the river which discharges the waters of Lake St. Joseph, until it meets—what? Why the terrible line which has so long exercised the hon. member for Bothwell, a line drawn due north from

the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi, which forms the boundary eastward of the Province of Manitoba. The line from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi is there described as the eastern boundary of the Province of Manitoba. In this decision of the Privy Council the line running from Lake Superior by the chain of lakes to the Lake of the Woods, and thence due north to the English River, is described as the western boundary of Ontario; the due north line from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi is described as the eastern boundary of Manitoba—so that the descriptions overlap each other, and this disputed territory, which lies between those two lines, is given, by the decision of the Privy Council, with great impartiality, both to the Dominion and to the Province of Ontario. It may be said it is very easily amended, but there are the words as they occur in the document. Now, why was this due north line from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi brought into the description at all? It was not mentioned in forming the Province of Keewatin; it is not mentioned in the Act describing the boundaries of Manitoba as enlarged, and why is it brought into this? Why is it made a factor in the case at all? But it is there, and it forms the boundary eastward. There is no qualification of the term. The prolongation of the line from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi is, without the slightest qualification, described as the boundary eastward of the Province of Manitoba; and, with equal certainty, the line running due north from the Lake of the Woods and the chain of lakes between that lake and Lake Superior are described as the western boundary of Ontario. The western boundary of Ontario is declared to be at the Lake of the Woods, and the eastern boundary of Manitoba the prolongation of the line drawn due north from the confluence of the Ohio and the Mississippi. The description overlaps, and how are you going to amend it? Of course, it may appear in a different light to some hon. gentlemen, who may try to explain away its meaning. The House will remember a very extraordinary work which appeared while this question was in discussion, some years ago, perhaps the most wonderful work of modern times—the Ontario Book of Documents. I believe the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) had a good deal to do with the production of that work, and in it there are no less than eleven boundary lines suggested for Ontario. This decision of the Privy Council, to judge from its wording, bears the impress of the genius to which that great work is due, and I should say it looks very like as if it had been drafted by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). These two boundaries, given in a decision of the Privy Council, with the other eleven suggested by the hon. member for Bothwell, make thirteen boundaries in all for the Province of Ontario. Perhaps I had better read the description as given by the Privy Council:

“That upon the evidence their Lordships find the true boundary —”

Mark you, they are very careful to say upon the evidence submitted to them—

“between the western part of the Province of Ontario and the south-eastern part of the Province of Manitoba to be so much of a line drawn to the Lake of the Woods, through the waters eastward of that lake and west of Long Lake, which divide British North America from the territory of the United States, and thence through the Lake of the Woods to the most north-western point of that lake as runs northward from the United States boundary—”

That is a little ambiguous; it would seem actually as if it left a portion of the territory which formerly was ours in the possession of the United States, though that is a matter of small consequence as compared with what follows:

“and from the most north-western point of the Lake of the Woods, a line drawn due north until it strikes the middle line of the course of the river discharging the waters of the lake, called Lake Seul, or the Lonely Lake, whether above or below its confluence with the stream flowing from the Lake of the Woods towards Lake Winnipeg, and their Lordships find the true boundary between the same two Provinces to the north of Ontario and to the south of Manitoba, proceeding eastward

Mr. DAWSON.

from the point at which the before-mentioned line strikes the middle line of the course of the river last aforesaid, to be along the middle line of the course of the same river (whether called by the name of the English River or, as to the part below the confluence, by the name of the River Winnipeg), up to Lake Seul or the Lonely Lake, and thence along the middle line of Lake Seul, or the Lonely Lake, to the head of that lake, and thence by a straight line to the nearest point of the middle line of the waters of Lake St. Joseph, and thence along that middle line until it reaches the foot or outlet of that lake, and thence along the middle line of the river by which the waters of Lake St. Joseph discharge themselves, until it reaches a line drawn due north from the confluence of the Rivers Mississippi and Ohio, which forms the boundary eastward of the Province of Manitoba.”

The hon. gentleman—the member for Bothwell—looks exceedingly amused with the view I take, but I can read an extract written by an expert on the matter, a gentleman who has made the study of boundaries the study of his life, Mr. W. McD. Dawson, and I will ask the House to allow me to quote it:

“Here we have the due north line from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers established in the most definite terms as alike—for the two things are coterminous and synonymous—the eastern boundary of Manitoba and the western boundary of Ontario in direct contradiction of the first part of the description, by which we have a due north line from the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods established in the most definite terms as alike—for the two things are coterminous and synonymous—the western boundary of Ontario and the eastern boundary of Manitoba. The disputed territory lies to the east of due north line from the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, which is declared to be the westerly boundary of Ontario, and is therefore given to that Province. The disputed territory lies to the west of the due north line from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio, which is still more emphatically declared to be the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and is therefore given to that Province also. The disputed territory—as between these two Provinces—is thus emphatically given to each Province alike.

“If something else than this was intended or meant, as regards the eastern boundary of Manitoba, then how does the due north line from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio become a factor in the case at all? It forms no part in the legislation constituting that Province, unless it be, in its entirety, the western boundary of Ontario! Manitoba is bounded on the east by a line ‘beginning at the western boundary of Ontario on the international boundary line dividing Canada from the United States of America,’ that being the description of the starting point of the District of Keewatin as established by the Act 39 Vic., cap. 21, before the enlargement of Manitoba. The description of Keewatin then (and legal definition as regards that part of its boundary which became the divisional line between it and Ontario, being identical with the divisional line between Manitoba and Ontario now) is described as running ‘westerly following upon the said international boundary to the easterly boundary of Manitoba’ (as then constituted before its enlargement.) The description of Keewatin is then continued first northerly and then easterly, until it reaches a point due north of its point of beginning—(that point of beginning being at the western boundary of Ontario, on the international boundary)—a due north and south line from that point then forming its easterly boundary. Thus it will be seen that in constituting the District of Keewatin it was left wholly undecided by the McKenzie Government, in 1876, as to what was the western boundary of Ontario, but whatever it was, it was made by that Act the easterly boundary of Keewatin. If the due north line from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio was the westerly boundary of Ontario, then also and not otherwise it became the easterly boundary of the District, Keewatin throughout its entire length, which could at no point terminate to the west nor extend to the east of the line due north from its point of beginning at the westerly boundary of the Province of Ontario on the international boundary line dividing Canada from the United States of America.

“If, in like manner, the point of beginning at the westerly boundary of the Province of Ontario on the international boundary line dividing Canada from the United States of America, is at the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, then also the district of Keewatin commenced there and had for its easterly boundary, throughout, a due north line from that point, and could at no point terminate to the west nor extend to the east of that due north line.

“In like manner the Province of Manitoba was ‘increased’ by the Act 44 Vic., chap. 14, so that its easterly boundary throughout its entire length became precisely the same as the foregoing definition of the easterly boundary of the District of Keewatin. The definition of its boundary by the Act, instead of beginning at the south-east angle of the province, ‘at the western boundary of the Province of Ontario, on the international boundary line,’ commences at the south-west angle of the Province (of Manitoba), describes its westerly boundary first, then its northern boundary ‘to its intersection by the easterly limit of the district of Keewatin, as defined by the Act 39 Vic., chap. 21, that is to say to a point where it would be intersected by a line drawn due north from where the westerly boundary of the Province of Ontario intersects the aforesaid international boundary line dividing Canada from the United States of America, thence due south, following upon the said line to the international boundary aforesaid.’

“The description of the boundary of Manitoba, in this respect, merely differs then from that of Keewatin in the fact that its westerly boundary is described first, then its northerly and then its easterly boundary, to its

intersection with the international boundary—the only difference as regards its easterly boundary being in the order of description.

"Here, then, we have the eastern boundary of the enlarged Province of Manitoba, throughout its entire length, made to consist of a line due north from where the westerly boundary of Ontario intersects the international boundary line. If that point is where the due north line from the confluence of the Mississippi and Ohio rivers intersects the international boundary, then a continuation of that due north line is, throughout its entire length, the eastern boundary of Manitoba. If, on the contrary, the point where the westerly boundary of Ontario intersects the international boundary line, is to be found at the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods, then, in like manner, a due north line from that point is, throughout its entire length, the eastern boundary of the Province of Manitoba. If the first of these propositions be true, then the due north line from the confluence of the Mississippi and the Ohio is alike the true western boundary of Ontario, and, as declared by the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the order of the Queen in Council following thereon, 'forms the boundary eastward of the Province of Manitoba,' and, if so, it cannot be in part, but from one end of the Province north and south to the other, and can at no point terminate to the west nor extend to the east of that line; and if, on the other hand, the latter of these propositions be true, and the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods is the point at which the westerly boundary of Ontario intersects the international boundary, as also declared by the Lords of the judicial committee of the Privy Council, and the order of the Queen in Council following thereon, then a due north line from that point is the eastern boundary of Manitoba, and, if so, it cannot be in part, but from one end of the Province due north and south to the other, and can at no point terminate to the west nor extend to the east of that line."

Now, I think there can be no doubt, from the reading of the Act, that the prolongation of a due north and south line from the confluence of the Ohio and Mississippi is the boundary eastward of the Province of Manitoba, according to the decision of the highest court in the land, and that a line drawn due north from the north-west angle of the Lake of the Woods is the western boundary of the Province of Ontario. These two things cannot be reconciled. The description overlaps, and the only way it can be remedied is by a reference to the high authority from which it emanated. If this case is to be reopened at all, I suggest that it should be reopened from first to last, that the Imperial Government should be requested to allow the case to be reopened completely, that counsel should be sent over, that it should be thoroughly studied, that maps should be prepared, and that it should be fairly and clearly set before the Lords of the Privy Council. In the late reference one side was most elaborately got up, through years of study and labor, and I admit, with a great deal of talent and ability, and it was laid before the Privy Council, and we sent home two gentlemen, no doubt very eminent, very able and very clever; but how, in a few months, could they become familiar with a historical question of great importance which it has required years for men of great ability to become acquainted with. It took Mr. Mowat, and anyone will give him credit at least for being a man of great talent and ability, a year to become acquainted with the question. I do not desire to detain the House. That is my view—that some steps should be taken to have the whole case reopened and reheard from first to last, and then a decision given upon it would be satisfactory. I should have mentioned that the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council is in error, too, in placing a part of Manitoba to the north of Ontario. By the Act enlarging Manitoba, the two Provinces are divided by a line running due north, from some point on the international boundary. Consequently, wherever that point may be, the one cannot lie north or south of the other.

Motion agreed to.

OBSTRUCTIONS IN RIVERS.

Mr. IRVINE moved for:

Copies of all despatches or correspondence between the Government of Canada and that of the United States, or between the Government of Canada and the British Minister at Washington, or of any other documents in possession of the Government, having reference to alleged obstruction of the Maduxnakik River, in Carleton County, New Brunswick,

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There are no papers.

Motion withdrawn.

DUTIES ON HAY.

Mr. IRVINE moved for:

Copies of all despatches or correspondence between the Government of Canada and that of the United States, or between the Government of Canada and the British Minister at Washington, or of any other documents in possession of the Government not already brought down, having reference to excessive Customs duties on hay grown in and exported from Canada to the United States, and the refunding of the same."

He said: It is unnecessary for me to recapitulate what I said on this motion a year ago. I have no doubt the Government have done all they can do in the matter. Without reading the correspondence that has been brought down, I may mention the prominent facts upon which this motion is based. The Government of the United States have acknowledged that they have collected unlawfully from Canadians a certain amount of money, which they still retain; that is, they acknowledge that they have exacted from Canadian shippers of hay a duty of 20 per cent. when they had only the right by law to exact 10 per cent., but by a technicality which, among ordinary men, would pass for a quibble, the Government of the United States have so far refused to make restitution. They say there is a provision in their law which requires exporters of hay to enter a protest within thirty days of paying the duties, and that as the Canadian exporters did not do this, they have no right to have the excess refunded. We hold, on the other hand, that it was not incumbent upon our shippers—or, at all events they should not be expected to understand the law of the United States, and that the United States Government and officials misinterpret their own statute to the prejudice of the rights of Canadians. The United States officials passed the hay as a manufactured article, whereas it was decided in the courts that it was not a manufactured article; but, under their pretention that it was a manufactured article, they have been collecting for a number of years 20 per cent. on hay exported by Canadians. But there is a section of their law which gives to the Government discretionary power, when it is shown by the parties interested that it was not within their power to comply altogether with the requirements of their law. The latter part of the communication from Secretary Folger reads as follows:—

"This Department can only act in paying moneys from the Treasury in accordance with some power conferred upon it by law, and the only law which gives such power in a case of this character, where the requirements of section 2931 are not complied with, is found in section 3013 of the revised statutes. This provides that when it shall be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that more moneys have been paid to the Collector of Customs, or other officer acting as such, than the law requires, and the parties have failed to comply with the requirements of section 2931, the Secretary of the Treasury may direct a refund of the money, provided that he is satisfied that the non-compliance with the formal requirements of the law was owing to circumstances beyond the control of the importer, consignee, or agent making such payment."

Now we say it was not our business to interpret the laws of the United States. We say that the United States officials transgressed their own law when they exacted 20 per cent. instead of 10, and that our shippers could not be expected to know that they must put in their claims within ten days, otherwise they would lose their right to restitution. All I ask on behalf of those who have lost their money in this way is that the Government should ask the United States Government what proof they require in order to obtain repayment of the 10 per cent. which the United States officials thus obtained from our exports. They acknowledge they have obtained the money, and we desire to have it refunded. When they tell us what our people should do in order to secure this repayment, we are willing to comply with the demands.

Mr. SCRIVER. When this matter was under discussion last Session, the attention of the Minister of Customs was called to it, and he stated that his Department had been in correspondence with the Department of the Secretary of

State at Washington, with respect to the matter, and he very kindly promised then, if I remember rightly, that further correspondence would take place, and that the Government here would lose no opportunity and spare no pains to impress on the Government of the United States the injustice done towards Canadian exporters arising out of the position they have taken. I think my hon. friend who has just spoken is perhaps mistaken in respect to the matter of proof as to this claim. I do not think the United States Government or the Department of the Secretary of State at all disputes the fact that a very large quantity of hay was sent out of the country by Canadian exporters, and a duty of 20 per cent. was paid on it, when the rate of duty, under the decision afterwards rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States, should have been only 10 per cent. The ground on which they refused to refund the duty was, as the hon. gentleman has stated, that no protest was lodged against the payment of the duty at the time the duty was paid. I fancy, further, that the ground taken by the Secretary of State at Washington is, that the impossibility mentioned in the Act quoted by my hon. friend must be a physical impossibility, and ignorance of the law cannot be pleaded as a ground on which relief can be claimed. I observed, not very long ago, that during the Session of Congress just closed, a Bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by some member, providing for the repayment of certain duty under similar circumstances to those which we are now discussing. The matter was fully debated there, and I remember the position taken by those who opposed the passage of the Bill was, that the statute provided clearly that a certain course must be taken by exporters, that they were supposed to know what the law is, that they are bound to know what it is, and if they fail to comply with the requirements of the law, they really had no legal claim, at all events, on the Government, for a refund of the duty. And the Bill was defeated by a considerable majority. But, after all, as my hon. friend has stated, it seems a very unjust position to take under the circumstances. Of course, men doing business with a foreign country, exporting goods to that country, take it for granted that those who are charged with levying the duties on the goods they export understand the law and are not exacting an improper duty; and it would probably not be one case in a thousand in which an exporter would have sufficient doubt to lead him, either directly or through the medium of a professional adviser, to look into the law. And even if he did so, as in this case, differences of opinion would exist. As my hon. friend has said, the Customs Department in the United States first took the position that hay was a manufactured article and exacted a duty of 20 per cent.; and the courts afterwards decided that hay was not a manufactured article in the sense of the law, and that it was, therefore, subject only to 10 per cent. The position taken is a very unfair one towards citizens of a foreign country, and there is a fair opening for our Government to interfere and press on the United States Government the injustice of the position they have taken and urge upon them to be governed by the terms of the statute which my hon. friend has quoted with respect to this matter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. This matter is about in the condition stated by the hon. member who has submitted the motion. The claimants for repayment by the United States Government of duty overpaid, or rather for duty that has been paid and which was recognised by the courts afterwards as not to have been properly exacted, made representations to this Government so as to place their claims through Her Majesty's Ambassador at Washington before the United States Government. That was done, and the answer, from a copy of which I presume the hon. gentleman was reading, was to this effect: That no money could be paid unless it was paid according to the provisions of the revised statutes

Mr. SCRIVER.

of the United States. One clause provides that to be entitled to secure repayment one of two things must be proved: First, that the man who had made the payment had given notice that he would appeal from the decision of the Collector of Customs within a certain time to the Secretary of the Treasury; and second, that in case such notice of appeal had not been given, evidence would be adduced by the claimants to show why such notice of appeal could not be given. A petition setting forth both the facts and the law as understood by those claiming indemnity was sent to this Government and was forwarded by His Excellency the Governor General to Her Majesty's Ambassador to the United States. One of the parties claiming indemnity sent what he thought was the only good evidence as to why he had not complied with the first section quoted of the revised statutes. It was this: The condition of giving notice of appeal from the decision of the collector to the Secretary of the Treasury certainly could not be exacted from the claimant, for this reason: that the appeal from the collector to the Secretary of the Treasury was to the effect of having a decision from the Secretary of the Treasury, an official decision on the point, ruling the action of the different collectors of the Union. In this case the claimant contended, and I think rightly, that from 1868 or 1869 notice was not given and appeals were not taken from the collector, because a decision had been rendered by the Secretary of the Treasury, saying that the duty was regularly and legally collected, and the decision of the collectors in executing their duty was correct. Then, non-compliance with the law could not be pleaded as a bar to their demands, because really the decision of the Government had been rendered in favor of the Collector of Customs. The Canadian claimants, as I stated, say: We did not appeal, we did not give notice, because that decision was rendered, and the only evidence which we can give, according to the revised statutes of the United States, is evidence that we took the law as it was, and we complied with the decision of the United States Government, by one of its most important Departments. We took it to be the ruling of the Government and the law of the country, and we paid regularly, because we were asked to pay, and our appeal would have been of no avail. What further action this Government should take will be obvious to the hon. members of this House. Let the claimants exhaust the legal means in their power, to get from the tribunals in the United States the payment of their claims, if they are right, as I think they are. And if they are baffled in their exertions; if the courts are prevented, by some technical impediments, to admit of their claims, then will be the time to ask should the Canadian Government interfere diplomatically in the matter. I understand that some of them were disposed to take such proceedings, and *en passant*, I may state that I have read with a good deal of surprise in a newspaper, which it is true has no great importance in this country, that the law partners of mine in an office where my name is only used *pro forma*, and in whose profits I have no share, but where I am keeping a foothold—for good as Governments may be, they are not immortal and ministers may have to go back to their professions—had bargained with the claimants that I might be the recipient of 10 or 15 or 20 per cent. of one million of money, which the American Government was to give those claimants. I was greatly surprised to hear that such good luck had befallen me. All I know is that my partners have asked for a summary of the proceedings that had been taken, and that it was given to them. Since that time the firm of which I am *pro forma* a member, has not heard of the million or of any fraction of it. I believe they have engaged counsel to prosecute those claims in the United States. The question is: Are the means of the law exhausted before the American tribunals? When they are, and when they represent to this Government that they have gone to the American tribunals, and that no remedy can be given to them from the ordinary law of the United States

then will come the question for this Government to enquire whether it would be necessary to ask the action, through diplomatic representation, of the American Government in that matter. I understand that the amount which is due is large and covers a long period of time. At all events, the Government has not neglected its duty. All the demands that have been forwarded to us have been transmitted to the American Government, and now there remains the question of knowing what the tribunals of the United States will decide, and then the action of the Government might be asked if necessary. I may say that we have no further correspondence than what has been given, a quotation from which was made by the mover of the resolution.

Mr. SPROULE. I may say that I think the action of the hon. member in advocating the claims of these Canadians is highly commendable, and it is desirable, if they are entitled to the money, that they should get it. I think he has succeeded in making out a good case for their being entitled to the money. But it seems to me rather strange and amusing to notice the position taken by the hon. gentleman to-night, while previous to this, on other questions relating to the tariff, he invariably took opposite ground. Heretofore this hon. member told us that it was not the producer who lost the money, or who paid the tariff for the purpose of getting into a better market than he possessed at home, but that the consumer was always the loser. If his arguments in this respect about the Canadian tariff are logical and correct, these men would not lose the money, but the consumers would suffer the loss; and it is certainly pleasant to know that there are some circumstances in which hon. gentlemen opposite will acknowledge the correct principle. What has been said to-night establishes what many on this side of the House have said before, that there are circumstances under which the foreigner does pay the duty to get into a better market than his own, and that the consumer does not always pay it. It is true that there are many circumstances under which the consumer does pay the duty, but it is equally true, there are others under which the producer pays it, and not the consumer.

Mr. IRVINE. As the Secretary of State has said that there is no correspondence, I ask that the motion be withdrawn.

Motion withdrawn.

PORT MULGRAVE, GUYSBORO' COUNTY, N.S.

Mr. KIRK moved for:

All papers, letters, correspondence and Minutes of Council relative to making Port Mulgrave, in the county of Guysboro', a sub-port of Port Hawkesbury, in the county of Inverness.

He said: I beg to say that although the alteration made with regard to this port may be of small consequence to the Government or the Minister of Customs here, it is of considerable consequence to the people of Guysboro', which I have the honor to represent in this House. By the manner in which the reports were made in the Public Accounts one could see at a glance, in examining the trade returns, the amount of trade done in any county in the Province of Nova Scotia, because each port made its report to the Department through the chief port in the county. Previous to Confederation there were in Guysboro' county about five or six ports each, not a sub-port of the other, but subordinate only to the chief office at Halifax. After Confederation, however, these ports were made sub-ports to one port in the county, and the chief port reported to the Department of Customs. In looking over the trade returns one could not tell what amount of trade was done in any sub-port, but could see at a glance the amount of the whole trade for the county. There was no instance, I believe, in the Province of Nova Scotia, in which a port for one county was made a sub-port

for another until last year, when a port of the county of Guysboro' was made a sub-port for the county of Inverness, and it is impossible now to tell the volume of trade in the county of Guysboro' from the trade returns placed in our hands by the Minister of Customs. This the people of Guysboro' consider an injustice to the county. If this practice were carried out, you might wipe out from the trade returns a county altogether, because every port in one county might be subject to one port in the Province—Halifax, for instance; or to carry it out farther, every port in the Province of Nova Scotia might be made subject to a port in another Province, and you would be unable to tell from the trade returns what was the amount of trade in the Province of Nova Scotia, for the port of Montreal, for instance, might be credited with the whole trade. This we consider would be unfair. It is on the same principle that we complain that Port Mulgrave was made a sub-port of the port of Hawkesbury, in Inverness county, thereby depriving us of the privilege of ascertaining what amount of trade was carried on in the county of Guysboro'. I think it is only necessary to refer the matter to the Minister of Customs in order to have it remedied.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). I can assure my hon. friend from Guysboro' that I, at least, have no design of depriving Guysboro' of all the credit of the exports of that county, and I can go further and assure the House that the change was made without my knowledge. I will say too, that I quite concur in what the hon. member says, that the comparative statement in the customs report is very misleading, and I object very strongly to these comparative statements being made by Provinces. I think they are calculated to perpetuate sectionalism in the Dominion. Indeed, those comparative statements are so misleading that they cause an actual injustice to several sections and counties of the Dominion. My hon. friend from Guysboro' has reason to complain, but I submit that unless the change was made, notwithstanding that I had nothing to do with it, the counties of Inverness and Cape Breton, as a whole, would be more unfairly treated. A few weeks ago, with a view of ascertaining the trade on the Eastern Extension Railway, from Port Mulgrave to New Glasgow, from the island of Cape Breton, I communicated with the manager of that road, and received from him an approximate statement of the trade from the various counties of the island. He replied on the 7th February, thus:

"I have made careful enquiry in regard to the proportion of freight for the Eastern Extension received from the county of Inverness, as compared with that from the rest of the island of Cape Breton. I find that about one-fourth of our freight from Cape Breton was received from that county, and about one-third of the freight passed over our road for Cape Breton was for the county of Inverness. If the latter county shipped less by other routes, the business she would give the railway would be very extensive. A suitable boat running in connection with our road from ports Hood, Mabou, Margaree and Cheticamp should prove a big feeder. The *Rimouski* is of little use for other than passenger traffic. I have always advocated a subsidy being granted for the establishment and maintenance of a proper boat. It would be advantageous to the railway as affording a channel for trade, and it would help to develop the resources of the county of Inverness by opening up a readier market."

I was not satisfied with the quantity of freight which he represented as coming from the county of Inverness as compared with that from the other counties of the island, and I intimated to him that the statement should be corrected. He replied, on the 20th of February, as follows:—

"I have your letter of the 13th inst. In reply, I have to say that the approximation I sent you was correct. I am quite aware that Inverness county exports largely. I should say that county exports, exclusive of coal, as much, if not more, than all the other counties in Cape Breton put together; but these exports do not go over our road in that proportion. The greater portion, go either by the *Beaver*, from Mabou and Port Hood, the *M. A. Starr*, from Hastings and Hawkesbury, and by the Boston boats, from Hawkesbury. It is true, that pork, butter, etc., come from Whyoccomah via lake boats, but a great deal of this is delivered at Hawkesbury, and goes by the *M. A. Starr* and Boston boats. In regard to fish, we received, speaking

roughly, about 1,885 barrels of all kinds last season from Inverness, 2,395 from Richmond, and 800 from Cape Breton county, two cars frozen salmon from Inverness county, and three cars canned fish from Victoria county. Of course, I can give no more than an approximation, and even that is somewhat difficult with the data I have to work on; but as far as our railroad is concerned, I think you may consider the information reliable."

Now, my hon. friend from Guysboro' must see at a glance one fact, that the port of Mulgrave, which is on one side of the strait of Canso, on the terminus of the Eastern Extension, being made a sub-port of Hawkesbury, would receive credit for the export of 2,395 barrels from Richmond, 1,885 from Inverness, and 1,000 from Cape Breton county—or for all the fish exported over the Eastern Extension Railway to the United States. My hon. friend from Guysboro' knows that the trade returns only show the exports from the Province of Nova Scotia to the outside market. They have no reference to the export of the interprovincial trade, and therefore but for the fact that Port Mulgrave has been a sub-port of Hawkesbury all the exports of Hawkesbury and the exports from the island of Cape Breton over the Intercolonial Railway to the United States would be credited to Guysboro'.

Mr. BOWELL. Is the hon. gentleman reading from the Trade and Navigation Returns?

Mr. CAMERON. No; not at all. This of course would be a greater injustice to the county of Inverness, and the island of Cape Breton generally, than it would be if the port of Mulgrave generally were left a sub-port of Guysboro'. If it were, the export from the island of Cape Breton over the Eastern Extension Railway would be credited to the port of Guysboro', but this only proves after all the fallacy of making relative statements of this kind.

Mr. BOWELL. There is nothing in the Trade and Navigation Returns that gives the exports and imports of Guysboro' and the different parts of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, or any other part of the Dominion.

Mr. CAMERON. I will come to that soon. The principle that I apply to counties is equally applicable to the Provinces. I find by the Trade Returns that the imports of Halifax amount to \$6,933,253. My hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, knows that the imports into Halifax are distributed and consumed in all the counties of the Province of Nova Scotia, if not in other sections of the Dominion and in Prince Edward Island as well. The exports from Halifax amount to \$4,886,264, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs knows that those are not the exports of Halifax county alone, but of the accumulated trade of all the counties of which the city of Halifax is a distributing point. Any one referring to the comparative statement would be led to believe that the exports from Halifax should be credited to the county of Halifax instead of to all the counties in the Province. Last Session I referred to the misleading character of statements of this kind, and I maintain that the amount of dutiable goods consumed in all the counties in the Province, and in all sections of the Dominion, depended altogether upon the producing power of the several counties or sections; and if that rule be applied, I hold that the purchasing power of the island of Cape Breton being as great as the purchasing power of any portion of Nova Scotia, according to population, the imports entered for home consumption, actually distributed through the island, are as great as the imports of other sections of the Province with a similar population. But if you look at the Trade Returns, you will find only a few thousand dollars credited to the island of Cape Breton, and when a person turns up the trade returns he is misled to believe that the island of Cape Breton cannot be of very much importance. It is known that it is isolated by nature from the Province of Nova Scotia; and the inference is, that these comparative statements show exactly the importance of its trade; but instead of doing that, they are altogether

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

misleading. The same remark applies to the Provinces. I have no hesitation in saying that the amount of duty collected in the Province of Nova Scotia should not be charged to the Province; in other words, every person who knows anything about trade knows that a large quantity of the goods imported into Halifax is distributed in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, and other parts of Canada, and therefore the duty collected in the Province of Nova Scotia is not absolutely a tax upon our own people. I, myself, have given this question some attention. I would much prefer to see the exports and imports by Provinces, if you have sections at all; but what I would prefer to see is, that the collections would not be by Provinces at all. I would prefer to see the Custom house officers send in their returns, directly in such a manner that no invidious distinction could be made on turning up the Trade Returns, and it would disabuse the minds of many people very considerably of the idea that they are enormously taxed. Any person looking at the trade returns of Montreal would be misled to believe that the city of Montreal contributed immensely to the Exchequer of the Dominion, but we all know the duty charged and collected in the port of Montreal is on goods distributed over the Dominion. In reference to the imports and exports of Halifax, which show largely on the Trade Returns, I beg to assure my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, that the purchasing power of the county of Halifax, including the city, is not any greater than the purchasing power of any other county in the Province of Nova Scotia. Looking upon it as an agricultural county, I find it is far below the average of any county in the Province; and as a fishing county it cannot compare with the Atlantic counties of the Province; and, these being facts, it is manifestly unfair, on the face of the Trade Returns, that they should make it appear that the city of Halifax contributes so largely to the revenue. When we ask for collectors or any other officials for the purpose of securing additional protection to the revenue, we are referred at once to the Trade Returns, and we are convinced, if we are at all easily convinced, that our ports are of so little importance, and so little duty is collected in them, that no preventive officers are required. I think this is a mistake.

Mr. BOWELL. There is no possible objection to bringing down the papers moved for by the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk), but it would be somewhat difficult to understand how those papers can furnish him with the information he is evidently desirous of obtaining; and it is also difficult to understand how he can argue that the fact of a sub-port of Guysboro' being placed under the port of Hawkesbury would interfere with the trade returns of his own county to which he refers. Hawkesbury is a mile or two distant from the sub-port which was removed from the port of Guysboro', which was some 20 or 30 miles distant. It was purely and simply—not only for the accommodation of the port, but for the interest of the service itself—so that communication could be kept up more frequently and rapidly with the collector than it possibly could be if he had to report to Guysboro'. It was purely a departmental matter. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) is quite correct when he says he knew nothing of the transfer, nor am I aware that it was necessary, in conducting the Department over which I preside, to consult the representative of any county particularly in a matter so trivial as this. The hon. member for Guysboro' must know that there are no figures in the Trade and Navigation Returns of this country which would give him the information he seeks. He says that if sub-ports are to be taken from one county and connected for statistical purposes, with another county, the return of the exports and imports which legitimately and properly belongs to the other county, cannot be obtained. It matters very little whether it remains with one county or the other; the information could not be

obtained except by applying to the port itself for special returns. They are not made to the Department at Ottawa, and the only difference really is that the sub-collector at the port of Mulgrave reports to the port of Hawkesbury instead of to the port at Guysboro'; but, if he will look at the Trade and Navigation returns, which are very full, he will find that the amount collected at each sub-port can be obtained.

Mr. KIRK. Not in the Trade Returns.

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly, in the Trade Returns. He has not given any attention to them, or he would not have made that statement. If he will look at page 18, he will find, under the head of Nova Scotia, the collections made at Guysboro', and the collections made at each of the sub-ports. He will find that the collections at sub-port Mulgrave, up to the time of its transference to the other port, that is up to the 5th July, 1883, amounted to the sum of \$50; and for the balance of the year he will find, if he turns to Hawkesbury, that the sum collected was \$956.94. If he adds the two together, and adds that to Guysboro', he will have very little difficulty in ascertaining how much was collected in the county he represents. The hon. gentleman says his county is the only one that has been interfered with in this way. He is wrong. Sub-ports in Kent have been attached to ports in Westmoreland for precisely the same reason that I have given for the removal of this sub-port from Guysboro' to Hawkesbury. The hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) has raised an altogether new question, and I am very glad that he has brought that question before the House. It is one I should like to hear discussed and to have the opinions of the different members upon it. He will have observed, upon reference to these Trade and Navigation Returns, that some of the provincial returns, which were formerly given and which were just as misleading, if not more so, as the points to which he calls the attention of the House, have been left out. And, in the present return, I have left out two or three tables which were altogether misleading, from the fact that the importations into one Province, which were credited to that particular Province, divided by the population, would lead you to suppose that that Province paid *per capita* double the amount it really consumes of the articles imported into the Province. So I have given the table from a Dominion standpoint exclusively, and it is a grave question whether the suggestions thrown out by my hon. friend from Inverness should not be adopted and carried out more fully in future returns. It is quite true that, on reference to these returns, he will find, say, the port of Montreal, will show that that port alone paid to the Dominion Treasury from \$7,000,000 to \$8,000,000 annually. No one supposes, who knows anything of the trade and commerce of this country, that all these goods are consumed at that port. Those who have paid any attention to the subject know that a large proportion of the goods entered at Montreal are taken to the lower Provinces and sold in the markets there; and it is also the case with goods that are entered at the port of Toronto. Toronto pays into the Dominion Treasury some \$3,000,000 or \$4,000,000 annually, but no one supposes that Toronto consumes all those goods. The large wholesale dealers in that city send their goods all over the Dominion, and it is just so in reference to other articles which are imported into the country. I agree with my hon. friend that it would be better if these returns showed only the amounts imported into the Dominion. That is the policy pursued in the Trade and Navigation Returns of the United States, with this exception, that they have large areas and they credit each district and not each State. If that were adopted we could give a book quite as large as the present, with a classification quadruple that which we now present to the House and the country, which would enable the trade of the country to form a correct idea of the quantities of the larger number of the goods that are

imported as well as the countries to which the variety of exports we have in this country are sent. I am very much obliged to the hon. gentleman for bringing this question before the House, and I hope the members will consider it well and that before Parliament rises there will be a fuller expression of opinion upon this point. If it be the opinion of the House that a change should be made, I promise that, commencing with the next fiscal year, to give them a much more interesting report in a volume no larger than the one we have at present. If the system was continued that was carried out when the present Government came into power, in preparing these Trade and Navigation Returns, we should have had two volumes to-day of this size, instead of one, and they would not be so compact nor so easy to understand.

Mr. VAIL. If I understand him aright, the hon. member for Guysboro' complains that one of the sub-ports of his county has been transferred to the county of Inverness; and I think he has just cause of complaint, inasmuch as the returns from the several counties convey a wrong impression of the amount of duties paid in those counties. If the hon. Minister of Customs will look at the returns in the Public Accounts, he will find that Guysboro' is credited with \$2,878 as collected, and also the cost of collection, while Port Hawkesbury returns \$7,500 which, I say, conveys a wrong impression, because a certain portion of this \$7,500 is collected in the county of Guysboro'; and according to the Public Accounts it would appear that Hawkesbury collects a very much larger amount than the whole county of Guysboro'. I think it is only fair that Guysboro' should have the credit of the whole amount of duties that are collected within the county.

Mr. KIRK. I agree with the Minister of Customs when he says that it is impossible to tell the amount of trade in each Province by the Trade and Navigation Returns. The hon. gentleman knows that frequently in this House long arguments are based upon the fact that certain Provinces have a right to only a certain amount of money because they only do a certain amount of trade. Last Session I heard an hon. gentleman in this House make an unjust comparison between Nova Scotia and other Provinces, on the basis of the return made by these Trade and Navigation Returns. I am aware that the hon. Minister of Customs knows the working of the system too well to base an argument upon any such returns. I said I believed that this was the only exception in the Province of Nova Scotia; as to the case referred to in New Brunswick, I know nothing, because I know nothing of the system pursued in the other Provinces. I do not blame the hon. member for Inverness (Mr. Cameron) for suggesting or recommending a change. I know he is a fair-minded man, and would not recommend anything unjust to another county if he knew it, but I think he is entirely wrong when he says that the exports last year from the county of Inverness, had this change not been made, would have shown the exports of Port Mulgrave to be much larger than they should be, because Port Mulgrave would get the credit of exports from Inverness county. I do not think it would be so. Although I have not the returns before me, I do not think they show the amount of trade, so far as Guysboro' is concerned, from Port Mulgrave. The credit is all given to Port Hawkesbury for the last year. I do not know what the exports of Port Mulgrave are, but I find in the previous year that Guysboro' reported \$179,957 worth, whilst Hawkesbury, in Inverness county, only exported \$113,445. In 1884 Guysboro' only exported \$196,689, whilst Hawkesbury exported \$236,868, showing that Hawkesbury has been largely credited with exports from the county of Guysboro'. The increase was so great that a correspondent from Inverness county wrote a letter to the *Halifax Herald*, giving credit to the National Policy for this

large increase, and the Halifax *Herald* based an editorial on the assumption that the National Policy was doing great things for the Province of Nova Scotia, inasmuch as the port of Hawkesbury had exported last year so much more than the year before, whereas the fact was that a portion of the exports had gone from the county of Guysboro' to swell the exports from Inverness, and the National Policy had nothing to do with it. I cannot see, Mr. Speaker, what reason the hon. Minister had for making the change. He has not given any reason for it; he has not stated to the House that it was inconvenient in any way to conduct the business as it was conducted before. There is a daily mail between Guysboro' and Port Mulgrave, and there was no difficulty in getting the returns back and forth between these ports. I am under the impression that the collector at Guysboro' is quite as sharp in looking after his sub-collectors as the collector at Port Hawkesbury, and I think the business would be quite as well done under his supervision as under the supervision of the collector at Hawkesbury. When an application was made to the Government for an amount of money to erect buildings for a Custom house and post office, the first thing the Minister did was to look at the returns and see the amount of business done at these ports. He deprived the county of Guysboro' of the credit of doing the business that is really done there, and therefore he deprived that port of the chance of having a building erected to accommodate the Customs and post office business there. In this way I think that by making Port Mulgrave a sub-port to the port of Hawkesbury he has done an injury to the county of Guysboro', an injury of which the people of Guysboro' complain.

Motion agreed to.

RETURNS ORDERED.

1st. Copies of all demands and claims made by the town of Emerson on the Government for financial or other aid, and all correspondence respecting the same. 2nd. Copies of all Orders in Council or departmental orders respecting such demands or claims, and the action or decision of the Government thereon.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Return of all correspondence between the Auditor-General and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, relating to an Order of this House made on the 28th March last, for a return showing all sums received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on account of rental of rivers and streams, etc.; or in any way relating to any irregularity or inaccuracy connected with matters of the said Department.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Memorials and papers presented to the Government, or any member thereof, relating to the Canada Temperance Act by deputations, on Thursday last, the 19th ult.—(Mr. Kraaz.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 10th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT.

Mr. JAMIESON for Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 92) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain the object of the Bill.

Mr. JAMIESON. This Bill comprises seven clauses. It has been prepared by the legislative committee of the Mr. KIRK.

Dominion Alliance for the suppression of the liquor traffic. It embodies several amendments which are deemed necessary to the effective working of the Canada Temperance Act of 1878. I do not think it necessary for me to go into a minute explanation of the several clauses. I will say, however, that the first clause proposes to amend section 96 of the Canada Temperance Act by providing that the publication in the *Official Gazette* of the Order in Council by which the Canada Temperance Act is put in force in any county or city shall be notice to all persons—magistrates and others—enforcing the law; in other words, that it shall not be necessary, as at present, to produce a copy of the *Official Gazette* in every prosecution instituted under the Canada Temperance Act. It must be obvious that in a very short time now, the Act is likely to be in force in a large number of counties, and there will be a large number of prosecutions under it, and to require the production in every case, of a copy of the *Official Gazette*, would be an impossibility, and in many cases there would be a failure of justice, in consequence of the absence of the provision embodied in the 1st clause of this Bill. The 2nd section of the Bill proposes to amend section 99 of the Act. At present, under the Act, liquors cannot be sold or prescribed by a medical man in less quantities than a pint, and we propose to leave the quantity in the discretion of the medical man, whose certificate is made necessary under the Act. In addition to that, we propose to insert an amendment imposing a penalty on a medical man who gives a certificate colorably under the law. Although there are not many medical men now who will be guilty of such an offence, still, there have been cases where men have been so dead to principle as to give certificates colorably, to give them for a fee when they were not necessary for medicinal purposes. Section 4 proposes to amend section 107 of the Canada Temperance Act. That section provides that prosecutions shall be conducted under and in accordance with the Act respecting the duties of justices of the peace out of sessions. It has been found that that does not go far enough. We propose to amend it so as to provide for proceedings for the enforcement of the penalty. Section 5 proposes to amend a clerical error in the law, which will be apparent to anyone who carefully reads it. Section 6 proposes to amend section 105 of the Liquor License Act of 1883. This section is introduced for the purpose of obviating the difficulty which has arisen in consequence of a late decision of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. I have no doubt that it is within the knowledge of almost every member of this House that a difficulty has arisen there. It seems that the court in New Brunswick has held that the enforcing clauses of the Canada Temperance Act have been repealed by the Liquor License Act of 1883, though that was certainly not the intention of Parliament at the time, and the object of this section is to provide that these clauses shall not be repealed as the effect of that decision. It is quite obvious that the intention of Parliament at the time was that this provision was to be auxiliary to the provisions of the Canada Temperance Act. However, unfortunately, it has been held that it repealed some of the provisions of that law. The Bill provides a set of forms for justices of the peace and others, which the promoters of the Bill deem necessary, inasmuch as the ordinary run of magistrates are not men skilled in the law, and require something of that kind for their guidance. These are the whole provisions of the Bill, and we trust we shall have the assent of the House to this measure, and that it will become law before the House rises, because we believe it to be absolutely necessary to the efficient working of a law, which is now very popular with the people of this Dominion and which this Parliament has given to the people, and we further believe it to be the duty of this Parliament to provide sufficient machinery to carry out the views of the people as embodied in that Act.

Mr. BLAKE. I have not had an opportunity of seeing the measure, but I have heard the explanation of the hon. gentleman, and, if I rightly understand it, it is a measure which is designed to remedy some defects which have occurred in the working of the Temperance Act, and which have been partly produced by a diversity of judicial decision in different Provinces, and partly by the operation of the License Act of 1883 as construed by some judicial authorities. I understand that some time ago, the organisation of which the hon. gentleman has spoken, presented this measure for the consideration of the Government of the day, with a request that they would themselves take the responsibility of proposing the legislation. That took place somewhere about a fortnight ago, and a considerable delay has taken place in consequence of the period of time which the Government required before announcing their decision. It seems to me, in view of the late period of the Session at which we have now arrived, and the block in public business which is likely soon to take place, that every effort should be made to expedite the printing of this Bill, and that the Government should give every opportunity for its consideration. I do not pledge myself at all to these views because I have not had an opportunity of considering the clause, but I think, under the circumstances, that it should be understood that this Bill is not to be crowded out, that, whether innocent or guilty, it is not to be slaughtered. It should have a fair opportunity of being reached and disposed of by the House.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition need not be so anxious about this Bill, as no one has any desire to strangle it. As to the printing, that is in the hands of the House, and the necessary orders will be given concerning it. I did not fully understand the explanations given by the mover of the Bill, but I got an impression from what he said that not only does his Bill propose to amend the Canada Temperance Act of 1878, but it also amends the License Act of 1883.

Mr. BLAKE. So he says.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If that be the case its title will have to be changed so that it shall be stated that it affects both laws. I am not in a position to say now what the Government will do about it, but we will consider it as soon as possible.

Mr. IVES. There are two or three other Bills upon the same subject which have already been introduced for a number of days, Bills in which many members of the House feel a considerable interest, and in which a large number of people in the country feel a considerable interest. If there is to be any special effort on the part of the leader of the Opposition with the Government to obtain a favorable consideration for this particular Bill, I think the Government should be urged to facilitate the printing of these other measures that have been introduced for more than a month.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not ask the hon. gentleman to give a favorable consideration to this Bill. I understood the Government decided not to give it a favorable consideration—at any rate decided they would not take the responsibility. What I asked was that inasmuch as the printing of the Bill had been delayed the Government should see that the House had an opportunity of considering it for itself.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COURT OF CLAIMS FOR CANADA.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 93) to establish a Court of Claims for Canada. He said: The object of this measure is to replace the Dominion Board of Arbitrators that has been in existence for a number of years, by a Court of Claims for the

Dominion. I will, on this occasion, give only a synopsis of the Bill. The court will be a court of common law and equity, and shall be called the Court of Claims. It will consist of one judge to be appointed by Her Majesty by letters patent under the Great Seal of Canada. He shall hold office during good behavior, but may be removed by an Address of both Houses. He shall be assisted by three assessors to advise him on questions of fact, and such assessors shall hold office during pleasure. There shall be a clerk of the court who will be appointed by the Governor in Council. Neither the judge nor the assessors shall hold any other office under the Government of Canada, or under the Government of any Province. The judge must have been either a judge of the Superior or County Court in one of the Provinces, or a barrister or advocate of at least one year's standing, and shall take an oath to be administered by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. The judge and assessors shall have both a salary and retiring allowances. Then there is the ordinary clause about the superannuation of the judge, the same as in the case of the other judges. Then as to the jurisdiction of the court, there are seven different items giving the nature of the claims:

"(B) Every claim for alleged or indirect or consequential damage to property arising from or connected with the construction, repair or maintenance of any public work undertaken or performed at the expense of the Government of Canada, or which is now vested in the Government of Canada;

"(C) Every claim arising out of or connected with the performance of any contract entered into with any Minister on behalf of Her Majesty, whether in the name of Her Majesty or otherwise, and every claim arising out of deductions made by any Minister for the non-performance of any such contract;

"(D) Every claim for direct or consequential damage to property, arising out of anything done by the Government of Canada, or arising out of any death or injury to the person or to the property on any public work under the control and management of the Government of Canada;

"(E) Every claim founded upon any statute of Canada or by any regulation made by the Governor in Council;

"(F) Every claim which is referred to it by the head of any Department in pursuance of any statute of Canada;

"(G) Every claim which is referred to it by the order of the Governor in Council;

"(H) Every set-off, counter-claim, claim for damages, whether liquidated or unliquidated, or other demand whatsoever, on the part of Her Majesty against any person making claim against Her Majesty in the court."

As to the procedure in respect to claims, I do not suppose the House wishes me to give all the details. At all events, a claimant who wishes to enter a suit has twelve months to do it in. Then the Government may make a tender—

"Any claim arising out of or connected with the performance, or on account of deductions made for the non-performance of any contract entered into with the head of any Department unless such notice is filed with the Secretary of State within three months of the date of the final estimate made under such contract, if the said contract provides for such final estimate, and if it does not, then within twelve months after the breach of contract complained of."

"Any other claim which might otherwise be transmitted or referred to the court, unless such notice is filed with the Secretary of State within twelve months after the claim first accrues."

There will be an additional clause, which is not yet printed, providing that the Government may do as they do now, that is take the opinion of one of the assessors about the claim, and thus avoid a lawsuit if possible—

"No claim shall be transmitted to or entertained by the court for or in respect to which the claimant has pending in any other court any suit or process against any person who, at the time when the cause of action alleged in such suit or process arose, was, in respect thereto, acting, or professing to act under the authority of Her Majesty."

"Nothing in this Act contained shall make it imperative for any head of a Department to transmit any claim to the court, or shall prevent Her Majesty from at any time resisting any claim, by the exercise of the rights, privileges or prerogatives of Her Majesty."

There will be a clause by which the court may sit anywhere where the Governor in Council may direct them to go; for instance, the Governor may send the judge to Toronto, Hamilton, or Montreal, if they see fit, in order to save the expense—

"The hearing and trial of any claim shall be by and before the judge of the court sitting with at least two of the assessors, and such judge shall decide the case, and his decision shall be the judgment of the court herein."

"If it appears to the court, in any case, that the facts set forth in the claimant's notice do not furnish any ground for relief, it shall not be necessary to take evidence in the matter."

Then with regard to references :

"The court may, for the purpose of taking accounts and making enquiries, refer any claim, or matter connected with a claim, to the assessors or any two of them."

Then rules for adjudicating upon claims :

"The court shall consider the advantage, as well as disadvantage, of taking all the testimony, copies of judgments, documents, etc."

With regard to the travelling expenses of these officers, we intend taking the same clause as in the Civil Service Act. There is a clause providing as follows :—

"When a claim has been referred to the court for examination and report, the court shall have all the powers in reference thereto which it has in case of a claim transmitted to it for trial and adjudication, but the judge in such case shall report to the head of the Department his finding on the questions of fact and upon the amount of damages, if any sustains, and the principle upon which such amount has been computed."

Then there may be a new trial—

"When judgment is rendered against any claimant the court may grant a new trial for any reason which, by the rules of common law, in suits between individuals, would furnish sufficient ground for granting a new trial."

The decision of the court shall not be final. The idea is to give an appeal to the Supreme Court. It provides that :

"The costs incident to the appeal in the Supreme Court of Canada, whether for or against the claimant, or for or against Her Majesty, shall be in the order and discretion of that court and shall be taxed and allowed by its proper officer."

Then there are provisions for enforcing judgments and orders. Then there are provisions respecting process of court, sheriff and other officers, barristers and attorneys of court, report to Minister of Justice, rules of court. The rules of court are to be made by the court with the approval of the Governor in Council :

"The Governor in Council may, from time to time, make regulations respecting court rooms for the use of the court, the travelling and other expenses of the judge and the assessors, in connection with his and their duties, the remuneration of sheriffs and other officers of the court, the reporting of the decisions of the court, the disposal of moneys received for fees by the clerk of the court or for costs allowed to Her Majesty against any claimant, and the mode of payment of any judgment or costs against Her Majesty."

There are repealing clauses respecting such Acts as must necessarily be repealed. We shall take care that matters now pending before the court will not be affected by this Bill. I have given only a general idea of the measure; there are a number of other clauses, and those I will explain more fully afterwards.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Will this Bill abolish the Exchequer Court?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) It does not apply to the Exchequer Court. It merely concerns the four arbitrators which were appointed a long while ago, in 1867, and who were in existence under the law of the old Province of Canada. As soon as this Bill becomes law these arbitrators will cease to exist.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) If my memory serves me aright, under the Act of Confederation—and I call the attention of the hon. Minister to this point—the constitution of the various courts in the country is left, as far as I can remember, to the Local Governments. I believe it is under a special clause of the Act of Confederation that we have established the Supreme Court; and I think that by referring to this Act it will be seen that we have no power to create new courts. I simply wish to call the attention of the hon. Minister on this point, especially on the first reading of the Bill, because I think it is a serious question.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) The hon. member is mistaken on that point. If he will once again refer to the Act of Confederation—I cannot, for the moment, quote the clause—he will find that the Dominion Parliament can decline to go before the provincial courts and create courts for the carrying out of their own laws and for all cases which may affect them.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has given us a synopsis of the contents of the proposed measure, but he has wholly failed to give us any reason for the proposed legislation. He has not pointed out to us what those circumstances are which have induced the Government to believe that the existing arrangements are such as to require the establishment of a new court, and the creation of this somewhat expensive machinery. I well remember when discussions took place in this House with respect to the Supreme and Exchequer Courts, and particularly with respect to the appeal to be given to the Exchequer Court in some cases from the decision of the Dominion arbitrators, that very great pressure was put on the Administration of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) by the hon. gentlemen who were then on this side of the House to abolish the Dominion arbitrators altogether, and to vest in the Exchequer Court jurisdiction which had theretofore existed in the Dominion arbitrators. At that time the Supreme Court had been but just established, and its working had not yet been indicated by practical experience, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mackenzie) and those who were associated with him, without at all declaring that the suggestion of hon. gentlemen then on this side was unsound, still they were not prepared at that time to take the responsibility of dealing with the question in that way, and they held that it required consideration and determination. A very strong opposition was made to the continuance of a special court for the purpose of dealing with these cases. Well, many years have since elapsed, and no proposal in the sense of that which I mention, as made by those hon. gentlemen when in Opposition, has been proposed since they resumed power; but now without any cause assigned, without any reason of any description given, a proposal is made, not to abolish the provincial arbitrators with a view to vest in the Exchequer Court the jurisdiction which it may be thought proper to vest in some judicial tribunal with respect to Government claims, but to abolish the Court of Dominion Arbitrators with a view to the creation of a new court. It seems to me this is not the time for the creation of a new court, it is not the time for the creation of new offices; and I think it would be much more satisfactory if the jurisdiction proposed to be vested in those officers should be vested in the Court of Exchequer, with such modifications as the powers and functions of that court in dealing with this class of cases may require. You find that the proposal is to have a judge and three assessors. There are at present four Dominion arbitrators, of whom, however, not all sit in all cases. You have for all practical purposes at least the expense of the old Dominion arbitrators plus the salary of the judge. As to the amount of salary we are not yet informed, and I do not wish to press the hon. gentleman beforehand for a revelation of these sacred mysteries. I suppose the information will be given in committee; but whatever it may be, the expense will be what I have stated and perhaps a good deal more. Without entering into any further discussion at this time I wish to say that this measure does not at first sight, without any explanation from the Minister as to the reason of the change, and the reason for the departure from the views expressed on a former occasion, commend itself favorably to my mind, that the Government should set about creating a court with a newly appointed judge to discharge functions, which, so far as I can judge, can be thoroughly and effectually discharged by existing tribunals without increasing expense.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not intend, and I do not intend now, to enter into the reasons of the proposed measure, and to debate the matter with the leader of the Opposition. That I shall be prepared to do on the motion for second reading, after the Bill has been printed and distributed. I trust the hon. gentleman when he hears the explanations will be prepared to admit that the proposal of the Government is a sound one, a reasonable one, and is in the interests of the Dominion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolution:—

That it is expedient to give effect by legislation to an agreement made by the Department of Public Works with Dr. Allen Holford Walker, for the sale and transfer to him of the Dundas and Waterloo Road, and for that purpose to authorise such sale and transfer to him by Order in Council to be published in the *Canada Gazette* as in the cases provided for in the Public Works Act.

He said: This was a public work belonging to the Dominion, and it was thought that it was in the interests of the public that we should dispose of it by sale, and under these circumstances I was authorised by Order in Council to do so. Public advertisements were published freely announcing that this road would be offered at public competition at a certain time and place. We fixed an upset price which was, I think, something like \$:5,000, though I cannot state the exact amount, and it realised over \$21,000. The sale was effected, but when we came to give the deed, the Department of Justice, to which the matter was referred, having looked closely into it, thought that we would require authority from Parliament, and therefore I now come to Parliament on behalf of the Government to ask the legalisation of the sale. I think it will be in order for the House to proceed immediately into Committee of the Whole, as the resolution does not involve a burden on the public, but rather the contrary—an accession to the public funds.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not prepared to say how the resolution stands on the point of order. I am sure that if it was a complete cession or grant of the public domain which was proposed the principle would apply. I cannot now say whether it applies or not to sales, but I am rather inclined to think with the hon. gentleman. At the same time I would request him not to go into committee until a future day, but on another ground. It seems to me that our going into committee would be the merest formality unless the hon. gentleman has placed before us the papers necessary in order to enable us to form some judgment about the matter. I, therefore, ask him to defer going into committee, and that in the meantime he should lay the papers before us, including the opinion of the Department of Justice, and any other papers which will aid us in coming to a judgment.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, Mr. Speaker, if you decide that I cannot proceed to go into committee to-day, or if you say there is any doubt about it, I would not wish to imperil the measure by having to begin again, and so I would move simply to go into committee at a future day. However, it seems to me as there is no charge on the people, but, on the contrary, it is bringing money to the public coffers, that the rule should not apply; but if there is any doubt about it, and as the point is an important one, I will not press going into committee to-day.

Mr. MILLS. I think we should have before us some means of forming a judgment before proceeding to committee. It is true the hon. gentleman proposes to put money into the treasury, but we do not know whether he is getting back what was originally paid for the road or not, and I think it is only reasonable that we should have

such information as would enable us to do something more than merely to register the wishes of the Government for the time being.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. If we had gone into committee, it was my intention at a subsequent stage to supply any information that might be asked for.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not been able to give the point of order full consideration, but I think the object of the rule is that full time should be given for the consideration of all Bills, motions, or resolutions which may result in a charge on the treasury, or upon any department of the public domain or property. That it seems to me is the reason for the ordinary rule of the House, that it shall not presently go into committee, and under those circumstances I think it would be more advisable not to proceed to committee forthwith, but simply to take the motion to go into committee at a future day.

Motion, amended as suggested, agreed to.

COLONIAL AND INDIAN EXHIBITION OF 1886.

Mr. POPE moved that the House, to-morrow, resolve itself into committee to consider the following resolutions:

1. *Resolved*, That the proposed Colonial and Indian Exhibition, to be held in London in the year 1886, under the presidency of H. R. H. the Prince of Wales, will bring prominently under notice the development and progress which have been made in various parts of the British Empire, in products, manufactures and resources, and will afford a widespread opportunity of acquiring a more intimate knowledge of the vast fields for enterprise which exist throughout the British Dominions.

2. *Resolved*, That it is expedient that Canada should take such part in the said exhibition, as becomes her position amongst the Colonies of the Empire.

3. *Resolved*, That His Excellency the Governor General in Council be authorised to guarantee, on the part of Canada, against any loss resulting from the exhibition to the extent of £10,000 sterling, being one-fifth of the whole sum which it is proposed to be guaranteed by the Government of India, the Dominion of Canada and the Colonies represented by agents general in England, the money so guaranteed to be held to meet any sum in which the intended exhibition may fall short of being self-supporting.

Mr. BLAKE. I trust that the hon. gentleman, before he asks us to go into committee, will lay on the Table such papers as are necessary to enable the House to consider this matter. We have no information except what appears in the resolutions.

Mr. POPE. I will bring down the papers.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT BUSINESS ON THURSDAY.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That for the remainder of the Session Government business shall have precedence on Thursday after routine business.

Mr. BLAKE. Having regard to the condition of the Order paper, I hope the hon. gentleman will alter that motion by saying after this week. If he looks at the Order paper he will see that there are several pages of matter in the hands of private members, and it will be utterly impossible to make substantial progress with them unless we are allowed one other day at any rate.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think if we postponed the resolution for another week the list would be quite as long; there is no means of stopping it. We have been in Session more than a month, and the motions in the hands of members not connected with the Government have had a fair opportunity of being presented and discussed, and papers have been called for over and over again. I think it is in the interest of the public that we should adopt this resolution, and give the Government another day.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have been a member during several Parliaments, and I can speak from experience. Now, my

experience is that for the first three or four weeks of the Session we are here, I will not say doing nothing, but not doing the business which the Government is obliged to bring before the House. We have not yet seen several of the measures which the Government promised in the Speech from the Throne. I have already had occasion to refer to this matter. At the end of the Session we always run through the business with such undue haste that we are ashamed of it; for my part, I am. It is very difficult to bring the Conservative members, and especially the leader of the Government, to adopt any kind of reform. He will adopt the reform when it is forced upon him, but he will not introduce one. Now, I am going to propose a little reform to-day. Suppose, instead of spending three or four weeks at the beginning of the Session, debating more or less interesting questions, we had the Speech from the Throne sent a little time before the beginning of the Session, as with the President's Message, so that it would be on the Table and we could discuss it when we met. At present we meet on Thursday, and spend that week without doing anything but going through all the schoolboy performance of hearing the Speech in the Senate. I think in this 19th century, when things are moving rapidly, we might adopt a more expeditious system. During the four or five Parliaments during which I have had the honor of a seat in this House, we have seen a very great loss of time and money to the country, and a loss of time to ourselves as well, because, if we could get through the business a fortnight or three weeks earlier than we do, it would benefit all the individual members of the House. I congratulate the leader of the Government that we have had a little reform at any rate. We have our Sessions earlier than usual, but we might have a regular time of the year appointed for Parliament to meet, and the time that would suit the country best would be the first week after the 6th of January. All the work of the Session might then be done and finished by the opening of navigation, when trade and business begins anew. There is another point to which I desire to call the attention of the House, referring to private Bills. All these private Bills that come before the House ought to be read and examined and passed upon by the Minister of Justice, so that we might have his opinion upon them, and avoid imposing upon the committees the task of saying whether these Bills are *ultra vires* or not. And why should not banks, railway companies and other corporations be chartered under one general law? Why make a rule for one and exception for another? Some companies are, in fact, chartered under a statute law now. I congratulate my hon. friend on the good motive he has in taking another day. It indicates that we are going to make some progress with the Government business, because up to this time he has not given us much work. The Franchise Bill is a very important one, and some other Bills were promised also. I hope we will be able to help him in the matter, though perhaps not to a very great extent, and perhaps give him a little opposition also.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I trust the hon. gentleman, the First Minister, will not press this motion, the effect of which will be that one-fourth the public orders and one-tenth of the Notices of Motion cannot be possibly disposed of this Session. There are 37 public Bills and 85 notices of motion on the orders, and with one and a-half day for the notices of motion and half a day for the Public Bills and Orders it will be utterly impossible to dispose of a-tenth of the business on the Order paper. We lost last Wednesday and the previous Wednesday, not through the fault of private members, and the hon. gentleman ought to give us next Thursday to make up the loss. As far as I am concerned I have no objection that the Thursdays after this week should be taken by the Government, but I think we should be allowed next Thursday.

Mr. CASGRAIN.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). I hope the right hon. gentleman, the First Minister, will press the motion. When do hon. gentlemen opposite expect to get through? On Thursday we will have as many, if not more, motions on the paper than we have now. I do not believe there is a Parliament in the world in which there are so many motions made for returns as here. As far as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cameron) is concerned, he certainly has had his share of the time of the House, and his friends also have had their share up to the present.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I have not taken as much time as you.

Mr. MILLS. The Government have not occupied the days allowed them during the month and more this House has been in Session. There is no reason why the Government should not be ready with all the legislation they promised in the Speech from the Throne, nor is there any reason why they should not have used the days at their disposal from the beginning of the Session. The Finance Minister has produced his Budget, but if we look back at the parliamentary practice, in which our parliamentary legislation originated, you will see that it was the business of the Government to propose to the House those legislative measures upon which the action of Parliament was sought before the Budget was brought down at all. What does the hon. gentleman propose by this Budget? He proposes to ask from the people a subsidy for the Crown. Upon what condition does he ask it? On the condition that the Crown will redress those wrongs and grievances the people are supposed to have. The Government, as a responsible administration, stand in the position of the ancient council who demanded the correction of abuses and the settlement of grievances. In the Speech from the Throne the policy the Government proposed for the Session is an enunciation of what they considered to be defects of the law they propose to remedy, but before they ask for the supply they should submit to the House the measures they intend to carry through. Up to the present, this has not been done by the Government, their measures are not before the House, and yet the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), though he has not produced those measures, proposes that we should go on with the consideration of the question of Supply. We have on the paper a large number of questions, a large number of important subjects in connection with which this House wishes to have redress, and in which they ask the co-operation of the Government; and what do the Government propose? They propose that this House shall go on with Supply without complying with those conditions which our constitutional system recognises and without which the House of Commons itself has practically no power.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentlemen who cry "no, no," are here to register the wishes—

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. MILLS. I yield to your appeal, Sir. I have no means of knowing, except by what I have seen, what those hon. gentlemen are here for; and if I have mistaken their views and motives, of course, I am quite ready to accept their correction.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman, I think, was just as much out of order in stating that hon. gentlemen on this side were here merely to register their votes in favor of the Government—

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. You did not get quite through the sentence. The hon. gentleman was just as much out of order as if hon. gentlemen on this side were

to say that hon. gentlemen opposite were sent here to form a factious opposition to the Government. No hon. gentleman on this side would say such a thing. The hon. gentleman says we ought not to go into Supply at all until all the constitutional grievances are redressed.

Mr. MILLS. I did not say that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think that was what the hon. gentleman said that the debate on Supply should go on after all the grievances were redressed. Why, in England the navy estimates were brought down and gone into the day after the Speech from the Throne was read and replied to. If the hon. gentleman will look at the records of the English Parliament, he will see that the Appropriation Bill was moved for before the adjournment by Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Randolph Churchill took the ground that the Appropriation Bill should not be carried except the last day of the Session, after all the grievances were redressed and all the legislation got through. Mr. Gladstone quoted a number of precedents, which he is always ready to do, to show that he was quite right, admitting, at the same time, that he was perhaps forcing the question a good deal in carrying the Appropriation Bill, and then having in fact a new Session after a long adjournment. As regards this Session, three days in the week are given to general business and two to the Government, which shows that Parliament considers the measures and orders or Bills in the hands of private members are of great importance. The hon. gentleman says the Government have not brought down many Bills. If not it has given more time to hon. members, who have not the misery to be members of the Government, to bring down their measures. They have had a month to do so up to the present. The list has been called over and over again and measures postponed, the majority of them at the instance of the hon. members themselves. I can appeal to the hon. member for Huron (Mr. Cameron) to look back, and I think he will find that, notwithstanding the taking of the third week by the Government, there has been no substantial measures in the hands of private members thrown over. Every opportunity has been given to private members, and I think I must press my motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I might remind the First Minister that he spoke of a motion of mine the other day as being a piece of factious opposition. No doubt he has now reconsidered the matter and considers that I was perfectly in order.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What motion was that?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The motion dealing with the Exchange Bank.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, yes, I thought that was an unnecessary motion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The hon. gentleman appealed to me.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It was to the hon. gentleman behind you (Mr. Cameron).

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I mistook the hon. gentleman. I thought his appeal was made to me as I have had a good deal of experience in putting through estimates. If the hon. gentleman will look over the records, he will find that during the Administration of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) the Budget Speech was made on all occasions within a fortnight after we met, instead of waiting five weeks to make it, and the estimates were in the hands of the House at the earliest possible moment. I will merely remark, as a suggestion, that I have often thought that our practice might be conveniently changed in this respect, that in such a special debate as the Budget debate, we

might go on *de die in diem* for a reasonable number of days, instead of taking the usual number per week which unnecessarily prolongs and protracts the debate. And, for my part, in the public interest, I would have been disposed to use what little influence I have to bring about that desirable reform. As to the other matter, however, I think the Minister might very fairly yield to the reasonable requests of my hon. friend from Huron for this particular Thursday, because he knows that, as my hon. friend says, it was not the fault of the private members at all that two Wednesdays were practically lost to them—last Wednesday and the Wednesday before. On each occasion, the House adjourned at half past eight or something like that, and that at the special instance of the First Minister or one of his colleagues. We are not on this side of the House disposed to talk for mere talking's sake. I am sure I am not and my friends are not. If he allows this particular Thursday, it may save time. There are certain motions on the paper which, if we cannot get them moved in the ordinary way, it may be necessary to bring up in the shape of motions in Supply, which will take up a great deal more of the hon. gentleman's time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will accept one portion of the hon. gentleman's suggestion, to go on *de die in diem* in the discussion of the Budget.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. You cannot do it now, you cannot take to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not propose it to-morrow, but I propose that on Thursday and Friday we shall go on *de die in diem*.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That is what we do not want you to do.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. We will not ask for Monday, and we will give every opportunity to the hon. gentlemen opposite to bring up their motions.

Mr. DAVIES. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that there are two classes of motions, one class of motions are made in order to allow the gentlemen who put them there to bring certain grievances before the House, though the secondary object may be to obtain papers. The other class are not for the purpose of raising a debate or a conversation, but simply to move for papers, which is absolutely necessary to move for before we go through Supply. I know that a large number of the motions on the paper are simply with a view to get that sort of information, and, if arrangements were made that those motions on which no debate could arise could be run through as they were last Session, it would greatly facilitate business and would enable us to obtain information, which is now only in the possession of the Government before we get through Supply.

Mr. MITCHELL. I have listened with attention to the remarks made both by the leader of the Government and the leader of the Opposition, and his assistant, the ex-Minister of Finance. I entirely agree with the position taken by the gentlemen on the Opposition benches to-day. It is not often I do, but in this case I do, and I hold that my action is quite consistent with the course I have pursued in this House for some years past, in fact ever since I ceased to be a member of the Government. When I was a member of the Government, I sympathised with the action of the Premier in wishing to cut down all the private days, and to absorb, at as early a period as possible, the days allowed for private members to bring matters before the House. My hon. friend opposite, whom I had occasion to devote a great deal of attention to when I was in Opposition, will remember that I persistently and consistently claimed that those days ought not to be taken away from

private members so early in the Session. I have argued the same thing for the last two Sessions, since I have been here again, against my right hon. friend on this side of the House, and I think so still, and I think it would be wise for the Premier to give way and not take the first Thursday, but let the motion apply to the second Thursday. There will surely be time enough to do the Government business. It is not right that we should not have opportunities for laying the grievances of our constituents—and we have a great many of them—before this Parliament. There is an enormous list of motions on the paper, and numbers of others will still be made, for I am sure the leader of the Opposition will have a great many more motions to make about the Pacific Railway, and I may have some more to make about the Grand Trunk Railway. I cannot let him have the whole. I think the Premier will do a graceful act by giving way on this occasion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MITCHELL. Hon. gentlemen may say "no, no." It is all very well, they may not choose to put forward the claims of their constituents. I do, and I want to have the opportunity to do it. I make the suggestion, but I know the hon. gentleman has the power to override the independent expression of opinion. Still he cannot prevent that expression being made.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am ready to make a compromise with my hon. friend, and to promise not to oppose any motion he may make respecting the Grand Trunk. Will that satisfy him?

Mr. MITCHELL. He may not oppose any motion in respect to the Grand Trunk, but last Session I had to criticise the amount of support which he gave to the Grand Trunk.

Mr. BLAKE. I am not sure that the leader of the Government was as prudent as usual in making that promise, because the hon. member (Mr. Mitchell) may move to abolish the Grand Trunk.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will give him an opportunity.

Mr. MITCHELL. They have nearly abolished themselves.

Mr. BLAKE. However, the hon. gentleman knows as well as anybody how to get rid of promises.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is not parliamentary.

Mr. BLAKE. It is scarcely right to say that private members have had time enough to get on with the legislation in their hands. It is true that there were two days when we were here when the hon. gentlemen who were leading the House in the absence of the First Minister invited us, in view of the thin nature of the benches, to allow certain Bills to stand, and secured an adjournment at about twenty-five minutes past 8 o'clock. But, apart from that, it is necessary that a certain time should elapse after the introduction of these Bills, in order that they may go to the country and be read, and that we may get information from outside, and that they may be considered by members of the House; and, though I agree that it is a proper diligence on the part of private members to bring in their Bills early in the Session, still this part of the Session is as early as several of these measures can possibly be ready. A great many of them are not ready for the second reading now, because they are not printed in both languages. So the case is not such as the hon. gentleman presents. On the other hand, important business on the part of the Government, which might have been brought forward earlier, has not been brought down.

Mr. MITCHELL.

The most important measure mentioned in the speech has not yet been introduced, and the Budget, instead of being brought in at an early period, was brought in at a late period. If my hon. friend took the view of my hon. friend from Bothwell, and said it was constitutional to defer going into Committee of Supply and Committee of Ways and Means until this legislation was brought down, I could understand it, but he does not. He contends that the Budget should be brought in at an early period, and I am disposed to agree with him; but I complain that he does not practice what he preaches, and that he does not bring it down till a late period of the Session.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. *In medio tutissimus.*

Mr. BLAKE. No, the hon. gentleman sometimes gets to the bottom between two stools. That is the *medio* in which he does not walk *tutissimus*. I persist that in these circumstances we ought to have this Thursday, but I perceive from the melodious sounds which greeted my hon. friend from Northumberland when he persisted in demanding it, from those harmonious and agreeable intonations of the human voice by which those gentlemen intimated their dissent, that there is not much likelihood of our getting it, because, when the hon. First Minister has such a backing whose views are expressed in such agreeable sounds, he is never deaf to such charmers—

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Who charm so wisely—

Mr. BLAKE—as he has heard to-day. I think we should have, at all events, the opportunity, on the first occasion, of going over the paper in the ordinary way, which would no doubt clear the Order paper of more than half the notices, and give the Government more time to get down the papers. I also suggest that we should continue to have the power of having questions answered on Thursday after routine.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. That only involves about a quarter of an hour. I persist in my requisition for Thursday, but, as I perceive the hon. gentleman will not grant it, I offer these other suggestions.

Mr. FARROW. I think the Opposition have no reason for complaint. Any person that will take the paper from day to day, and look at the notices of motion, will come to the conclusion that about nine-tenths of all these notices of motion and items on the Order paper, originate on the other side of the House. I want to impress this fact upon you, Mr. Speaker, and upon this House, that they have called for more returns this Session than have been called for in England during the last six years, where they have three times as many members as we have in Parliament, and about six times as many inhabitants.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman that questions should be put on Thursday as if it were not a Government day. Also, I have no objection, on Thursday next, to take the time from the meeting of the House till half-past four to go over the Order paper and grant all the Orders for returns, where there are no speeches upon them.

Mr. McCARTHY. The First Minister has proposed to take Wednesday away, which is partly for notices of motion and partly for Public Bills and Orders, and I do not see why any arrangement should be made that any part of Thursday should be given up to any notices of motion.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I mean motions for returns.

Motion, as amended, agreed to on a division.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. I will not trouble the House with reading them, but I have here a memorandum of over 40 important returns, which the hon. gentleman has just been complaining about, and I will send them across the House and ask the hon. gentleman's diligence towards them, as he seems to be so well disposed.

Mr. VAIL. I would ask when we may expect to have the returns from the engineers with regard to the piers that I asked for in February last.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The hon. gentleman was kind enough a few days ago to write me a note about this matter, which I handed to the Secretary of the Department, and he told me they were working at the return, and it would soon be down. I will take note of it again.

Mr. VAIL. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for returns of copies of accounts for supplies for the Hudson Bay steamers. I trust he will be kind enough to take note of that also, and let me have the papers soon.

Mr. CASEY. I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to the remaining returns ordered by the House in regard to Section B, which have not yet come down. One was the engineer's reports and his classification, ordered the 16th of last month. Then on the 17th we ordered the claim put in by the contractors, the case submitted to the arbitrators, and the evidence taken before them. Can the hon. Minister say when they will be down?

Mr. POPE. With respect to the first part of the question, those returns will be down shortly. With respect to the last part, I do not know whether I will be through with them this year or not. We are going on as fast as we can.

Mr. CASEY. The evidence was all taken, and we paid \$3,000 for taking it, and I think it ought to be in shape to bring down to the House.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I would like to enquire of the Government with reference to a motion adopted by the House at an early stage of the Session with reference to the return of the number of licenses that were granted under the Liquor License Act of 1883. I think it would take only a short time to prepare the return. There are many Bills now before the House in the discussion of which we need to have the returns, and I would like to know how long it would be before we can expect to have it.

Mr. CASEY. I would say with regard to this evidence that I mentioned a moment ago, that it should have been brought down to the House at any rate without being asked for. There is no necessity for delay. The evidence should have been printed, as many less important things have been printed, and brought down. The claims of the arbitrators and other things which I have asked for are short documents and cannot occupy many pages. They could be prepared in a few days, and I hope the hon. Minister will show the sincerity of his efforts and give us the information on this matter.

Mr. POPE. I have said I would bring down the smaller returns, but I do not agree with the hon. gentleman that we should have brought down this mass of evidence and laid it on the Table. There are over a thousand pages of it, and it will take some time to copy it. We cannot bring down the originals, we must bring down a copy of it.

Mr. CASEY. The original could be laid on the Table.

Mr. BLAKE. May I ask the hon. gentleman when his own report will be down.

Mr. POPE. It is in the printers' hands, and will be down pretty soon.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. When will the fourth volume of the census be down?

Mr. POPE. It will be down very soon.

Mr. LANDERKIN. I trust the Government will have the courtesy to answer the very proper request I have made with reference to the motion that was carried at an early stage of the Session. It will only take a short time to make out the return. It is very important that we should have the information asked for in that return, and I trust the Government will have the courtesy to let us know something about it.

Mr. BOWELL. I will say in the absence of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue that I will make a note of it, and hand it to him.

REPORT OF THE FACTORY COMMISSION.

Mr. BLAKE. I would call attention to the fact that the report of the Factory Commission has not yet been distributed, though I understood that advance sheets were in the hands of some hon. members some time ago. It is very important that this document should be distributed before the debate on the Budget proceeds farther. I trust therefore that some effort will be made to have the report distributed at an early date.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, the financial statement made this Session I think most people in this country regard as eminently satisfactory. I think myself that at a time when the over-production throughout the world has brought almost paralysis to trade, the statement which the Finance Minister of this country was able to present was not only remarkable because of the thoroughness with which it was prepared and the satisfactory showing that it makes, but it was remarkable in this, that it has produced through this country a feeling of reassurance, a feeling of confidence; although those feelings were perhaps somewhat shaken by the damaging utterances of the leader of the Liberal party during the recess.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TUPPER. I hear cries of "no, no." I suppose some hon. gentlemen opposite would gladly deny that damaging speeches were made by their leaders during the recess. I repeat that in my opinion, and it is the opinion of people who have read the utterances of the Liberal leaders, that they were calculated to do the greatest damage possible. I say that those utterances wafted across the ocean do an extraordinary amount of damage to this country. There are business men who will endorse this statement, and who, to their sorrow, have felt the truth of what I say. The Finance Minister's speech, as I have said, was a remarkable one. It was remarkable for the reasons I stated, and it was remarkable too, for this reason, that the position taken by the Finance Minister, stands at this stage of the debate absolutely unassailed. The position he took up at the beginning of the debate has been strengthened by the position which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) took after him; and we can afford to hear and to read and to allow to go abroad the utterances of the ex-Finance Minister and of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), because they are simply conspicuous for the inaccuracies they contain in regard to this country, and of the jaundiced impression they would produce on the mind of any one who should read them. In this Dominion we can afford to allow to be made public such utterances as those, and the

only reason why damage is done is because those speeches are sent across the ocean to the markets of the world and are given a certain amount of weight which they really do not possess, simply because they were spoken by men who at a time, unfortunately for the welfare of Canada, occupied official positions in this country. We could well afford to allow their speeches to go abroad if the political characters of the hon. gentlemen who uttered them were as thoroughly understood elsewhere as they are understood here. We could afford to have the streets of London filled with the speeches of the ex-Finance Minister if he was known politically as he is known in this country, as the king of deficits, as the mixer and muddler of figures, as one of the greatest failures as a Finance Minister that the Dominion has ever seen. If the people of England knew him as we know him, we could well afford to have his speeches sent throughout the United Kingdom. They would do as little harm as they do in the constituency of Lennox or in that of Queen's, P. E. I. We have learned to understand, and we have learned to our cost, the value of the financial opinions of the ex-Finance Minister. He is a unique character in the history of our country. He stands forth as the only high-flying Tory the Liberal-Conservative party ever produced. The high-flying Tory has been so well described by Moore that I will venture to drop into poetry for a few seconds in order that the House may understand what a high-flying Tory really is:

"Keep him always reversed in your minds night and day,
Like an Irish barometer turned the wrong way,
If he's up you may swear foul weather is nigh;
If he's down you may look for a bit of blue sky.
Never mind what debaters or journalists say,
Only ask what he thinks, then think t'other way."

As a Canadian I take courage in this fact, that in this debate he has been eminently "down." From his own standpoint he has not been able to hold his own; overwhelmed as he was by the statistics produced by the Finance Minister, he could not, under the circumstances, with the *role* he had to play, do justice to the ability which even I admit he possesses. I take comfort from the fact that, having regard to the arguments he addressed to the House, he was "down" simply because the bit of blue sky had been brought home to him by the Finance Minister's statement. We find later on in the debate that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson), who is known in this House for his eloquence and on the stump for his pleasing manner in discussing the public questions of the day, was also "down." The hon. member for South Brant was not himself. He had to fall back on those utterances—all except his reference to the Commissioners' report, which has been published since—to which he gave expression in Lennox, the effect of which on a former occasion was to turn a Grit majority of four into a Conservative majority of forty. With that experience, knowing how the country appreciates the hon. gentleman's arguments, we could have afforded, with the utterances which have been made from this side of the House to let the debate close; but I take it that there are speeches to be made. We were told that the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the ex-Finance Minister, not having been able to cope with the Finance Minister in regard to the subject of expenditure, another gentleman had been busily preparing himself, and he would soon enter the lists with his opponents on this side of the House, and endeavor to meet the position taken, and so ably taken, by the Finance Minister, and so ably entrenched by the hon. member for Cardwell. So it is only reasonable that I, a humble member of this House, should express the views I entertain. The hon. member for South Brant, who was comparatively humorous in his remarks, and dealt in jaunty style with this subject—a subject once so serious to him, as I will show later on—held the Finance Minister to account for having unfairly presented his case to the people of this country: that in making his Finance

Mr. TUPPER.

statement the hon. Minister had no right to take three good years and 1884, and claim a good showing on the whole, and he said such conduct was similar to the act of a merchant, who, having lost every dollar refers to years ago when he made something. The hollowness of that argument was exposed last Session by, I think, the hon. member for King's N.B. (Mr. Foster), and was satisfactorily disposed of. I was surprised to hear the hon. gentleman make use of such an argument again, because it was conclusively answered at that time. Sir, the position of a merchant who has lost everything is not the position of a country which has gained everything. And we are not restricted to a period of one year. The Government of the day is not accountable to the people of this country, merely for the results of one year's administration. They go to the country on the showing of their whole term of office. If that position were not correct, I have no doubt that the Reform party, if they had gone to the people, after holding office one year, would have occupied a different position from what they did; if they had confined their case to the first year they came into office, when they had considerable money left to them, they would have had the only surplus they could boast of. The people of this country are not bound down to a month or a year in putting a Government on its trial; they criticise the whole term of a Government, and they wish to know if, on the whole, they have been just and faithful stewards of the people's affairs. On that position the Finance Minister made his speech, just as the Chancellor of the Exchequer of England would make his statement, as any man in such a position would make his statement, and the statement he made on the whole was eminently satisfactory, was indeed far beyond the anticipations of hon. gentlemen opposite when first this Government took office. He could further say the position we are in is not that which the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) tried to make out where everything had been lost; it is not the case of a merchant who loses every dollar he has. The hon. gentleman complained most indignantly of the shameful waste of money spent for immigration purposes, and before him the ex-Finance Minister characterised the whole system as a fraud and a sham, as a waste of the public money. Well, Sir, I was surprised—I was amazed, that for the sake—it would be unparliamentary to say, I suppose, for the sake of currying favor with the trades unions of Toronto, and therefore I shall not say it—but I will say that I was surprised to hear language of that kind coming from the mouths of men who had not only known the responsibilities of office, but had themselves come down to Parliament and asked in the year 1875, a very different year from 1884, for a vote of half a million of dollars for this very purpose. I was surprised to hear a statement of that kind coming from men who, to induce the small number of 19,243 souls to settle in this country, spent \$14 per head in inducing them to come here and in bringing them here; I was surprised to hear that charge brought against a Government which at the small expenditure of \$5.28 per head brought into the country 68,133 settlers. But my surprise was only temporary, because I recollected that at all times the Reform party is the party of surprises. It is surprising to hear them laying down certain principles as fundamental principles of Government, when they are in Opposition, and to notice the sudden manner in which those principles are scattered to the winds the moment they come into office. For that reason my surprise was only of short duration. In the speeches of the ex-Finance Minister and the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), we notice the greatest inconsistency when they arraign the National Policy, whether these speeches are delivered in this House or in the country, they blow hot and then blow cold. At one period they denounce monopolies and decry a policy which makes the rich richer and the poor poorer, and when

they thoroughly deal with that subject they, revenue tariff men as they are, employ the arguments of free traders, and then they drop into another part of their subject and employ a totally different set of arguments and abuse the policy because the manufacturers have not made large profits and because capital has been sunk. I say that the country understands the hon. gentlemen thoroughly, and I tell them that they must resort to other arguments than those to injure a policy which, in this crisis of the country's history, has stood out so well. The hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) can afford to be humorous, for he to-day is a manufacturer, and like many other manufacturers he still clings to his political feelings and is bound by his political ties; but they have been enabled either to make or to save a great deal of money and they have been prevented from losing money under the operation of a policy, which under party pressure, and for party's sake, they often feel themselves bound to denounce. He, I say, then can afford to be humorous in arraiguing that policy at the call of his party, but there was a day when the hon. gentleman's tone was serious, when he was not only very eloquent, but when every sentence he urged in the course of the debate, to which I refer, came from his heart. In those days, the hon. gentleman, not only implored the ex-Finance Minister, the Finance Minister of that day, to adopt a policy similar to the one now in force, but he stood up as a living witness, as to the effect that that policy would produce. He claimed that protection given to the industry in which he was engaged, had not only brought thousands of people from Germany, but that while injuring no one, it gave all the benefit of that production and the employment of that labor to this country. There was no jaunty air at that time; there was no tearing to pieces the different reports circulated in the country in regard to the statistics of the country. He said it would be folly to speak of the losing manufactures of the Dominion; the thing they had to do was to act, and he stood out much longer in his petition to the Finance Minister of the day than the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) did. The latter was a protectionist up to six o'clock during the debate, and after that he went solidly for the policy of the day, but the member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson)—as any hon. gentleman will see if he looks up the Debates of that day, and they are interesting in this respect—continued loyal to protection through the whole Session, not only in the Budget debate but in the discussion on the agricultural interests of the country. He showed that he was pledged to the farmers of his riding to obtain protection, that he wished protection not only for the cigar industry in which he was interested but for all industries alike. He was willing that the millers should be protected, and in fact he was an out and out protectionist. Now, in the course of the little banter in which the hon. gentleman indulged the other evening, in reference to the present Finance Minister, he said that "he had no desire to read old literature again, but he was forced to do so." That is my excuse for reading to the House, in order to strengthen my position, some very old literature which is often read to the House. It is read when the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) sits down to find out what were his views when he was serious, when he was speaking from a common sense standpoint, when discussing the effects of this policy upon his own industry. In 1876 the hon. gentleman who now arraigns the policy of protection, when imploring the ex-Finance Minister to raise the Customs duty, contended that the prices would be brought down, that the consumers would get the benefit of cheaper goods than they then had. I ask him if his prediction has not been verified. He said:

"It would simply remove the competition from the American manufacturers to our own, the consumers receiving the benefit all the same, but the country being enriched by the industries."

58

He discussed the tariff, he sounded every part of it, and he brushed away all fears of the exodus in these words:

"I believe that by a defensive tariff you would not have to pay to bring those men here. Adopt it and you will find the steam whistles of our factories will be the call for them to come."

That is the language of an hon. gentleman who to-day holds up to ridicule those who cannot agree with him, a gentleman who, in 1876, spoke of steam whistles and tall chimneys. We could only draw the deduction the other evening that those remarks only came from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House; but we find that they originated with a better authority than myself on trade matters at that time. The hon. gentleman was interrupted by the hon. member for West Elgin, one of the whips of the party, who endeavored to bring the lash to bear upon him for his tremendous storm for a protective tariff; but he asked: "If free trade be better than protection, why have any duties at all?" Could we have a sounder argument for the National Policy than that to-day? That is our position, and we could not have it better defined than it was by the hon. gentleman who now advocates a revenue tariff only, and who in doing so, endeavors to use the arguments of free traders. His position, to my mind, is illogical; it is worse than illogical; it is absurd that the hon. member, in advocating a revenue tariff, should attempt to bring to his aid the arguments of free traders. But I must read something more from this interesting old literature:

"The other year, the Finance Minister, in revising the tariff, gave some encouragement to our industry which it never had before. The result was that a thousand men who were engaged in that industry in Germany were literally transported, by the change in the tariff, to Canada, and set to work here. The cost of the article was not increased one iota, and Canada got all the benefit. The middlemen suffered a diminution of profits; but for them nobody seems to care much, the producer and consumer received all the sympathy. It is inevitable that a like result would flow to other manufacturers under the same policy. If the Finance Minister finds such is the case, I trust that the wisdom which led him to yield that point will induce him to grant the same to other industries, and that no sectionalism will tie his hands."

That is the policy we wished to adopt, and that is the policy we obtained. The hon. member has changed his views—no doubt he has the privilege to do so; but I say he has never answered those arguments, fortified by his own experience in the very business to which he alluded. There has been no sectionalism displayed by the Government of the day. They never confined their National Policy to the tobacco industry of South Brant or to the oil wells of Ontario; but, consistently with the policy propounded, they have given to every industry that could possibly live in this country some fostering protection. Now, if all that the hon. member for South Brant, and all that the First Minister anticipate as the result of the National Policy, has not come to pass, why had he not the candor to say that neither he nor the First Minister, nor any Finance Minister in the world, ever anticipated or could anticipate the extraordinary over-production which this world has seen in the last two or three years? Everyone knows that economical theories and practical views have all had a serious check in consequence of the extraordinary manner in which the world has been brought together, so to speak, of late. There has been an extraordinary development of railroad enterprise the world over, and electricity has done so much that to-day it is difficult to find what used to be considered a "far-off" land. The world has been brought closer together to-day, I venture to say, than any man in this Chamber believed even three years ago was possible. Competition is now at its height; and the question of over-production has attracted considerable attention in England, as well as a considerable amount of painful foreboding. But in this country the Finance Minister was able to make a statement, warranted by the facts, that no other Minister could make, in regard to the condition of the people. Now, we are told, by the curious method of reasoning adopted by the hon. member for South Brant as a proof,

that the farming industry of this country has not been benefitted by the National Policy, that the value of the exports of butter, eggs, cheese and potatoes had actually increased. Now, it does seem odd that if the exports of that industry have increased, the industry itself has not prospered. Why, is it not perfectly consistent with the development of the home market that at the same time the demand outside, over which we have no control, should have also increased? Sir, was it intentional that the hon. member ignored a most important consideration in this connection? Was it intentional that he ignored the wonderful advance we have made in what the fathers of Confederation wished to promote an inter-provincial trade. How is it that the hon. member ignored the facts, which the public records of his country could have given him, that the coasting trade since 1878 has increased by 4,500,000 tons, and that freight carried on railways has increased since 1878 by nearly 6,000,000 tons? Why was it that the hon. member did not go on to state that that was a benefit to the farmers? Why did he not refer to his own principle, that what benefits the manufacturer benefits the farmer, and that you cannot help one without helping the other? The hon. gentleman was in my constituency last summer on a visit pleasing to himself, I hope, as it was to those who heard him; and surely, while there, he could not fail to see the effects which the National Policy had produced. He could not see the effect in the exports of the country; but did he not see there a trade that depends entirely on the home market? Did he not see that we are sending up to Ontario not only the products of our mines, but from the industries in New Glasgow our manufactures of steel and glass? Why had he not the candor in this connection to mention that he noticed during that trip signs of prosperity and signs of the healthy growth of an interprovincial trade? It did not suit the gentleman's purpose, I have no doubt, to dilate on that view of the question, and so he amused the House and his friends by a very clever and very carefully prepared *critique* of the work of the commissioners appointed to investigate the condition of industries in this country. He produced a certain amount of merriment by his elaborate and exhaustive *critique*. Now, I have no intention of making a reply to that; it was, perhaps, too carefully prepared for me thoroughly to criticise it now; but I will venture to take this position, that, on reading the hon. gentleman's speech, it produced a conclusion which I do not think he desired to be drawn from it. It produced the conclusion that, instead of mistakes having been made by these commissioners in exaggerating the resources of the country, many factories had been entirely overlooked. That a thorough examination of the state of trade had not been made, and that the approximate estimate which the commissioners—and the hon. gentleman should have alluded to that—said they had made of some of the industries was entirely below the mark. The hon. gentleman certainly left that impression with me, and I have no doubt he left it with others; but at any rate the force of this remark was that you could not depend absolutely upon that report. I think it was intended to give an approximate idea, so that that part of the hon. gentleman's speech will not influence the country to any appreciable extent. Again the hon. gentlemen blew hot and cold, as all revenue tariff men do, who depend upon free trade theories, when he charged the Finance Minister with not having brought millions into Canada, and then, in the next breath, accused him of bringing more millions into Canada than the country required, causing millions to be sunk in enterprises that do not pay. If that be true, have not the laborer and workman received some benefit? If millions have been brought in and used in developing these different industries—and we do not altogether admit the accuracy of his statement as the hon. gentleman will ascertain in this debate—why does he not admit that that

Mr. TUPPER.

may be one of the causes which have induced the working-men, speaking generally, in this country, to become strong and enthusiastic defenders of the National Policy. I say that the fact that depression exists the world over, the fact that business has received the check to which I have alluded, and the fact which is in the knowledge of every hon. member in this House, that there is so little real distress, so little real poverty, so little misery, above that which always exists at any time, no matter how prosperous the country may be—I say these facts combined, furnish one reason why hon. gentlemen opposite have failed to captivate during the recess the support of any body of laboring men in any of the counties which have been opened. The hon. gentleman referred to the decrease in the export of manufactured goods, and again he did not deal candidly with the subject in hand. He did not explain, and therefore left it necessary for those who follow him to mention the fact, which we all understand, that it is absolutely absurd to suppose we have any direct control over foreign markets; and the fact that the over-production which worries other countries far worse than it does Canada to-day accounts in some measure for decrease in our exports of manufactured goods. I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to the report of a lecture given by Mr. Fairweather, of St. John, a lecture which has not and cannot be successfully attacked, and which has been published and extensively noticed by the press of Canada. If the hon. gentleman had given us a candid and fair criticism of that paper he would have afforded us, not merely a source of amusement, but would have given us a criticism of far greater importance than his attack upon the commissioners' report. Attention has been directed in that lecture to the extraordinary development of the inter provincial trade, and that is what concerns us to-day. The National Policy is simply another term for the policy of Confederation. Confederation was intended to develop interprovincial trade, and it had this effect up to a certain period, when the United States market assumed a different position. Confederation alone having ceased to continue operating the effect desired, we simply added another stone called the National Policy to the fabric of Confederation, and that has produced the same satisfactory results as Confederation alone had produced for several years after the union. If it will not weary the House, I would like to support that position by an authority which will not be questioned by hon. gentlemen opposite; and in doing so I am keeping well within the subject of debate, because among other questions discussed during it is the question of reciprocity. When the late George Brown went to Washington to endeavor to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, in 1874—the year when our trade was becoming visibly affected by the growing industries and extraordinary development of the United States and our then tariff did not operate successfully in securing to us our own market—when he went to Washington in April, 1874, he made a certain showing to the people of the United States, and in that statement he brings out the idea I have just mentioned:

"Effect in Canada of the Abrogation Treaty.—The repeal in 1866 of the Reciprocity Treaty, under which so vast a trade had grown up, rendered imperatively necessary prompt measures to open new markets for the sale of Canadian produce. These measures were at once taken. Under the influence of the formal notice given by the United States in 1865 of their intention to terminate the treaty, federation of the provinces, then under discussion, was hurried on and became *un fait accompli* within fifteen months after its repeal."

He also says:

"The Act of Confederation, too, removed from the category of foreign commerce to that of home consumption, the large interchange of commodities between the several sections of the Dominion; and the aggregate foreign commerce of the provinces consequently fell in the first year after the repeal of the treaty to \$139,202,615 from \$160,409,455 in the previous year. As will be seen from following statement, however, the trade of the Dominion speedily recovered from the blow, and the volumes

of its foreign commerce gradually increased until, in the seventh year from the repeal of the treaty, it reached the great sum (for a people of 4,000,000) of \$235,301,203—being \$75,000,000 higher than it had reached in any year of the treaty's existence."

Then, in order to show the wonderful growth and expansion of trade in Canada, independent entirely of the United States, he gives the figures of the different years, and to swell the amount he adds the foreign trade of Newfoundland. In 1868 the total exports and imports of Canada and Newfoundland amounted to \$138,202,615; and so on to 1873 when they amounted to \$235,301,203, making a total foreign commerce in seven years, of Canada and Newfoundland, of \$1,207,807,817. My point is this, that that showing was perfectly correct; it was a satisfactory showing, as Mr. Brown admitted of the effect of Confederation up to that date, owing, as I have said, to the circumstances of the United States. Up to that time everything had turned out as the Hon. Mr. Brown himself and the other fathers of Confederation had desired and expected, but from that time our trade began steadily to decrease from \$217,000,000 in 1874 down to \$172,000,000 in 1878. The late Government failed to obtain reciprocity and they also refused to adopt the National Policy; that is they refused to strengthen the National Policy of 1867 by increasing our Custom duties. The consequence was our trade did not develop itself. Now the figures show that when the present Government came into power they took up this subject boldly, they took it up in the spirit in which I believe the late Mr. George Brown himself would have taken it up, if his remarks give any indication of his opinions in 1867, as reported in the debates on Confederation. The stand he then took, as regarded the United States, was to the effect that: If you will not trade with us on fair terms we will adopt the offensive and protect our own trade. The results have been satisfactory, because we can show that from 1879 to 1884, only six years, we have in Canada alone had almost the same volume of trade as that which the Hon. George Brown was able to show to the United States as the result of seven years trade of Newfoundland and Canada together. From 1879 to 1884 our trade amounted to \$1,191,178,618; add Newfoundland, from 1879 to 1883, and you will have a total of \$1,248,721,685. Therefore we were consistently carrying out our policy of Confederation and with the most satisfactory and natural results. I think it would not be irrelevant, in order to strengthen the position that the Finance Minister has taken, to point to circumstances somewhat similar, to point to depression far more intensified than it is in this country. No one can successfully contradict the statement that the depression in England during the last few years, aye, even from 1881, has been far more intense, far more injurious to the people than the temporary depression in business which exists in this country to-day. I am able to show that in the English House of Commons and the English House of Lords the Government there met the arraignment exactly in the style of our Finance Minister, except that they could not point to anything like the record which he can point to in Canada to-day. My deduction from that, if I can sustain the point, is that it ought to be a satisfactory answer to those gentlemen here who complain that the free trade Government which they pretend to take as a model for a revenue tariff, when arraigned for a policy of free trade, uses the same kind of defence the Finance Minister has used in this debate. Let me cite the evidence that the commercial position in England is far worse than it is in this country. I will read but few extracts. I will take them from good free trade organs, not when they are dealing with the subject of free trade and protection however, for I find there is the same narrow mind in England in that respect as in Canada, that when discussing free trade they carefully keep these facts in the background, but when they are discussing trade as newspapers, then we are able to

understand their position. The *Times* of 10th December, 1883, says:

"It is now complained by merchants generally that their profits have either disappeared altogether or are extremely small, while great industries are admittedly in distress. Nowhere is there real prosperity." Now that is in England. Then the *Times* of July, 1884, says:

"It is hardly necessary to say that ship building is for the present dead. The cotton trade is to all appearance stationary, profits being hard to obtain, owing to the intensity of competition both at home and abroad."

And surely free traders will hail with astonishment this statement:

"Probably the revival will come, when it does come, from—"

Where? From their own empire, from the regions of the world in which free trade is working such wonders? No, but—

"from the United States."

I will give another extract. This is from the *Statist* of January 31st, 1885, in which the whole trade of the year is summed up. It says:

"During the year likewise there has been no recovery from the steady depression which has now lasted about two years. At the end of the year not only were prices much lower than they were at the beginning, but the prospect of recovery seemed further off than ever. The extreme fall in prices appears, in fact, to have taken the heart out of business men. The year 1884 has altogether been much worse for business than its predecessor, and the prospect at the end of the year was, and the prospect now still is, less cheerful than twelve months ago."

"As the result, there have, perhaps, been more complaints of small profits and of want of employment amongst workmen during the past year than there have been for many years previous. The fall of prices, perhaps, has especially affected capitalists by diminishing their profits. But whatever the cause, there has apparently been less surplus capital available for the employment of labor in new works than there has been for many years; while capital has also been idle, because in many directions, particularly in shipbuilding, which is one of the most important modes of investing capital, there was no prospect of profitable employment."

I know these extracts as a rule are not interesting to hon. members in this House, but, in order to strengthen the position I take, I have deemed it necessary to cite them. Under these circumstances, let us turn but for one moment to the manner in which Lord Granville met the indictment that the Government were responsible for the condition of affairs and that the condition of affairs was as bad as these commercial free trade organs had asserted. They explain the position of affairs there, and I think the comparison will hold good here. Lord Granville contended that the appearance of depression arose from the existence of lower prices, but that the volume of trade was still great. Can we not do the same? Have not the hon. gentlemen who preceded me on this side of the House most successfully established that fact? The aggregate trade from 1879 to 1883, Lord Granville claimed, was enormous. He was not charged with having taken all these years together. No one seemed to find fault with him there for taking a range of years in order to give confidence to business men and to the country, and he pointed with pride, as our Finance Minister pointed with pride, to the increased production of coal. And then he dropped down into what hon. gentlemen opposite dislike so much—averages. He took the average production of coal from 1875 to 1880, and compared it with triumph, not with that of 1883 or 1884, in reference to which they were bringing the charges against him, but with 1881 and 1882. That was satisfactory to a majority of that House, and surely we have a right to point with pride to the fact that, in this so-called depression, the production of our coal stands boldly out and shows that manufactures must still be kept going even though profits at this time are small. Lord Granville also instanced the raw cotton consumed from 1875 to 1880 and compared it with 1883. He also alluded to another

point which is a matter of importance with us, the increased amount of savings bank deposits and the increased consumption of sugar, tea, coffee and tobacco; and he concluded, as we can with more right and with more reason, that "the present depression of trade to a large extent was only apparent, and that the production and consumption are large and the people well off." If he could say that of the condition of the people in a country in reference to which, if time would permit, I could cite some extraordinary evidence, our position should be, as the Finance Minister has convinced a majority of the people of this country, most reassuring. Lord Granville claimed that there had been simply a curtailment of profits of manufacturers and wholesale merchants, and that, to men who view the matter here apart from party bias, is the state of things with us to-day. In the House of Commons, the Chancellor of the Exchequer compared the exports of 1893 with those of 1869, and surely we can do the same, to show the improvement in trade. We could show that the exports of Canada in 1869 amounted to only \$60,000,000, whereas in 1883 they amounted to \$98,000,000. Then I say my conclusion is a fair and reasonable one, and the people in this country ought to be satisfied in this which is a time of extraordinary over-production, that the Government can give the same answer with the same force and the same reason and the same style of statistics as the Government at home can do. We have heard a good deal about monopolies. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) alluded to them last Session, and, although not much has been said in this debate, we have heard of them. No doubt the people of Lennox heard of them in the first part of the hon. gentleman's speech who preceded me. I put this question to the hon. gentleman, where would you rather have the monopoly in the employment of labor, in the production of saleable articles, and in the development of our natural resources—would you prefer to have these monopolies at home or abroad? They exist, but they exist where our laborers get no benefit from them. Take the case of thread. Every hon. gentleman knows that Coates and Clark had a monopoly of the thread trade. They had gigantic works in Paisley, Scotland, and even controlled the market in the American States, but the Americans, with their keen business knowledge, erected a defensive tariff wall and levied a duty on thread. And what is the consequence? Why, works just as large, but still owned by Coates and Clark, have been established in America; their works have been actually transported to the State of New Jersey, and the United States get not only the thread but they get also the benefit of the thread being manufactured in their own country, and of the wages being paid to their fellow taxpayers. We know that there is to-day a cry of monopoly. But there is no monopoly in this country fostered by the tariff; there are, however, monopolies in England; there are monopolies existing in connection with many industries in England, and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that the monopolies in England are such that, though wheat was never lower, bread in England was never dearer. I call attention to the fact that monopolies are existing in that free trade paradise. Perhaps hon. gentlemen will not take my statement for it, and I will give them the evidence of the *Saturday Review* of September 6th, 1884. The article is headed "Dear bread and cheap wheat," and it reads as follows:—

"At the present moment there is a universal complaint on the part of producers that they are being ruined by the fall of prices and yet consumers do not find that the prices charged to them are proportionately lowered. Just now production is paralysed precisely because consumption is held in check by too high prices. The most striking example of this is furnished by the price of bread. Roughly, it may be said that just now the price of wheat is very little, if at all, over three-farthings per pound. Yet we know from letters to the daily papers that the price of bread in various parts of London has until a week or two ago been as high as 7d. the 4-lb. loaf, and even now is 7d. the loaf. In other words, while the price of wheat is little over three-farthings a pound, the price of

Mr. TUPPER.

bread is not much under 2d. a pound. The consumer is being deprived of the benefit which he ought to derive from the fall in wheat, while the farmer is a great sufferer from that fall. But though the difference between the price of wheat and the price of bread is attracting most attention just now, it is by no means a singular phenomenon. A case has been heard of in which a banker in the city, having set up an old servant in a retail shop, bought for her tea at tenpence a pound, which she sold to her customers at three-and-sixpence a pound. This is, no doubt, an extreme instance. But every one who knows what is going on in Mincing Lane is aware that tea has been for the last couple of years sold there for tenpence a pound, which has been retailed at from two shillings to half-a-crown a pound. Similarly, sugar which costs in Mincing Lane from five farthings to three-halfpence is sold at twopenny-halfpenny and even threepence in the retail shops. It is notorious, for example, that the brewers own the majority of public-houses in London; and it is said that in the same way the millers control the majority of bakeries. There is thus no real competition between the retail dealers, and prices are settled by the ring, a strict combination being kept up to the detriment of the public."

So much for monopolies existing abroad. Now, I have alluded to the state of business generally in England, and challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to produce anything equally authoritative showing such an extraordinary state of things in this country. I challenge them to bring forward any evidence that the workingmen of the laboring classes are in as degrading a position in this country as they are in England. A School Board Commissioner, Mr. T. Marchant Williams, of the City of London, wrote a very remarkable description of the state of things he found existing in that city, and it bears truth upon its face. This comes from a man who is endeavoring to benefit his fellowmen, who has no object in misrepresenting the facts, and who speaks from personal observation. This gentleman says:

"There are at least 60,000 families in London whose homes consist of one room only, and I have statistics in my possession which clearly prove that, so far as the Divisions of Finsbury and Marylebone are concerned, of the children from these homes that attend any efficient elementary school at all, an exceptionally large proportion are in attendance at the Board schools. There are schools in Finsbury Division that are filled with children of whom 60, 70, and even 80 per cent. come from homes consisting of one room only, and such schools are not confined to one particular district. It was only the other day that I discovered in one of these streets a house containing nine rooms, each of which accommodates on an average eight persons! And, be it understood, Board schools have been built in all these districts. In one of the Clerkenwell schools I found, on the day of my annual inspection, that 36 per cent. of the parents of the children were out of employment, that 40 per cent. of the children come to school sometimes without a breakfast, and 28 per cent. come sometimes to afternoon school without having had any dinner. In another district I discovered that the parents of 34 per cent. of the boys in attendance at the Board school were out of employment at the time of my visit to the school; 10.5 per cent. of the boys had no fathers; 17.5 per cent. occasionally came to school dinnerless, and 23 per cent. breakfastless. These facts are not so entirely exceptional that they may not be considered applicable to a considerable proportion of the children attending the Board schools in my district."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must ask the attention of the House to a table prepared by Mr. Williams, which bears out what I have just quoted, and shows how the people are crowded together in some parts of that city:

Occupation.	No. of rooms occupied.	No. children family.	Wages when fully employed.		Rent.
			s.	d.	
Moulder	1	4	18	0	4 6
Porter	1	2	18	0	5 6
Laborer	1	5	20	0	3 6
Printer	1	0	25	0	6 0
Bootmender.....	1	7	17	6	6 0
Painter.....	2	5	20	0	6 6
Laborer.....	2	6	20	0	5 6
do	1	6	20	0	4 6
Riveter.....	1	6	?		2 9

Mr. Williams goes on to say:

"Our philosophical theorists are doing well in warning the benevolent against the dangers of pauperising the people; but they would be doing better if they were to supplement their warnings with suggestions as to their own plan of feeding and saving the little children who are now rotting in heaps within sight of the porticoes of their churches. If economic theories are to be applied to the parents only, children cannot thrive upon them."

Canadians found they could not thrive upon them either.

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

After Recess.

Mr. TUPPER. In order to show that a National Policy underlies the Confederation scheme and that the principles of that policy mainly contributed to bring about the Confederation of the Provinces, I will refer to the Confederation debates. I find that Mr. George Brown, who upheld the scheme, said :

"But the proposal now before us is, to throw down all barriers between the Provinces—to make a citizen of one a citizen of the whole; the proposal is, that our farmers and manufacturers and mechanics shall carry their wares unquestioned into every village of the Maritime Provinces; and that they shall with equal freedom bring their fish and their coal and their West India produce to our 3,000,000 of inhabitants."

He also said :

"I say one of the best features of this union is, that if in our commercial relations with the United States we are compelled by them to meet fire with fire—it will enable us to stop this improvidence and turn the current of our own trade into our own waters."

That language, of course, is fresh in the minds of many hon. gentlemen. I simply wish to call attention to it now in connection with the fact that the successors of George Brown in the Reform party have sadly degenerated. They have taken a position entirely antagonistic to that occupied by him and the hon. member for Lambton in those days; because we find that while the Reform party were in power they gave a protection to one of the natural industries of Ontario, a protection to the development of the petroleum wells, and refused to give a like protection to another industry, alluded to by George Brown as a profitable industry, namely, the coal fields of the Maritime Provinces. The Reform party have pursued an unfair, sectional and illiberal policy. They have departed from the traditions of the party in 1865: they gave protection to an industry of one Province, while they refused it to that of another. It is idle, I contend, for them to talk about the necessity of placing coal on the free list because it is a necessary of life, for one has only to remember that the same argument can be used in regard to the taxes they imposed on tea and coffee, and even on petroleum, because that is not only fuel but light to the rich and poor alike. There is and can be no defence of their inconsistent conduct in that connection. I wish to direct the attention of the House to the narrow-minded view taken of this vast field of profitable industry by the present leader of the Opposition. I was present in Halifax some years ago and heard the hon. gentleman there allude to this enormous industry of Nova Scotia, and now, of course, of British Columbia and the North-West Territories. I heard him give utterances to views which showed to me only too plainly that he had not lost his character of a special pleader on the public platform. He showed too clearly that he was holding a brief and acting essentially in his capacity as one of the profession to which I belong; and it is disclosing no secret, I am sure, when I state that when you hold a particular brief you do not do full justice to your opponents case, and do not attempt to bring out any strong features in connection with it. The hon. gentleman showed he was unable to take a broad statesman-like view of the questions of the day. He should have known, as he was bound to know, that the coal industry was a great industry affecting every hole and corner of the Province, and one which, if developed, would assist every part of the Dominion. He ought to have been willing to have gone that far. Instead of belittling that industry he should have been man enough to have stood up and said that he knew it employed many thousands of people—because he could have ascertained beforehand that 40,000 men, women and children were directly dependent on that industry in the Province where he was speaking—that it provided employment and subsistence not only to those 40,000 individuals in the coal districts of Nova Scotia alone; that it benefitted the shipping interests of the St. Lawrence; that colliers had been built specially for the trade since the National Policy was developed.

Not only so but increased employment in connection with the trade had been given, more stevedores, sailors and train hands being employed; that more factory hands had been employed in order to supply the expensive machinery and gear necessary for the working of the mines; that while this industry was encouraged, it was able to pay in the shape of royalties into the provincial treasury, one-fifth of the total revenue, over \$100,000. Not only that, but in order to keep the mines in operation a construction account amounting to \$200,000 a year was necessary to be expended. But what do I find the hon. gentleman saying? I have here the report of the language he used, and I desire to place it before the House. He is reported as having said—and I was present at the meeting, which was in 1881:

"Our coal mining had been said to have been benefitted. He denied that it had; but if it had, a benefit conferred on 3,300 men and boys (being the number of persons engaged in coal mining in Nova Scotia), could not be set off against the harm done the Province generally by the tariff."

Why was such a narrow view taken by the hon. gentleman? Even when speaking of the men and boys employed, the number was not correctly given. The number actually employed at that time, as is shown by the mining reports, was 3,967 instead of 3,300; in 1882 the number was 4,225. But, as I have said, he should have recognised the fact that 40,000 people, as he could easily have ascertained, were dependent on that industry for their means of subsistence. We find that the Government of which he was a member in 1875, while not willing to extend protection to the coal industry of the Maritime Provinces, was ready to give protection to the petroleum industry of Ontario. The figures show the following:—

	Value.	Duty.	Per cent.
Protection to oil, 1875.....	\$110,995	\$102,165 32	93
1876.....	119,618	113,811 14	98
1884.....	380,082	227,562 60	60

The protection to our coal industry, which I have shown the fathers of Confederation desired to benefit and foster, receives a protection of only 15 per cent. We do not complain. The mines have done well, both in good times and in bad times, under the National Policy; and they are not complaining to-day. But we find that this attack is hurled from the ranks of men who gave the industry 96 per cent. protection, while they complain of an industry which has only a protection of 15 per cent. to-day, for we find that, while the coal imported in 1884 was valued at something like seven million dollars, the duty collected was only one million of dollars, or a duty of about 15 per cent. Now these hon. gentlemen are very inconsistent in regard to the industries of the Maritime Provinces—or rather they are inconsistent in regard to those industries as compared with the rule they would apply to the rest of the Dominion. What is the position of the Reform party to-day in connection with the National Policy? Take the speeches of hon. gentlemen during the recess and what do we find? We find that if anything they are trying to outbid the members sitting on the Treasury benches by a purely sectional cry, that they entirely disregard the laboring men and the manufacturers of Nova Scotia and the Maritime Provinces, in order to make a bid for the Ontario vote. They say we do not attack the industries peculiar to this Province, with 30 to 35 per cent. protection, but we will give you more protection at the expense of the Maritime Provinces. They say they will put coal and iron on the free list, but they say nothing about taking the duty off oil or other articles peculiar to Ontario. They say we will go one better and put these articles on the free list at the expense of the Provinces, which only give a comparatively small number of votes, and you will be so much the better off. That, it seems to me, is not a statesman-like position. I wish to point out the fact that these two great industries coal and iron are in the Lower Provinces found in juxtaposition to our fisheries. I admit that the present Reform party were opposed to the protection given to the

fishing industries; they ridiculed the arming of the fleet which was raised for their protection; they opposed the Government in reference to the Washington Treaty; but strange to say, time has taught them that that course would be dangerous to-day and we find Grit and Tory all agreed in the Provinces down by the sea, that they hold meeting after meeting and that both parties alike urge on the Government that some vigorous action be taken to protect the fishing interests of the Maritime Provinces, to impose duties and to arm fleets to protect that industry. There is no free trade argument in that request to this Government, no desire to trade freely with their American competitors. We could understand them if they took the consistent position of declaring that we should allow all our waters to be free to the world, that we should make our fish free to all who chose to come keep out no competitors. But I would be amazed to find at this day that the Opposition would take such a position as that, and I have no doubt that they will not do so. But how can they, while willing to extend this protection to the fishing industry, refuse to extend it to coal? Every one must admit the tremendous value to the Dominion of our coal deposits, not merely in the Maritime Provinces, but all over the Dominion, away to the west on the Pacific coast; and I say it is a hopeful and auspicious sign of the grand career in store for this country—it is no doubt one of the greatest possessions of Canada—that on both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts we should have these immense coal fields; and it must be that they were intended by Providence to be developed, and they could not be without a National Policy, for without it they would likely be extinguished. It is important to know that while the total production of coal in the United States in 1860 was only something like six millions of tons, the position in that country has so much changed that to-day it is actually over eighty-seven millions of tons, and this increased production has arisen under a fostering protective tariff. This question of protection is a serious one in connection with the coal trade, for if we had difficulty in competing with a country which produced six millions of tons, our difficulties will be greatly enhanced in endeavoring to compete with a country which produced eighty seven millions of tons a year. My hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson), in referring to this question, finding that he could not show that the prices would be raised, that he could not prove that the evil prophecies which had been uttered in regard to this industry had been verified, stated that he had found that the real cause of the increased output of coal to which the hon. Finance Minister alluded was that before the National Policy was introduced wood was largely consumed on railways. The hon. gentleman has fallen sadly in his position on the question of protection; for does he not know that the leader of the Conservative party stated that all that was to be changed, and that we were to be no longer hewers of wood and drawers of water, and the industries which made us the hewers of wood and the drawers of water have been supplanted and other industries have grown up in their place. But why is it that the hon. gentleman dealt so delicately with this question, for we know that there is no feeling against the duty on coal in Ontario to-day. The people of Ontario have learned that the coal trade in the United States having been vastly developed is now being handled by rings all over the American Union, and that districts are divided, and were it not for the coal duty and for the fact that Toronto has been made a competitive point by the National Policy, that city and other western cities and towns would be brought within the influence of the rings and made subject to their prices, subject to the tariff of rates that is set up in those territories that are to be operated upon. Statistics have been given, and they have never been contradicted, showing who does pay the duty. The *Belleville Intelligencer* gave figures on the 7th of February, 1883, showing that while coal sold at \$3.75 in Cleveland it

Mr. TUPPER.

sold in Canada at from \$2.30 to \$2.80 per ton. We find also that while the price of coal has been decreasing here under a protective tariff in free trade England it has steadily risen; that while steam coal at Cardiff sold in 1880 at 8s. 9d. it sold this year at 10s. 9d. We know also that English coal is sold in Paris at a lower price than it can be purchased in London. These are facts which should be considered by the hon. gentleman when discussing this question of coal. We find further from *Chambers' Journal of Commerce*, in London, of December 5th, 1883, the following:

"In the coal trade, no less than in cotton manufactures, the miners and their leaders will find themselves obliged to consider the influence of other countries as producers, and must already feel themselves constrained to acknowledge that we no longer absolutely rule the market."

The *New York Sun* says:

"Ontario is a nearer market for Pennsylvania coal than it is for the Maritime Provinces. Ontario is now using American coal, but the duty leaves very little profit on the coal, because the dealers have to sell it at a price that keeps out the native product."

Professor Roberts, of the Pennsylvania Railway, quoted in the *Toronto Mail*, said:

"The rates that are now charged by our company for carrying soft coal are made for the purpose of meeting the competition in the various markets in which coals are introduced."

This shows what has been pointed out by gentlemen who have taken part in this discussion in previous years, that where there are competitive points the duty prevents the price being controlled by American rings and keeps the prices down instead of putting them up. Now, I stated that coal was sold at a lower price on the continent than in England. I find, in a letter addressed a short time ago by Mr. Ellis Lever, to the *London Times*, the following remarks:

"We are actually selling our coal at a price which leaves no profit to the colliery proprietor for his capital and risk, and which does not admit of adequate wages being paid to the collier, whose labor is in the midst of darkness and danger. At the same time, we are delivering coal at the continent of Europe at a less price than we can deliver it in London. The foreigner has the advantage of procuring our coal free of export duty; not so the population of the metropolitan area."

Now, why do I allude to this? Surely it is a fair argument, if I can show that the increased duty has decreased the price, and that the only increase in price is in a Free Trade country; and I say it is for hon. gentlemen opposite to find some other effect to urge against the duty than that which they urge. Now, I do not think it would be inappropriate for me to mention in this connection since this is a question peculiarly affecting the workingmen, that it has been stated broadcast throughout the land by a lying press that I, on the floor of this House, have sneered at the workingmen. When a press is so lost to decency that for lack of other material it must descend to lying calumnies against a member of my experience and age in this House, it shows what a poor and miserable cause it must have. I defy any man to stand up in this House and say on his honor that in any discussion in which I have engaged I have attempted to sneer at the workingmen or have used the term "the lower orders." I can appeal to *Bansard*; and if there is anything with reference to which we have reason to feel some comfort that we have reports so accurate, it is on an occasion like this. My speeches are there, uncorrected by me, and I can safely appeal to them to corroborate what I say. Why, how ridiculous for me to sneer at the men who sent me here. The county of Pictou, of course, contains a large number of agriculturists; it is a large, prosperous and splendid county; but the bulk of the voters who sent me here to support the National Policy are *par excellence* workingmen. They are men whom I never sneered at, but whom I am proud to serve; and I believe I am serving them and fulfilling the mission for which they sent me here in supporting the policy of the Government, the policy which gives them bread to eat. So much for what are very common in this country, that is,

misstatements in the Grit press. I have only to state the interest I have taken in this subject as the excuse I have to offer for occupying so much time. I attempt no peroration in closing my remarks on this occasion; but I do hope that some good effect may follow from something I shall give to this House, and particularly to hon. gentlemen opposite. They have denied, and they indignantly deny here, because it is not safe, I suppose, to admit it, that they have done vast injury to this country, both by their policy and by their damaging speeches. They deny that; but they will not deny that they have gloated over the fact there was an exodus—that men did leave this country at times, and they have exposed and magnified before the world every bad spot they could find, as a warning to people that if they come here they will have to stand the terrible effects of misgovernment. Well, Mr. Speaker, I find that the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) stated, in 1880:

"We know that the great and alarming emigration that prevailed from 1860 to 1870 is resuming its former proportions."

Now, that is a fitting introduction to the little lecture I would like to read in closing from the files of the *Globe*, written, I have no doubt, by a man whom the party opposite were once proud to follow. In the year 1868, when that paper was conducted by the Hon. George Brown, and when he was anxious to vindicate the policy of Confederation which he had done so much to consummate, his paper thus dealt with hon. gentlemen who make such speeches as hon. gentlemen opposite. It first abuses the New York papers, which alone at that time made such assertions, happily, for stating:

"That the people in what used to be called Canada, both east and west, are at present in a very impoverished condition, glad to escape by any means from their misery. There is something worse than a mistake in this. There is very gross, and we are almost uncharitable enough to say, intentional misrepresentation. * * * There is suffering and destitution in various parts of our Province, as there always will be in any community, however prosperous; but we are quite safe in saying that rarely since the country was settled has there ever been less, either in extent or degree, than at the present moment. * * * When we look at our position materially, socially, educationally, and religiously likewise, and compare it with that of many others, we have no occasion either to envy or repine. We are so often assured that our country is a poor, contemptible, God-forsaken place, that some may be almost inclined to believe that such is the fact, and to bear themselves as if begging pardon of every one they meet, for the misfortune of being in existence. There is no reason for all this. We have no wish to disparage other lands or to use harsh language about the condition of any people; but we see no reason to go to the opposite extreme, and allow, without contradiction, such representations of our country, when any one in a position to form an enlightened opinion knows that the facts are just the reverse."

And this paper indignantly denies, in 1863, that this "great and alarming emigration" has taken place. I do not wish to add anything to that, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am sure, Sir, that we have all listened with pleasure to the speech of my hon. friend the member for Pictou. A few of the points he has made I shall perhaps notice in the course of my remarks to-night. The interest taken in the financial statement made annually by the Finance Minister of this Dominion is for obvious reasons increasing year by year. The importance of his statement as it relates to the interests and prosperity of the country is increasing year by year. That hon. Minister, Sir, on the present occasion, has met Parliament under circumstances perhaps less favorable and less comfortable to himself than on some previous occasions. He meets Parliament with the fact confronting him that the debt of this country is assuming alarming proportions—that it is increasing with great rapidity. He meets Parliament with the fact staring him in the face that the expenses of the country are also increasing. He tells us that the estimates for the coming year will probably reach \$33,000,000, an increase of almost \$20,000,000 since these Provinces were confederated in 1867. He knows that the taxation is ex-

tremely heavy, and that, owing to the depression that exists, although the rate of taxation has not been reduced, the revenue derived from taxation is considerably less than formerly. He also is unable to deny that following the stimulation which has been applied has come over-production and plethora, and that our manufactures to-day are in a stagnant position. He knows that the prospects of the great North-West, to which this country must look for expansion and growth, have been blighted by the policy this Government has adopted; he knows that the tide of immigration which set in in a stream towards that country has, it has not been turned, been reduced until the stream has become a mere dribble; and he knows that this result is due in a large measure to the operation of his fiscal policy. He knows his Government has been guilty of the incredible folly of saying to the people of the North-West that they shall not use their own money to create avenues of traffic for the transportation of their products to market; he knows that, although he met us unctious with plausibility, the case he presents to Parliament is one the reverse of pleasing to himself and the party which backs him, and in fact the conclusion at which he arrives, the one comfort he has for himself, is that matters might have been worse. He draws a comparison between the taxation of this country and the taxation of the old effete monarchies of Europe, in which great standing armies are maintained and the tax-paying capabilities of their populations strained to the utmost, in order that they may maintain an armed neutrality and congratulates himself because the taxation in Canada has not reached the sum it has in those countries. He points to the Australian colonies and their total revenue, and would lead us to suppose that their revenue is derived wholly from taxation, whereas he knows that 65 per cent. of it is derived from other sources and only 35 per cent. from taxation. His statements are all calculated to mislead the country and to give us a false sense of security, a false sense of good government and of proper management on the part of those who have in charge the financial affairs of this country. It is noticeable that the hon. gentleman does not assume the congratulatory tone which on former occasions he was wont to assume. His tone is deprecatory and apologetic, contrasting strongly with his utterances in some of his former Budget Speeches. I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to one or two brief extracts from speeches made by him on former occasions. In his Budget Speech of 1880, he used the following language:—

"I believe, Sir, there is a good time coming. I believe that the policy of this Government has inaugurated a good time, with reference to the encouragement of the industries of this country, giving a home market to our farmers for their produce, giving business for everybody, and filling up the vast territory in the North-West in preparation for the millions that will populate it in the future."

Where is the home market? We will enquire into that more fully in a few moments. Where is the market our farmers were to have for all the produce they could raise? Is the North-West filling up with millions? What is the condition of the North-West? Evidently the rosy picture drawn by the hon. gentleman in his Budget Speech in 1880 was not a prophetic picture; evidently his prognostications have not been realised. In his Budget Speech in 1881 he said:

"It is said the greatest enemy of truth is prejudice, and its greatest friend time. *Time is solving this question with reference to the Tariff.* The main discussion on the Tariff will be this Session. The result of another year's experience will be such that our friends opposite will be then veering their course for a moderate protective policy, in order that they may meet the desires of the country"

Well, the hon. gentleman spoke truly when he said that the greatest enemy of truth was prejudice, and its greatest friend time; he also spoke truly in saying that time would solve this question. Time is solving it, time has already nearly solved it, and the fallaciousness of the hon. gentleman's views

becomes more evident as time lapses. In his Budget Speech, in 1882, the hon. gentleman said :

"I may be permitted to say, Sir, that at no time in the history of Canada has a Government met Parliament with the financial condition of the country in the position it is to-day. At no period in the history of Canada has its credit stood so high as it stands to-day. At no period in the history of Canada, possibly, was the country, generally speaking, as prosperous or more prosperous than it is to-day, and I propose, Sir, in the statement that I am about to submit to the House to establish that that prosperity is, in a great measure, dependent upon the policy of the Government, adopted by Parliament."

He might truly say to-day that at no time in the history of Canada has the Government met Parliament when the financial condition of the country was in the position in which it is now. He might say to-day with perfect truth that at no time in the history of this country has the Government met Parliament with \$25,000,000 obligations shortly to fall due unsettled and unprovided for; he might well say that at no time in our history has the Government met Parliament with \$13,000,000 of floating debts; he might truly say that at no time in our history has the Government met Parliament when the Government is obliged to confess that it has been compelled to resort to the expedient called, in commercial language, "shinning," on the street, in order to meet its current obligations; or borrowing at all points where it can make a temporary loan, on the promise that the loan will be refunded as soon as the credit of the Government will permit it to make a permanent loan. If we go on to consider the pledges made with reference to this National Policy, we will find that scarcely one of them has been kept. With reference to the pledges made with regard to the employment of labor, I find in the Budget Speech of 1882, made by the hon. gentleman, the following language :

"I would ask hon. gentlemen, when they are referring to this matter, what would have been our position in the Dominion of Canada if we had not adopted a policy that has enabled us to give employment to our industrial classes? They would have had to go abroad for the purpose of seeking employment. It is stated that 23,000 persons have passed over to the United States from Sarnia, but we all know that a large portion of them belong to the United States. But admitting, for argument sake, all that has been said by my hon. friend opposite, we would have had an emigration much larger than we have had had it not been for the adoption of this policy.

When was this statement made? It was made in 1882, and the very year preceding the greatest exodus had taken place from Canada that had ever taken place at any period of its history. In that year 137,000 people had left Canada for the United States, while in the last year of the Administration of Mr. Mackenzie the exodus had not reached a number exceeding 30,000, or the exodus had been more than four-fold as great in the year preceding that in which this statement was made by the hon. gentleman as the exodus in the last year of the Mackenzie Administration; yet the hon. gentleman congratulates himself upon the fact that this policy checks the flow of emigration. He congratulates himself that but for the adoption of the National Policy the emigration would have been much greater. In Heaven's name, if it had been much greater, how much greater would it have been? It would have led to the depopulation of the country. Sir Charles Tupper, in 1878, referring to the employment of labor, said :

"The policy the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating the country. It has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labor, the finest sons of Canada to a foreign country, to obtain employment their own country denies them."

And in the speech made in the Amphitheatre in Toronto, in July, 1878, the First Minister used the following language :—

"If you desire this country to prosper, if you desire this country to rise out of the slough of despond into which it has sunk, if you desire to see manufactures arise, if you desire to see labor employed, if you desire to see the emigration of your young men stopped, if you desire to bring those who have emigrated back to this country, if you desire to see the value of your land arise, if you desire prosperity, you will support the National Policy and say : We must have Canada for the Canadians."

Mr. TUPPER,

Well, Sir, we adopted the National Policy. Did our young men cease to leave Canada? Did those who had left Canada return? Has the value of land risen?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. No, Sir, a greater number of young men have left the country since; comparatively few of those who had left have returned, and the value of farming land in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion is less to-day than it was in 1878. Everyone of these prophecies has proved false; not one of them has been verified by the result. Then we had some promises made with regard to agriculture. It was necessary, of course, when this policy was proposed, to carry it by the aid of the votes of the farmers. Unless the farmers could be persuaded to believe that there was something in this policy to their advantage, their votes could not be had; and, unless their votes were had, the policy could not be carried. One of the schemes resorted to by our hon. friends opposite in the campaign of 1878 was to endeavor to induce the farmer to believe that the Government could afford protection to him, that the agricultural interests of this country would be benefited by imposing burdens on the farmer, because it was held and announced that duties could be imposed which would benefit the farmer; he was to share in the benefits to be derived from this general scheme of taxation, and so he was made to believe that he had a share in the good results to be derived from this National Policy. I shall read one or two extracts in reference to the benefit promised to the farmer. In a speech of Sir Charles Tupper, made in the Budget debate in 1882, he says :

"It has been shown that the prices of farmers' products have been better than ever before, and the hon. gentleman opposite (the ex-Finance Minister) impaled himself on the horns of this dilemma the other night. He said you cannot improve the price of wheat because that is regulated in Mark Lane; and yet the hon. gentleman denounced the tax in bread-stuffs, including wheat, as an odious tax. I want him to establish the assertion that it is an odious tax, and that under the National Policy there is no improvement in the price of the products of the farm. Let me ask him this question: he says we have increased the farmer's burdens, and he has gone before the farmer with tears in his eyes to condemn our policy with this result: that the farmers have simply laughed at him. They have laughed at him because they knew what he had said here before, and would say here again, if in power, as he said the other night, that the laborer's burdens had been increased by the price of living—that everything he used he had to pay more for it. How can you increase the cost of everything consumed by the laborer, mainly consisting of farm products, without benefiting the farmer? It is just such questions we had put to him. We told him we would benefit all classes of industries in the country. We told him we would improve the condition of the farmer by a better home market. But the hon. gentleman could not understand. But now when the farmer laughs at him on account of his theories, he will know that the people hold that his former statements were baseless; that the farmer to-day gets more for every product, that is more for every product of the soil, than he could have got if the policy of the late Government, of making Canadians hewers of wood and drawers of water for any other country, had been carried out as he would still have carried it out."

Well, are the farmers getting more to-day in consequence of this policy? Has this policy raised the price of farm produce? Do the farmers laugh at my hon. friend to-day? Do they realise to-day that the price in grain in Mark Lane has nothing to do with the price in Canada; that the home market has established the price and is quite independent of the markets of the world? I think not. I think the laugh is on the other side of the cheek. I think they laugh at the promises which were then made; they realise how absurd and fallacious were the promises that a duty on grain could afford them any protection when we had a surplus of the article to export to other markets.

Mr. McNEILL. What is the price of oats to-day in Toronto?

Mr. CHARLTON. I will tell you in a short time. We will get to that in due order. Here is another quotation from the Budget Speech of 1880 :

"If you go to the farmer, you will find that he recognises the improvement in prices—"

Does he recognise that to-day?

"that he recognises the improvement in prices for the articles he has for export, or for home consumption in the home market. You may go to our shipping interests, and you will find that during the last five or six months everyone has a more hopeful feeling than they had before. Take the lumber interests of the Ottawa valley and other parts of the Dominion, and mark the change. You will find every man who is engaged in that business in the city of Ottawa, in the west, or down east, doing double work, making sales ahead, and with a different, a more buoyant spirit, than he had twelve months ago."

What is the state of the shipping interest to-day? Is there a more hopeful feeling for the future? What is the state of the lumber interest? Are the lumbermen of Ottawa and of the west and of the east working double time and making sales far ahead? There is a vast accumulation of lumber in the yards at Ottawa, and none of it is sold yet; gloom and despondency prevail in the lumber markets, the shipping interest is low, not a single promise made by the hon. gentleman in regard to any industry in the country has been realised. Then we had some promises made by the leader of the Government himself. Sir John Macdonald, in 1878, is reported in *Hansard* as saying:

"We say the present tariff is inartistic, unscientific, deficient in some parts; that it helps to depress and crush our manufacturing interests, to allow an undue and improper interference with our agricultural products in our own markets, and that there ought to be a readjustment in a scientific sense. I believe the tariff could be so readjusted that unless the future necessities of this country required additional revenue and an increase of duties for revenue purposes, we can give more protection to our agricultural interests, we can give an encouragement to our manufacturers, not only to enable them to maintain this present position, but to relieve them from the existing depression and give them an opportunity for development, and, at the same time, the whole amount of pressure and volume of taxation would not, on the whole, be increased to the people. That is the doctrine we have always held."

Well, we have had, since this unscientific tariff passed away, a scientific tariff introduced, I suppose, and our hon. friends opposite will earn the cognomen of the tariff-tinker in another Session, I believe. There has not been a Session since this tariff was adopted when the Finance Minister has not come to this House with numerous and important changes. It is an inchoate, incomplete arrangement, constantly requiring tinkering, constantly requiring change, and failing at all times since it was adopted, as it fails to-day, to meet the wishes or satisfy the expectations of the country.

And, with regard to the promises made by the right hon. gentleman, that the burden of taxation should not be increased but that there should be merely a readjustment of duties, a readjustment of burdens in such a way as to afford all the benefits a truly scientific tariff was capable of affording to the country—have these promises been kept? Has there been no increase in the taxation? In 1878 the taxation from Customs was in round numbers twelve and three-quarter millions, or \$15.60 per family of five. The taxation from Customs in 1883 was twenty-three millions, a taxation of \$25.70 per family; and in 1884 it was twenty millions, or \$24.24 per family, in place of \$15.60, under the administration of affairs by the ex-Finance Minister—a very large increase indeed.

Mr. HESSON. Are you adding deficits?

Mr. CHARLTON. We will refer to deficits in good time. I am afraid that, in two or three years to come, we shall allude to very alarming deficits. Well, we have had the benefit of a tariff which was not to raise the taxation of the country, which was to be readjusted without increasing the burdens, a tariff which, however, increased the burden of taxation under Customs from \$15.60, in 1878, to \$25.70, in 1883. We have had a tariff which was to afford the farmers of this country protection, and the very utmost claim the hon. gentleman has ever made with regard to the benefit the farmers derived from that tariff was made two Sessions ago, that possibly the farmers were receiving 3 cents per bushel more for wheat than they would if there had been no duties.

That is the very utmost advantage that they ever claimed from the operations of the grain duties. Now, Sir, I have had occasion to compare American and Canadian quotations repeatedly, in addressing audiences in various parts of this country; I have made those comparisons every year, and at every portion of the year, and I have never found one instance where the relative quotations in the two countries would lead to the supposition that the imposition of duties upon grain had conferred one iota of advantage upon the farmers of Canada, and I defy any man in this House of Commons to point to any day in the history of Canada since this tariff was passed, in 1879, when the grain duties have conferred any advantage upon the producer of grain in this country. What is the condition of things to-day? If the hon. gentleman will take the market quotations he will find to-day that No. 1 spring wheat, worth 82 cents in Toronto, is worth 91 cents in Buffalo, which is the corresponding market, about the same distance from the sea; and yet in Buffalo No. 1 wheat is worth 9 cents more than in Toronto. It does not require a duty of 15 per cent. to prevent the importation of 91-cent wheat from Buffalo selling at 82 cents in Toronto. To-day No. 2 spring wheat is worth 80 cents in Toronto and 88 cents in Buffalo, and 74½ cents in Chicago. Will the 8 cents difference between the two points pay for transportation. Is there danger of slaughtering the Toronto markets where wheat is worth 82 cents with wheat bought in Chicago at 74½ cents? To-day oats are worth 37 cents in Toronto and now the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. McNeill) will have his question answered) for 34 pounds; while right across the lake, at either Oswego or Buffalo, 32 pounds of oats are worth 36 cents or oats are worth 1 cent and a fraction per bushel more in Oswego than in Toronto. It requires no duty upon oats to keep 32 pounds of oats worth 36 cents a bushel in Buffalo, from being sold at 37 cents for 34 pounds in Toronto. To-day barley is worth 68 cents in Toronto and 84 cents right across the lake at Oswego, and that great difference has always existed in the price of barley at the two points. What is the use of a duty upon barley if the price in the American market is 14 or 15 cents higher than it is here? To-day rye is worth 59 cents in Toronto and 65 in Oswego in bond, without the duties paid. To-day peas are worth 61 cents in Toronto and 75 in Oswego. To-day creamery butter is worth 24 to 35 cents in New York city and 18 to 21 cents in Montreal, and so through the whole list. As to agricultural productions, it will be found, upon comparison, that never yet since 1879 has the imposition of grain duties conferred upon the farmers of this country any advantage whatever. Now, Sir, a few words with regard to the home market. I find that in 1879 the hon. Finance Minister, in his Budget Speech, used the following language:

"Or whether we will inaugurate a policy that will, by its provisions, say to the industries of the country: We will give you sufficient protection; we will give you a market for what you can produce."

That was the promise of a home market. Now I would like to call attention to the manner in which that promise has been fulfilled. I would like to point out to the hon. gentleman the great diminution that has taken place in the exports of the food products of this country, and how very nearly we have come to affording the farmers of the country a home market under the operations of the National Policy:

Total exports, exclusive of bullion and estimated short returns—	
1874 to 1878.....	\$342,884,504
Average per annum.....	\$ 68,576,900
1879 to 1883.....	385,435,566
Average per annum.....	7,707,113
Each period 5 years.	
Total excess, second period over first period	42,551,062
Average annual excess " " " "	8,510,212

That is the total exports, and as we come to the food exports we will find that a greater balance exists in favor of Canada. If we take the exports of animals and their produce, and of

the agricultural products, the produce of Canada, we find the following figures:

1874 to 1878.....	\$159,824,099	
Average per annum.....		\$31,964,819
1879 to 1883.....	\$210,852,852	
Average per annum.....		42,190,570
Total excess, second period over first.....		51,028,753
Average annual excess.....		10,205,750

We find, if we examine the exports of 1874, that they amounted to \$77,000,000 and that sum exceeds the annual average of 1874 to 1878 by \$8,500,000. Now, Sir, if we want to arrive at an exact condition of things, it requires a careful computation as to the nature of the exports, because our returns before the inauguration of the National Policy, with regard to the exports of grain, were kept in a loose manner. Grain was imported in immense quantities, all entered for consumption; it might be consumed or it might pass through the country, and the only way to arrive at the net export was to take the total exportation from the country and deduct from that the total importation into the country, and then you had the annual export. I have taken pains to compile a table upon that basis, to arrive at the actual net export over a period extending from 1874 to 1884. I find that the net exports of the cereals of malt, hay, grain, green fruit, potatoes, exports of animals and their product, the products of Canada, were as follows, and that statement also includes the exports of fisheries:—

1874 to 1878, 5 years.....	\$147,958,000
Annual average.....	29,591,600
1879 to 1884, 6 years.....	268,143,000
Annual average.....	44,690,500
Average annual excess second period over first.....	15,098,900

Now, Sir, the National Policy was to create a home market, was to absorb the whole of the productions of the soil of Canada, but under the operations of the National Policy we have approached the realisation of that promise by receding from it, and by increasing the export of food from this country to an extent of \$15,000,000. What is the promise of the hon. gentleman with regard to home market? It is a fallacy, Sir. The exportation of the food products of this country has constantly increased under this tariff. It is greater to-day than it was then, but that increase is due to a good harvest, and due to a foreign demand, and these have been the causes of the prosperity which has been falsely attributed to the operation of the National Policy itself. Well, there were great promises made. There were promises made by the father of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tupper) who spoke last, with regard to the potency of this policy as regards the securing of a reciprocity treaty with the United States.

The National Policy was to procure reciprocity for us, and I will read what the hon. gentleman said with reference to that point in 1877:

"Whether you look at it, Sir, in relation to revenue; whether you look at it as a means of getting a reciprocity treaty; whether you look at it as a means of giving a just, fair and legitimate protection to the great manufacturing industries of, and to the great agricultural interests of this country; look at it from what point you may, a policy the very reverse of that which is pursued by this country is demanded by the interests of Canada."

Yes, it was to give a reciprocity treaty. In 1879 the same gentleman used the following language:—

"I believe within two years of the adoption of the National Policy—not a policy of hostility to the United States, but one of following the system they had adopted to foster their industries—they will give us a free market for coal in the United States."

Yes, it was to give us free coal. And again, on same page, he says:

"When they wipe out the duties altogether we will admit their products free. At no distant day we shall enjoy all the advantage we possessed under the Reciprocity Treaty."

This was to be the effect that the National Policy was to produce. It was to give us reciprocity, free trade in coal

Mr. CHARLTON.

free admission for the natural products of Canada. What is the present status of this question? Are we any nearer reciprocity under the operation of this policy than we were before? In fact, did the Government that promised that this policy would procure reciprocity for us show any desire to secure reciprocity from the United States? Would they lift their hands to secure it? Have they not refused to make any overtures, refused to make any effort to secure reciprocal trade with the United States? Has not the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) told us that we do not require reciprocal trade; that unless we can obtain a reciprocity treaty confined to the natural products of the soil, Canada does not require such a treaty, and does not and would not accept it. We know that it is hopeless to expect to obtain a reciprocity treaty like the last one. We know that if we procure from the American Government free admission of the products of the soil, forest and mine, we have to give them something in the shape of reciprocity. We must, if we obtain reciprocal trade with the United States, admit some articles they want to sell, if they admit what we want to sell to them. This party, who promised that the result of the National Policy was to be reciprocal trade with the United States, would not accept reciprocity on fair, equitable and just terms—such terms as we might obtain. They have pronounced against it, and the people of Canada—the farmer, the lumberman, the fisherman—may understand that this Government stands distinctly pledged, not only to refuse to make any overtures to the American Government, but pledged to reject any such reciprocity treaty as is obtainable and is a fair treaty. So much for the status of the reciprocity question at the present time. We have latterly had a change of Administration at Washington. Since the 4th of this month, for the first time during over a quarter of a century, a Democratic President is in office. There is a large majority of Democrats in the House of Representatives. That party will very shortly control the United States Senate. That party has gone into power upon the issue that the absurd trade restriction of the United States should be modified. They are a party pledged to a revision of the tariff and a reduction of the duties. They are a party who would naturally entertain favorably a proposition made by this country with respect to reciprocal trade. Already the Republic of Mexico has negotiated a reciprocity treaty with that country. The Sandwich Islands have done so likewise; and a reciprocity treaty with the Spanish West Indian Islands, is under consideration. The time is propitious. We have every reason to believe that if we approached the American Government with respect to this matter, and sought to obtain a modification of those absurd commercial restrictions that exists between the two countries, the American Government would listen to those proposals favorably. Are the Government prepared to make those propositions, are they prepared to attempt to give to the country the realisation of that boon which they pledged the country would be secured as a consequence of the adoption of the National Policy in 1878?

And then we had some pledges with reference to the exodus. I have referred to the question before. I find in a speech made by the leader of the Government at Toronto, on 30th July, 1878, the hon. gentleman used the following language:

"Is not our population leaving this country? (Cries of yes.) Are not our young men actually going to the United States? (Cries of yes.) Oh, yes; it is said, make this a cheap country to live in. Gentlemen, this will be a cheap country to live in when property becomes valueless—when you can buy land next to nothing—when a man finds himself poorer every year, in consequence of the shrinkage in the value of his property."

I might ask to-night, is not our population leaving the country? Can any man truthfully fail to answer, yes? I might ask, are not our young men actually going to the United States? Who could answer, no? I might remind the people of the country that they are growing poorer every year through the shrinkage of the values of the vari-

ous properties. Farms can be bought in any part of Ontario cheaper than they could be purchased six years ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say the constant tendency has been towards a decline in prices. I speak of what I know. I affirm what I know to be true. An hon. gentleman who is conversant with these matters says there has been a decline of at least 25 per cent., and I believe that estimate to be correct. In fact, you can scarcely place a value on farms, because they are almost unsaleable. In July, 1878, the same hon. gentleman used the following language:—

“Was it not a crying shame that though this country had a fertile soil, a healthy climate, a strong and well educated people and good laws, 500,000 of our own people should have crossed our borders in a few years and taken up their abode in the United States, because they could not find employment here for their skill, energy and enterprise, in consequence of the false policy of our rulers.”

We have as fertile a soil to-day as we had then; we have a good climate; we have a strong and well educated people; we have fairly good laws, although perhaps not so good as they were then; and yet emigration has not been checked. If there were 500,000 native Canadians in the United States, then there are 1,000,000 in the States now. The policy of the hon. gentleman has been totally inoperative, so far as checking this exodus is concerned. I find that Sir Charles Tupper, in a speech delivered in this House, in 1878, used the following language:—

“Sir, the people are willing to be frugal and to work hard, but they ask for a policy from the administration which does not compel them to expatriate themselves in order to get an opportunity of working hard. The hon. gentleman's policy is to send them to Boston, New York and Baltimore, the places which he has made the commercial capitals of Canada.”

If that was the policy then, the policy since only varies in this, that it sends them not to Boston, Baltimore and New York, but to Michigan, Minnesota, Dakota and the western States. With respect to this exodus, with respect to the question as to whether the promises made in regard to the National Policy have been in any degree fulfilled, with respect to the question as to whether the exodus of Canadians from the Dominion to the United States has been checked or lessened in any degree through the operation of the National Policy, as compared with the period of the Mackenzie Administration, I wish to quote some figures. They will be denied. Every statement made by the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), in Toronto, was based upon American statistics, and the statements made in this House, lamenting the exodus of Canadians, were statements made on American statistics, statistics which I have in my hand, which are denied to-day, and they were statistics which at that time were accepted as correct; and strictures on the conduct and policy of the Government were based on the accuracy of those statistics. Now, Sir, what are the returns of the American Bureau of Statistics with regard to the emigration from Canada? My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) laughs in a sneering manner. I think I shall have occasion shortly to refer to the manner in which that hon. gentleman quoted school statistics. According to the American Bureau the emigration from Canada to the United States for the period from 1874 to 1878 was 127,000. This, Sir, is the exodus which was lamented by hon. gentleman opposite; it is the exodus which was to be corrected, which was to be stopped by the operation of the National Policy. Let us see how effective that policy has been in stopping it. The emigration from Canada to the United States, from 1879 to 1884, six years inclusive, has been 490,000 against 127,000 in the five preceding years. Now, I shall take occasion to show in a few moments that in all probability these statistics are reasonably accurate. That shows that under the operation of the National Policy 314,000 more Canadian emigrated to the United States in

those six years than emigrated to the United States under the Government of Mr. Mackenzie in the five preceding years. They show that the emigration to the United States from this country was two and a-half times greater per annum under the operation of the National Policy than it was before. I ask is it possible that so stupendous a blunder was made in reference to those statistics, as to show that this emigration is no greater than under the operation of the previous tariff? Now, with regard to the accuracy of these statistics, if we test them by the American census returns—if we take the return of native Canadians in the United States in 1870, we find them to be 498,000; and assuming that to be correct, if we take the return of native Canadians in the United States in 1880, we find them to be 717,000. If we take these statistics year by year, and allow a death rate of two in every thousand for the initial population, and one in every thousand for the emigrant population in every year, and work it out on that basis, as I have worked it out, we will find that the result is surprisingly near to the returns made by the Bureau of Statistics. I find, assuming it on that basis, and taking the population of the United States as shown by the census returns of 1870, and adding to that population year by year the emigration from this country, as reported in these returns, striking off two per thousand as the annual death rate for those in the United States, and one per thousand for those going in, we will find that in 1880 the population, as shown by the census returns of the United States, agrees with these statistics within some seven or eight thousand. That is what you will find, and I say it is impossible that any great mistake with reference to those statistics can have existed. Then if you take the school returns you will find that the school population has decreased. The other day my hon. friend at my right (Sir Richard Cartwright), quoted certain school returns, and the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), quoted certain other school returns. Well, there are two kinds. There is one return made by the assessors, which is very inaccurate, and naturally this was the kind which my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) took. There is another return made from the school registers, which is strictly accurate, and that is the return which my hon. friend to my right (Sir Richard Cartwright) took, and naturally they arrived at different conclusions, one from the inaccurate bungling and false returns, and the other from the strictly accurate and reliable returns. So much for the exodus question. I do not suppose my hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) knew the character of the statistics he was quoting, for I am quite sure he would not have attempted to mislead the House, only that he did not know what he was doing.

Mr. IVES. Are these officers Ontario officers?

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; the assessors.

Mr. IVES. They are from a foreigner.

Mr. CHARLTON. I stated that the assessors' returns were the ones used by the hon. gentleman opposite, and which were inaccurate, while the register of the school population, in which the attendance is given from day to day, was the one used by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright), and that they were accurate and reliable.

A word now with reference to the balance of trade. I really hope that I may have the attention of the Finance Minister with reference to this matter. I want to discuss it for a moment, and I want to call his attention to it, as I am sure it will be of great interest to him and perhaps it may lead him to take a different view of the matter from what he has hitherto taken. I find that in the Budget Speech of 1879, the hon. gentleman is reported in *Hansard*, page 413, in the following language:—

“There are other difficulties; the volume of imports has not much diminished. Regarding the matter, as I do, I think it is to be regretted

that the value of imports have not been materially reduced. I look upon the large imports ever since the Dominion was organised, showing a large balance of trade against it, as one of the causes of the trouble with which we have to contend."

On the next page he says :

"By the last returns I have which cover the year 1877, the balance of trade against her (England) is shown to be £140,000,000 or \$700,000,000 per year. The balance of trade against the United States in 1872 was \$116,000,000, in 1873 it was reduced to \$66,000,000, but the last calendar year shows that balance in favor of the United States had reached \$300,000,000 a year. I think then * * * that the prosperity of the one country at this moment is caused in a great measure by the large surplus in its favor and the depression in the other by the large deficiency. Under these circumstances it appears to me we should turn our attention to the best means of reducing our imports from all parts of the world."

Is that accurate, Mr. Speaker? Does the hon. gentleman still hold to these doctrines, that a balance of trade against a country is an indication of poverty, that a balance of trade in favor of a country is an indication of wealth, and that it should be the object of statesmen to reduce the imports—reduce the volume of trade. Does the hon. gentleman still hold by the language to which he gave utterance in 1879, with regard to the balance of trade against England, to which he refers the amount is £140,000,000. Let us look for a moment at the question of the trade balance against England. For the last thirty years, at least, an annual balance of trade has existed against England of an enormous amount; for the last twenty years it has averaged about five hundred millions of dollars a year. Now, if the theory of the hon. gentleman is correct, if a balance of trade against a country means that the country is being impoverished, then long ago England should have reached a state of bankruptcy, where she would have ceased to trade at all. I find that in the ten years, from 1873 to 1882, inclusive, the balance of trade against England was £1,074,851,000, sterling, or an average annual balance of £107,485,000 sterling, or over \$500,000,000 a year. But, Sir, when we come to analyse this question and examine into the condition of English trade, and see why it is that this large balance exists against that country, we will find that 11 per cent. should be added to the exports of England to cover the freight earned by her vessels in carrying her exports to foreign ports; that 11 per cent. should be deducted from the value of the imports to make up for the charges and earnings of the vessels which bring the imports into the English markets. The earnings of her vessels out and in comprise 11 per cent of the imports and 11 per cent. of the exports, and if we look at the matter in that light, in the ten years during which £3,857,917,000 sterling were brought into that country and £2,783,805,000 taken out—during those ten years England had to her credit £424,000,000 sterling as the earnings or freights on her imports, and £306,218,000 sterling as her earnings for freight on the exports, and that is to be deducted from the nominal balance against her. Then, England is receiving every year £56,000,000 sterling in interest from her investments in other countries, and that amounts to £560,000,000 in ten years. Add these three items together, and they amount to £1,290,588,000 to be deducted from the nominal balance of trade against England of £1,074,000,000. In addition to this, England has her direct profits from trade. Her commercial houses have their agencies in Africa, South America, China and other countries. Their cargoes are shipped from England and sent to their factors and traded for the natural products of these countries; often the same cargo discharged and returned represents a difference of twofold in value. So that the whole theory of the hon. gentleman with regard to an adverse balance of trade impoverishing a country, is an utter, an absolute fallacy. If we take the exports of gold from England into account, as the hon. gentleman stated, England would be exporting gold to pay the balances against her; and yet, since 1861, England has had a balance of gold against her only in two years.

Mr. CHARLTON.

From 1861 to 1878 her imports of gold exceeded her exports by £92,630,000. In 1861 and 1872, when the export of gold exceeded the imports, the balance of gold against her was only £2,066,000 and £728,000 respectively, a total of £2,794,000. The excess of imports over exports indicates the wealth of a country, but the excess of exports over imports indicates its indebtedness. Some of the richest countries in the world, Germany, Belgium, Sweden, Holland and Norway, have every year nominally large balances of trade against them. If we examine the case of the United States, we shall find that the favorable balance of trade there is nominal rather than real. It is probably made up in this way. The duties in that country are excessive, and a large amount of smuggling is engaged in, which, of course, reduces the favorable balances of trade to whatever extent it may be indulged in. Then there is said to be a systematic system of under-valuation by importers. Occasionally suits are brought by the Government for the recovery of hundreds of thousands, in some instances, millions of dollars of duty, in consequence of undervaluation and false invoices. If we take these two items, smuggling and undervaluation, I have no doubt they will very largely wipe out the balance of trade that exists in favor of the United States. We will find also that during the eight years that the balance of trade is said to have existed in favor of that country, in only two years has there been a balance of specie in favor of the country, while in six years a large amount of specie has been withdrawn to pay actual balances of trade against the country, although nominally the Custom houses showed a large balance of trade in its favor. I find, Sir, that the hon. gentleman also, in his Budget Speech of 1881, used the following language with regard to trade in this country:—

"Last year the excess of exports over imports was \$1,451,711—the first instance of the kind in the history of Canada. This is due to two causes. First, because we increased the value of raw material by manufactures by \$6,000,000, which diminished the value of the imports by the same sum. Then we increased the exports, due partly, I admit, to a bountiful harvest, for which we have great reason to be thankful."

Well, the hon. gentleman felicitated himself at that time that we were to have a favorable balance of trade, but it does not seem that we have done so. I find that from 1875 to 1879 the total balance of trade against Canada was \$105,111,079; and from 1880 to 1884, under the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the total balance of trade against the country was \$82,059,370, a difference in favor of the latter period of \$23,051,706. The year 1875 was an exceptional year; the balance of trade against Canada at that time was a very heavy one; and if we take the four last years of the Mackenzie Administration and the four last years of this Administration, we shall find, that in the former period the balance of trade was \$59,927,772, and in the latter period, \$83,481,079, or an excess in favor of the former period against the latter of \$23,553,307. Then, if we take the last two years of each Administration we shall find that in 1878 and 1879 the total balance of trade was \$24,231,293, and in 1883 and 1884 \$59,158,765, or an excess of \$24,927,473 in favor of the former against the latter period. So much, Sir, for the question of the balance of trade. I think I have shown to the satisfaction of the House that the hon. gentleman's views on this question are not in accordance with sound political economy. I think I have shown also that even if it were an advantage to Canada to lessen the adverse balance of trade, the hon. gentleman has not been successful in that respect, for it has been much heavier in the four last years under his Administration than in the four last years of the Mackenzie Administration.

Now, one word with regard to the coal duties. The hon. gentleman, in his speech the other night, used the following language:—

"I will not undertake to say that it may not be proved, to some extent, that in some cases the duties are paid by the party selling the

coal I am not going to take any doubtful ground. I will admit, for the sake of argument, that the people pay every cent of the duty."

Well, I suppose he will admit that for the sake of argument, because the argument is so overpowering that he cannot deny it. But he used different language with reference to this matter once. I recollect that in 1882 I heard the hon. gentleman make the following statement:—

"On the subject of coal I know there has been a good deal said, but my enquiries have led me to the conclusion that while we receive a very considerable sum from coal imported from the United States, and consumed in Ontario, one-half of that sum is paid by the coal producers in the United States. That is my conviction, and we have evidence of it."

Now, I would like to call the attention of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) to what Sir Charles Tupper said on the same matter; and I recollect, as distinctly as if it had been yesterday, the look of admiration that was on the face of the Finance Minister when he looked up and listened to this statement, very much as one boy would look at another who could climb a tree higher than he could. Sir Charles said:

"I defy any man who will approach this subject in a fair and candid spirit to arrive at any other conclusion than that the coal tax is not paid by the people of Ontario, though paid in Ontario. I venture to state, and have sufficient grounds for the statement, that the imposition of the coal duty has not cost the people of Canada one farthing, either in Ontario or out of it. * * * It is on this point I slightly differ from my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, who seems to think that perhaps half of the duty might be paid in the United States and half in Ontario."

Well, Sir, it is said to-day, on the admission of the Finance Minister, that it is a doubtful question, and he admits, for the sake of argument, because the argument is so strong that he cannot deny it, that the duty is paid by the consumer in Canada. Now I come to the question of taxation, as dealt with by the hon. gentleman, and he has certainly a very ingenious way of dealing with questions of this kind. He is able to manipulate figures with an ability which may fairly be said to stand unrivalled in its particular line and way. He sets out with the purpose of making a comparison between the two periods of taxation—the period of five years under the administration of Mr. Mackenzie, and the period of five years under his own administration. In taking the first period, he adds the deficit to the taxation. Well, Sir, the people did not pay the deficit; the people paid in taxation the amount derived from Customs and Excise. He then comes to the second period, and in as much as he had taken from the people \$20,000,000 more than he could spend in ordinary expenditure, he coolly deducts that amount from the taxation. He says: True, you paid that money, but we did not spend it in ordinary expenditure; we got rid of it in some other way; therefore, I will score it off as if not paid by you and will not consider it a tax at all. By adding on the one hand the deficit, and subtracting on the other the unnecessary taxation which he levied, he gets his figures into a shape that enables him to draw the comparison he desires to draw. I propose to adopt a different method. I propose to adopt the honest way of dealing with the question; I propose to take the actual taxation in the one period and the actual taxation in the other, and on that proper and just basis to draw a comparison between the two. It is true there was a deficit under the administration of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie), amounting to some four and three-quarter million dollars, but it is also true that he paid into the Sinking Fund out of the revenue of the country a sum of money amounting to \$4,190,000; and if you deduct the sinking fund from the revenue you have an allowance for the deficit which places the Government in nearly the position in which it would have been had no deficit existed. The actual sum derived from Customs, Excise and bill stamps, from the 1st of July, 1874, to the 1st of July, 1879, was \$93,295,770, and if you take the mean population for that period, upon the basis taken by my hon. friend opposite—and his basis is too high—the taxation for that period amounts to an annual average *per capita* of \$4.64 under the

administration of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie). Now we will take the taxation while the hon. gentlemen opposite have been at the head of affairs. The taxation from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884, derived from Customs and Excise, amounted to \$124,723,658, or upon the mean population, estimating the population upon the basis assumed by my hon. friend, which is too high, it gave an average annual taxation *per capita* of \$5.71, being \$1.07 higher per head, under the hon. gentleman's administration than under the administration of Mr. Mackenzie. I challenge the hon. gentleman to controvert these figures—\$4.64 *per capita* under Mr. Mackenzie, \$5.71 under the hon. gentleman; or a taxation of 23 per cent. higher under his management than under that of the late Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright), and an increase of 23 per cent. in taxation against an increase of population of only 9 per cent.

If we are to estimate the burdens resting upon the people from taxation, it is proper that we should estimate them only in reference to Customs duties, because the Excise duty is a voluntary tax. A man may pay the Excise duty or refrain from paying it as he chooses. He may drink or smoke and pay the duty, or he may, like an honest Christian gentleman, refrain from both these habits and not pay it; but the Customs duty is a tax no man can escape; it is a tax upon the necessaries of life. Every man must contribute to the Customs; no man need contribute to the Excise. Consequently, the Customs duties are the true and proper measure of the taxation imposed upon the people. We will, therefore, make an examination of the question, on the basis of the Customs duties collected under the two Administrations. I find that from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879, the total sum collected from Customs duties was \$66,405,321, or an average annual tax *per capita* of \$3.32, taking the basis of population assumed to be correct by my hon. friend opposite. From 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884, also a period of five years, the Customs duties amounted to \$97,092,477, or an annual average taxation *per capita* of \$4.52 under my hon. friend opposite, against \$3.33 under the late Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright). This shows an increase of taxation derived from Customs duties of \$1.20 under the administration of the present Government as compared with the revenue from Customs taken from the people of Canada by my hon. friend, Mr. Mackenzie, or an increase of 36 per cent. against an increase of population of 9 per cent—a taxation increase nearly four-fold greater than that in population and in the ability of the people of Canada to pay taxes. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say, "hear, hear," but these figures are incontrovertible. They present to you an exact statement of the case; they show precisely the relative burdens imposed by the two Governments; they are open to criticism, and criticism is challenged. We will take the last two years under each Administration for comparison, the years 1878 and 1879 and the years 1883 and 1884. In 1878-79, the Customs duties amounted to \$25,683,483, an average per head of \$3.09 on an estimated mean population of 4,150,000 people as made by the hon. gentleman opposite. In 1883-84 the Customs taxation amounted to \$43,033,472, an annual average per head of \$4.78, against \$3.09, an increase of \$1.69 in taxation per head under this Administration. Now allusion has been made to-night to my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) as a mixer and muddler of figures, as an incompetent Finance Minister, as a Finance Minister whose record was not a creditable one, whose record would not compare favorably with that of the hon. gentleman, the Finance Minister (Sir Leonard Tilley). I hear a response upon the other side. Hon. gentlemen opposite say "hear, hear." I wish that this country had been blessed with the services of a gentleman as capable of grappling with the difficulties of its position as the hon. gentleman on my right

(Sir Richard Cartwright); I wish that during the last six years the finances of this country had been administered with that prudence, sagacity and economy that characterised the administration of my hon. friend.

What is his record? It is said he had deficits. He had. And why? Because that hon. gentleman took the position, the sound, economic position, that in a period of depression the revenues derived from Customs duties were not a fair indication or a fair measure of the volume of revenue that would be derived from them under ordinary circumstances. He took the position that though the expense was slightly in excess of the revenue derived from Customs, the deficit would be obliterated when good times returned, by an increase in the revenue the Government would receive under the tariff, without any change whatever. Was his basis a sound one? Did he, in taking that, take a position which the result was not likely to prove correct? Let us see. We have no means of telling, so far as our own experience is concerned, because our own tariff was changed just at the time the depression was passing away but we have an opportunity of establishing a comparison by referring to the United States, which were effected by the same causes, which labored under depression when we labored under depression, and experienced the return of prosperity when prosperity returned to us, and where the Customs tariff was not changed from 1860 to 1882. The tariff of the United States remained the same during the period of depression, and when good times returned, and if, from the returns of that tariff, we find there was a large increase of revenue in 1880 and in 1881, as compared with 1879 and 1878, we may reasonably suppose that a corresponding increase of revenue would have characterised that time in Canada if no change had been made in our tariff. What was the result in the United States? The revenue from Customs in 1879 was \$137,250,000. No change was made in the tariff, but the revenue from Customs in the following year was \$186,522,000, in the following year it was \$198,159,000, and in the following year, \$220,410,000; in other words, the revenue of the United States increased, from 1879 to 1880, \$49,272,000, or 34 per cent., and it increased in the two years, from 1879 to 1881, \$60,909,000, or 44 per cent. A corresponding increase in the revenue of Canada, without a change of any character whatever in the tariff, would have been, from 1879 to 1880, \$4,386,000, and from 1879 to 1881, \$5,676,000. My honorable friend was right; the experience of the United States proves that the change in times, the return of prosperity in that country led to an increase of 34 per cent. from 1879 to 1880, and of 44 per cent. from 1879 to 1881; and, even if one-half of that ratio had been secured in this country, through the return of good times, the deficits which troubled my honorable friend would have passed away if he had remained in office and he would have had a surplus under the tariff of 1876, without a change of any kind whatever.

I now come to the consideration of some comparisons made by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, between this country and the United States. I wish I could arrive at the same conclusions as the hon. gentleman did.

Mr. RYKERT. No you don't.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, I do. I wish I could arrive at the conclusion that we were as lightly taxed a country as that; I wish I could believe that our financial position is a prosperous one. I know my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) says I do not wish it. He has no right to attribute to me any such wish. If I feel it my duty to expose the recklessness of this Government, if I feel it my duty to show that this Government is rushing this country to ruin, if I feel it my duty to sound the note of alarm, no man in this House has a right to say I rejoice because our position is not as favorable as that of the country to the south of us. It is my duty to show where we are going, to show the recklessness of this Government, to show how inordinately

Mr. CHARLTON.

our expenditure has been increased, to show to what alarming proportions the public debt is swelling, to show what dangers impend over this country and threaten it, and it is the duty of hon. gentlemen opposite to hear these statements, to examine them, and to make up their minds whether these statements are true or not; and, if they are true, it is the duty of every independent member of this House of Commons to check that Government and to see if the course which is being followed and which is likely to result in the ruin of this country cannot be stopped. Now, with regard to the comparisons made by my hon. friend, he first of all makes a comparison of expenditure, a comparison on averages; he speaks of the State taxes, too; he tells us that the State taxes amount to \$1.20 per head in the United States. The hon. gentleman is slightly in error there, his basis of calculation upon population is too low. He estimates the population of the United States at 54,000,000. It is estimated by their own statisticians at 57,500,000. If we take 56,000,000 it is certainly below the mark. The State taxation last year amounted to \$61,434,095, which would be about \$1.09 per head, but a large amount of that taxation is expended for purposes for which we raise municipal taxes, and, if we take out of question the subsidies in Canada, which last year amounted to \$3,603,714, and which would, in proportion, amount to \$46,848,000 in the United States, they will offset the State taxation in the United States. The hon. gentleman goes on to make a comparison between the two countries as to expenditure, and first of all he places the population too low. Then—I do not know whether he was aware of it or not—he included in the taxation of the United States a sum of seven and one-half millions which does not figure in the taxation of the country. He takes the bank tax, he takes consular fees, he takes patent fees, he takes fees of all kinds, and these items amount to \$7,432,333, and he informs the House of Commons that this a part of the taxation of the United States. It is not, Mr. Speaker. He places the taxation nearly eight millions too high and he places the population nearly three millions too low, and he strikes his balance on that basis and makes the taxation of the United States \$4.93½. It is not a cent over \$4.60. He makes it 33½ cents too high, at least. He starts on that basis. Then he goes on to make a statement with regard to the debt. He states the debt of the United States correctly. I believe he did not inform the House what our debt was. If he did I have forgotten. I will take the pains to supply the omission. On the 30th June last the gross debt of Canada was \$242,482,416; and the net debt \$182,161,850. On the 31st December the gross debt was \$253,739,146, and the net debt \$183,914,885. The net debt in six months had increased \$8,753,035. On the 31st January the gross debt was \$255,966,416, the net debt was \$192,123,080. The net debt had increased in one month \$3,208,195, and the hon. gentleman admitted that subsequent to that date, the 31st January, the debt had still further increased by at least two millions more. If that is true, the net debt at the time the admission was made—I do not know what it may be now—was \$194,123,000, or a charge *per capita*, if we estimate the mean population of the year at 4,500,000, which is high enough, of \$43.13 for every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada. But that is not all. We have nominal assets of \$63,843,336. These are deducted from the gross debt, and the balance is assumed to be the net debt. Will the Finance Minister assure us that he can realise upon these assets of sixty-three millions without a shrinkage of thirty millions? If he will assure us, I would like to have the assurance that the nominal assets of the Dominion of Canada would realise to-morrow \$33,000,000. I do not believe they would. I believe we are entitled to add thirty million more to the net debt stated by the Government for the shrinkage in realising upon the assets. If that is the case, our net debt to-day has reached the enormous amount of \$224,123,000, a charge

of \$49.80 per head if our population is 4,500,000, or \$48.72 if it is 4,600,000, as I believe the hon. gentleman asserts it is. We will compare that state of the case with the debt of the United States. The hon. gentleman made the comparison. It is my duty to correct statements which I believe are not warranted by the facts. On the 1st November last the debt of the United States was \$1,403,482,948, which, on a population of 56,000,000, is \$25.15 *per capita*, against at least \$48.72 in Canada, if our assets would shrink thirty millions in realising. He says we ought to add the State debts, as we have nothing corresponding to them in Canada. We will add them. The State debts amounted last year to \$237,511,758 funded debt, and \$30,250,317 unfunded debt. We will add these sums and we have \$1,676,245,023 as the total debt of the United States State debt and National debt. Well, what does that amount to *per capita* on a population of 50,000,000? It amounts to \$29.93 per head. If we take the State debt and National debt of the United States and make a comparison of the *per capita* charge between the two countries, we will find that even upon that basis the debt of Canada exceeds the debt of the United States by \$18 per head, which is the position of the country to-day. And how has this debt been incurred? What has the Government to show for their debt?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Full value.

Mr. CHARLTON. Public works, paying one fifteenth of 1 per cent.; thirty or forty millions sunk in the Canadian Pacific Railway; assets comparatively valueless; forty millions in the Intercolonial Railway, that we will ultimately have to close—this is the character of our assets; this is the full value that we receive for the money. The United States incurred their debt to save the life of the nation, confronted by a crisis which threatened the dissolution of their Republic, threatened by a crisis which required that country to put forth its utmost exertions, to bury 500,000 of its sons upon the battle field, which required that country to expend thousands of millions of dollars—it was under these circumstances that the debt of that country was incurred, that debt which has been reduced to \$1,400,000,000. But we, in a time of profound peace, with no necessity resting upon us, have gone on piling up our debt until it exceeds the debt of the United States by a *per capita* charge of at least \$18 for ever man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada. And what is the outlook ahead? Can the hon. gentleman assure us that the limit of the accumulation of debt has been reached? Can he assure us that when he makes his next financial statement, if he should make it in this House, he will be able to point to any diminution of our public debt? Will he not, on the contrary, be called upon to inform us, when we meet here again, if Providence spares us, that millions upon millions more have been added to that burthen of debt already so great? Sir, it is inevitable that we will. It is inevitable that when he next makes the financial statement to this country, we will have added to our taxation, added to our expenditure, and enormous as our debt is already, it will have been considerably increased.

Now, Sir, with regard to the interest charge. Did I understand the hon. gentleman, when he made his financial statement, to say that the interest charge in the United States was as heavy as it is in Canada? I think not. He admitted that it was heavier in this country, but he minimised the interest charge here, and he presents a statement with regard to that matter more roseate than the circumstances and the truth will warrant. Now let us all look at that question. Assuming the population of the United States at 56,000,000, and that of Canada at 4,500,000, our interest charge last year of \$7,700,000 was at the rate of \$1.69 per head; while the interest charge of the United States last year of \$54,578,000—amounted to a *per capita* charge of 95 cents against \$1.69 in this country. That was the condition of

things last year. What will be the condition of things in 1886, according to the estimates of this Government and the estimates of the United States Government? In 1886 it is estimated by my hon. friend that it will require \$9,450,000 to pay the interest on our public debt, and upon the basis of his estimates our population will be 4,660,000, which will be a *per capita* charge of \$2.02. What will it be in the United States? It is estimated that their interest charge will be \$48,500,000 for a population of 57,500,000, so that the interest charge in the United States next year will be 84 cents per head, against \$2.02 in Canada. In 1887 it is inevitable that the interest charge in Canada will be three times as great as the interest charge in the United States, in proportion to the population.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Perhaps hon. gentlemen had better wait till 1887, and then see who will be right. I say that, in all human probability, the year 1837 will show that the interest charge of Canada is threefold as great as the interest charge of the United States—a brilliant record, surely, for the hon. gentlemen opposite; and the disparity will continue to increase. The debt of the United States is being reduced from year to year, the population of that country is swelling to an enormous magnitude, and its wealth is being increased in proportion, while, on the contrary, our debt is continually augmenting, and the interest charge is increasing in proportion. So much for the question of the public debt and the interest charge resting upon the two countries. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter of grave importance to this country. I see my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Rykert) laughing. He cannot see anything wrong in this. He cannot realise, Mr. Speaker, that this country, lying alongside the United States, is a competitor with the United States in inviting emigration from the old world to our North-West, lying untilled, and asking for millions of people to settle in it; he cannot realise that the question of which country has the greatest debt, the greatest interest charge and the heaviest taxation, will have anything to do with the settlement of that country in the future, or will have anything to do with its prosperity. Oh, no! He cannot realise that. It is a matter of no consequence whether we owe three times as much per head as the United States or owe five times as much. It is a matter of no consequence whether we squander our resources, whether we accumulate a vast public debt, or whether we imperil the future of this country—all that matters nothing. The hon. gentleman from Lincoln can laugh as Nero fiddled when Rome was burning; he can laugh over the dark future that lies before this country, in consequence of the mismanagement of the hon. gentleman opposite; but I believe it is a matter of very grave consequence to us all. I believe the time has come when we should carefully consider our financial position. I believe the time has come when we should recognise that we have been proceeding in a wrong direction, and when we should retrace, if possible, our steps.

Now, with regard to our expenditure. The expenditure in the year 1884, chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, was \$31,107,000, upon a population of 4,500,000, making a *per capita* expenditure of \$6.91. The expenditure of the United States in the same year was \$200,916,000, as stated by my hon. friend when he made his financial statement. The *per capita* charge in that country on a population of 56,000,000 is \$5.19, or \$1.72 less than the *per capita* charge in Canada. Then, if we deduct the sinking fund from the expenditure in each country, we will find the expenditure in Canada to be \$26,100,000, or \$5.80 per head; while the expenditure in the United States is \$244,000,000, or \$5.35 per head, an excess of \$1.45 per head in Canada as compared with the United States; and if we analyse the expenditure of the United States we

will find various items of expenditure there we do not have here. We will find, for instance, an enormous expenditure for pensions, amounting to over \$55,000,000 a year, and a very heavy expenditure for the purpose of maintaining an army and a navy. These are expenditures which we are in a measure free from. Our expenditure for pensions last year was \$95,500. If you multiply that by $12\frac{1}{2}$, the discrepancy of population between the two countries, our expenditure for that purpose would be \$1,194,275, corresponding exactly in magnitude to what the expenditure in the United States would be if its population was at the same proportion as ours. If you take our expenditure for militia at \$1,475,481, and multiply it by $12\frac{1}{2}$, you have \$18,443,512, which is the expenditure we would have incurred upon the same basis if our population were the same as the United States. Multiplying those expenditures by $12\frac{1}{2}$, in order to make them compare with the United States, what do we find? We find the expenses of the United States under those heads, when our corresponding expenditure is multiplied by $12\frac{1}{2}$, exceeds the expenditure in our case by \$83,637,670, and deducting that excess and the sinking fund from the ordinary expenditure, the *per capita* rate is \$2.86. There is another view to take, and I invite the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to it. The United States have no such thing as a consolidated account and a capital account; all goes to current account. There is no capital account kept. When I state the expenditure of the United States at \$290,000,000 I state the entire expenditure of that country. We had an expenditure last year, deducting sinking fund, of \$26,000,000; we had, in addition, the expenditure on capital account, without counting payments of debts to Provinces, \$16,800,000. We spent last year, to say nothing of debts paid to Provinces, \$42,905,529. To make a fair comparison between this country and the United States, we have to take, on the one hand, the total expenditure, \$42,905,529, and on the other hand the total expenditure in the United States, \$290,916,473. If we make that comparison, and this is a fair basis, we find that the *per capita* expenditure for all purposes is in Canada \$9.41, and in the United States for all purposes, except payment of public debt, \$5.19. This is a fair comparison to make with respect to the expenditure of the two countries.

A word with respect to the taxation of the two countries. As I said a short time ago, the proper measure of taxation in this country is that derived from Customs. Excise duties are voluntary; you may pay them or not, as you please; Customs duties are involuntary; to them all men must contribute. The United States average annual Customs, from 1st July, 1879, to 1st July, 1884, was \$3.82 *per capita*. The annual average for the same period in this country was \$4.52, upon the basis of population as represented by the Finance Minister. If we take the United States Customs taxation for last year, we will find that the *per capita* amount was \$3.64, while our own taxation from Customs was \$4.45 *per capita*. If we take 1883, the Customs taxation in the United States averaged \$3.97 per head, as against \$5.22 in this Dominion. So much for the rates of taxation imposed in the two countries.

If we compare the expenditure in this country with the expenditure of the United States in different eras, we will find some startling contrasts. It will be remembered that this is a young country. If we go back to the history of the United States, to the time when that country was in a similar condition to our own, when it had not attained the proportions of one of the great powers of the globe, and if we make a comparison between the expenditure in that country then and the expenditure here, now, we will find, I say, some startling contrasts. I invite the attention of the Finance Minister to a few of these contrasts. I will take the years 1790, 1800, 1810, 1820, 1830,

Mr. CHARLTON.

1840, 1850, 1860; and in making these comparisons, I do not include interest paid on public debt on either side. The figures are as follows:

CANADA—ORDINARY EXPENDITURE, 1884.

Excluding interest, \$23,407,526.
Population, say 4,500,000; *per capita*, \$5.13.

UNITED STATES.

1790—Population, 3,919,214. Net ordinary expenditure, excluding interest, \$1,919,589. *Per capita*, 49 cents— $\frac{1}{10}$ our rate. Navy and war, in all cases offset subsidies.
1800—Population, 5,294,390. Expenditure, \$7,411,360, of which \$3,300,000 for war and navy. *Per capita*, \$1.40— $\frac{2}{3}$ our rate.
1810—Population, 7,230,809. Expenditure, \$5,311,032. *Per capita*, 73 cents— $\frac{1}{2}$ our rate.
1820—Population, 9,633,822. Expenditure, \$13,134,530, of which war, navy and pensions, \$10,226,758. Total *per capita*, \$1.36— $\frac{2}{3}$ our rate.
1830—Population, 12,866,020. Expenditure, \$13,229,533. *Per capita*, \$1.02— $\frac{1}{3}$ our rate.
1840—Population, 17,069,453. Expenditure, \$24,139,920, of which war, navy and pension, \$15,812,525. Total *per capita*, \$1.41— $\frac{2}{3}$ our rate.
1850—Population, 23,191,876. Expenditure, \$37,165,990, of which war and navy, \$19,458,634. *Per capita*, \$1.60— $\frac{1}{2}$ our rate.
1860—Population, 31,443,321. Expenditure, \$51,912,634; war, navy and pensions, \$29,037,653; balance, \$25,824,981. Total *per capita*, \$1.74— $\frac{1}{3}$ our rate.

I suppose these figures do not suit hon. gentlemen opposite, but the Finance Minister instituted a set of comparisons between the expenditures of the United States and Canada, and I want to show what is the real relative position of each of these two countries. I wish to call his attention to it, because he occupies a responsible position in this matter, and it is time for him to put on the brakes.

I wish to make one more comparison only. We launched out as a nation in 1867. I want to take that year and compare the expense or the taxation per head for expenditure in Canada and the United States, and then I want to see how we have travelled together; I want to make the comparison for this year and see whether we have lost or gained ground in the race which we must necessarily and inevitably run with that country. In 1867-68 the taxation of the United States, receipts from Customs and internal revenue, and the direct income tax, was \$357,000,000 on a population of 36,500,000, or a *per capita* tax of \$9.30. The ordinary expenditures in that year, and the payment of interest on debt was \$370,339,000, or a *per capita* expenditure of \$11.46. Now, we made a favorable contrast with the United States for that year. Our Custom and Excise taxation for that year was \$11,590,000, or \$3.40 *per capita*. Our expenditure was \$13,486,000, or \$3.93 per head, and the United States spent that year \$6.40 per head more than we did. Their taxation was $2\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. greater than ours, and their expenditure $2\frac{2}{10}$ per cent. greater, or \$7.53 per head greater. If we come to the year 1883-84 we find that the United States Customs and internal revenue taxation amounted to \$5.65 per head, and ours to \$5.62; or, in other words, while their taxation was nearly three times greater than ours in 1867, there was a difference of only 3 cents per head in 1884. The United States expenditure in 1884 was \$5.19 per head, and ours was \$6.91 per head, so that while theirs was almost three times as great as ours in 1867-63 it was \$1.72 less this year. This comparison is a suggestive one. If, eighteen years ago, the United States, burthened from taxation, had an expenditure nearly three times as great as it was in Canada; if, in 1854, the expenditure of the United States is \$1.72 less than Canada, there is food for thought in that statement; and if we are to continue to travel in that direction what will the contrast be in the next eighteen years? I say that if we are to go on in that direction we will not exist as a people in eighteen years, to institute comparisons between the two countries; we will have reached the goal of ruin before that time, if we are to continue in the course we have been pursuing in the last eighteen years.

Now, I shall be told, I have no doubt, that I am unpatriotic; I shall be told that these statements will be taken up by the American immigration agents; I shall be told that I am prejudicing the interests of Canada—in doing what? In telling the truth? Sir, I am not prejudicing the interests of Canada. I am warning the gentlemen in charge of the interests of Canada as to the condition of this country at this moment. I am warning them as to the dangers which threaten this country, as to the results which will attend persistence in the policy they are now pursuing. Sir, we cannot conceal our position from the United States or from any other intelligent men. It is not necessary to tell them; they know it. But we can inform ourselves, and it is necessary that the people of Canada should know the truth. It is necessary that the people of Canada should know the affairs of this country, and it is nothing short of criminal to conceal from the people of Canada the actual condition of the public affairs of this Dominion. I do not intend to conceal them. And gentlemen may prate about unpatriotic conduct and injuring the country if they choose. We have heard enough of that stuff; it is the business of an Opposition to criticise the policy of the Government, and expose what is wrong, to warn the Government and the people, if the Government is recreant to its trust, recreant to its duty.

Now I have just a word to say, by way of variety, about assisted passages. I have here a little morsel I came across accidentally, in the shape of an extract from a speech made by Sir Charles Tupper in Toronto, on the 11th day of May, 1878. It came to my mind when I heard his son, the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), speaking with reference to immigration. On that occasion Sir Charles Tupper used the following language:—

SIR CHARLES TUPPER. "I tell you that this Government within four years have spent one million dollars in bringing emigrants into this country. What for—to starve? (Hear, hear). The Finance Minister says his remedy is to tell the people to work harder and to be more frugal. Well, we may be willing to eat and drink less, to spend less on dress and to be more frugal, and we are willing to work hard, but we want work to do."

The arraignment was that the iniquitous Government of Mr. Mackenzie had spent a million of dollars in assisting immigration in the last four years. Well, what is the record of hon. gentlemen opposite? Have they spent anything? I looked at the Public Accounts and I find that they have spent for immigration and quarantine for the last four years \$1,516,000. I had not time to subtract the exact sum chargeable to quarantine, but I venture to say that they have spent in the four years for immigration purposes an amount exceeding by \$300,000 the sum stated by Sir Charles Tupper in 1878, when he arraigned the Government of that day for spending that money. I am free to admit that I believe the whole system of assisted passages is wrong. I believe we want the class of immigrants for Canada who are able to pay their own way, and that we are in danger, if we assist immigrants, of assisting criminals and jail birds, and the most undesirable classes of immigrants—those who have not the energy to pay their own way. I think we might very properly adopt the policy of the United States, which does not assist immigrants, but on the contrary, taxes its immigrants—taxes the steamship companies for the purpose of providing hospitals, and maintaining Castle Garden, and looking after the welfare of immigrants in going to their destination. I believe that that is a more wise and prudent policy than the one we have been pursuing hitherto.

Now, Sir, I come to the consideration of the question of expenditure, which I shall treat as briefly as may be, and in reference to this matter I ask the attention of the House to an extract from a speech made by the leader of the present Government, regarding the mode in which the finances were managed by his predecessors. The speech

was made in Toronto on 11th May, 1883, in response to an address delivered to that hon. gentleman. He says:

"We have endeavored to raise up this country from the incompetent men who unworthily hold the reins of power. Of those men I may say that their reign is to be a short one, and that the people are going to rise in their might at the coming election and sweep jobbery, corruption and incapacity into one common ruin."

Well, Sir, the people arose in their might, and they swept away—what? They swept jobbery, corruption and incapacity into power on the crest of a great tidal wave of folly and fatuity. We will examine the record of these two Governments—and the record will prove what I say; we shall examine the record of the two Governments as to the expenditure and the management of the finances of this country. These are the gentlemen, Sir, charging jobbery, who have been guilty of such little peccadilloes as the Onderdonk contract, who did not dare to allow a Bill introduced by my hon. friend who sits near me, to prohibit contractors from subscribing to election funds, from becoming the law of the land; who have refused, Session after Session, to enact that the contractors of this Government shall not be contributors to its election funds; those gentlemen, who charge corruption on the gentlemen whom they supplanted in power, are gentlemen who at that very time had resting upon them a stain which will be an indelible stain not only on them, but on Canada, so long as Canada has a history—the sale of a great charter, the Pacific Scandal. These men who charge corruption on the men they supplanted are men who have given away vast areas of this country without competition, and in many cases at one hundred times less than its value, to their favorites, in violation of every principle of justice and honesty—who have given away areas large enough for dukedoms and principalities, as pasture land, or as timber or coal leases, on almost nominal terms. No wonder this Government is popular with a certain class. No wonder it is strongly entrenched, when it has made a corrupt use of the influences at its command for the purpose of securing the favor of its friends. The gentleman who leads this Government, and whom I am sorry not to see in his seat, I will do him the justice to say, no doubt, has acted worse than he would have wished, on many occasions. I have no doubt that the heterogeneous elements he has been obliged to reconcile, and the political difficulties he has had to face, have forced him to commit acts that his better nature revolted against. The trouble with him is, that he is a first-class politician and a fifteenth-rate statesman. He can manage public men with the greatest facility, but as for the principles that actuate a statesman, to demand that if his principles are not carried out he will resign, if he was called upon to live up to that standard, he is not there. He reminds me of a story of an African preacher who was warning his congregation against the danger that confronted them in a spiritual sense. He said: "My brethren, the broad road leads to destruction, and the narrow road leads to damnation." Then a hearer in the congregation cried out: "Then this African takes to the woods." It is so with this hon. gentleman. He will take to the woods or to the narrow way, or will take any course in order that he may remain in power; and so, as I have said, on many occasions, he has taken positions and committed acts that his better nature has revolted against. With regard to the charge of incapacity preferred against the gentlemen now on the Opposition benches, that charge is made by the men who made the Pacific Railway contract, and who, when that contract was laid before this House, and it became evident that a better offer was made, refused to retrace their steps, and refused to comply with the law of the land and advertise for tenders in order to secure the construction of that work on terms more favorable to the country. The men who gave, or will give, to that syndicate more money than the road cost, in addition to the

25,000,000 acres of land; the men who have piled up a debt of \$225,000,000 upon this country; the men who have adopted a scale of expenditure which, if continued, will inevitably force this Government to resort to direct taxation to raise money, in addition to all they can squeeze out of the country by indirect taxation—these are the men who prefer the charge of incapacity, jobbery and corruption against the men they supplanted. Well, Sir, we will examine the financial record of the two Governments; and, first of all, we will take the general expenditure. I made this comparison partly last Session; but I had not then the complete returns as to the expenditure of 1884. I placed that expenditure too high; it was supposed that it would be higher than it has actually proved to be. I shall make this comparison to-night briefly. I start at the year 1863, with an expenditure of \$13,486,092, under hon. gentlemen opposite, who continued in power six years and increased that expenditure to \$23,316,316, in 1874. It may be asserted that my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) administered the affairs of the country for eight months of that financial year. It is true he did; but, Sir, he came within the estimate of my hon. friend opposite. My hon. friend opposite asked for \$23,685,009, and the expenditure was only \$23,316,316. Now, the increase in those six years was \$9,830,224, a percentage of 72 per cent., while the increase of population during the same period was only 11 per cent. The increase of the expenditure exceeded the increase of population by six and a-half times. Now, we turn to the record of the corrupt men who were driven out of power on account of incapacity, jobbery and corruption. They commenced in 1874 with an expenditure of \$23,316,316, and they went out of office in 1879 with an expenditure, based upon the estimates of my hon. friend, of \$23,669,000. It is true, that expenditure was somewhat increased, owing to the fact that the hon. gentleman opposite was in office eight months of that financial year; but the increase over Sir Richard Cartwright's estimates was due to them. This shows an increase, from 1874 to 1879, of \$352,684, or an average of \$70,536 a year, against an annual average increase of \$1,638,370 under their predecessors. Now, Sir, we have commenced on the third term of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Upon my hon. friend's estimate of \$23,669,000 they commenced operations. They increased the expenditure of that year. My hon. friend assures us that he would have kept the expenditure within the estimates, and we have reason to believe he would, inasmuch as he reduced the expenditure between 1877 and 1878 by \$16,000. If this be the case, those hon. gentlemen, starting with an expenditure of \$23,669,000, in 1879, have increased it, to \$31,107,706, in 1884. They have increased the expenditure by \$7,438,706, or 31 per cent., while the population of the country has increased but 9 per cent. They have increased their expenditure in the last period three and a-half times faster than the population has increased. But for the manipulation in the Dominion lands account, but for the placing to capital account the \$723,000 that ought to have been placed on the consolidated fund account, the comparison would have been \$723,000 worse than it is.

But there is another basis upon which to institute this comparison, and it is a fairer basis than the one I have adopted. If we take our Public Accounts and look at our balance sheet, we will find that the expenses chargeable to Consolidated Fund is placed under three heads. We find, first, the classification of charges on account of Debt, Subsidies or Sinking Fund, and so forth. These are fixed charges; they cannot be varied; whatever subsidies have to be paid, whatever interest is charged upon the public debt, whatever sum has to be put into the sinking fund, these sums must be paid. The pruning knife cannot be applied here; the Government cannot reduce the appropriation for these expenses. Then we have charges on revenue, the charges for collecting Customs, the charges of carrying on the

Mr. CHARLTON.

operations of the Post Office Department, the charges for the Excise Department, the charges for managing Public Works—these are charges that, so far from the Government being able to retrench them, must inevitably increase to a small extent every year. The pruning knife cannot be applied to those. If the pruning knife is to be applied at all, it must be to that class known as controllable expenditure, expenditure on account of Legislation, Administration of Justice, Civil Government, appropriations for Public Works, Militia expenditure, and expenditures of that character. It is to those the pruning knife may be applied, and I propose to institute a comparison between the expenditure of the two Governments as regards controllable expenditure, so that we may see what each Government has accomplished in the matter of retrenchment. We will take the period from 1868 to 1874, when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. Starting with a controllable expenditure, in 1868, of \$3,631,000, they had increased that by 1874 to \$8,324,075, or an increase of \$4,693,000 in six years, or 129 per cent., averaging annually 29½ per cent., or an increase in expenditure 12½ times more rapid than the increase in population. We will take the period when the incompetents came into power—when the jobbers and the corruptionists were put at the head of affairs. They started in 1874 with an expenditure of \$8,324,075; in 1879 the expenditure amounted to \$6,941,577, showing that they had effected a reduction in controllable expenditure of \$1,382,498, or 16 per cent. of a reduction against an advance of 29 per cent. by their predecessors. We then come to 1879, when the Government changed and hon. gentlemen opposite came into office. They started with a controllable expenditure of \$6,941,577, and in 1884 they had succeeded in raising it to the amount of \$11,294,374, an increase of \$4,352,797, or 62 per cent., giving an annual average of 12¼ per cent., or an increase seven times more rapid than the increase in population. If we add to this controllable expenditure the sum improperly placed to capital account, with regard to expenditure on Dominion lands, \$723,000, we will find that the increase was \$5,000,000, or 72 per cent. So much for the comparison of the expenditures, first, under the head of total expenditure chargeable to the Consolidated Fund, and secondly, under the head of Controllable Expenditure, the latter being the only one in which the Government can exercise its power of retrenchment:

I propose to occupy the attention of the House a few moments in making a comparison of the expenditures in certain Departments of the Government, coming under the head of Controllable Expenditure, made by each Administration; and, in whatever way we institute the comparison between the financial record of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) and that of the Finance Minister, we will find that in every instance it will redound to the credit of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright). I will take the Departments of Civil Government, the Department of Public Works chargeable to Consolidated Fund, the Dominion Lands and the Department of Public Works chargeable to revenue, and will institute a comparison in each case. As regards Civil Government, I would like to call the attention of the Finance Minister to this comparison I am about to make, because he may feel disposed to emulate in future the good example set to him in the past by my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright). In 1868 there was expended on Civil Government \$594,441; in 1874, \$883,685, an increase of \$289,244, or 48 per cent., or an average annual increase of 8 per cent., four and a-half times greater than the increase in population. Then my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) came into office; and starting with that expenditure of \$883,685, in 1874, he reduced it, in 1878, to \$823,369, a decrease of \$60,316, or 6¾ per cent. decrease against an increase in the preceding period of 48 per cent. Then the gentlemen who drove these incompetents from power came in, and they started with this expenditure of \$822,369,

which, by 1884, they had increased to \$1,084,417, an increase of \$261,048, or 31 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., being an average annual increase of 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., three times that of the population in this, the second period in office of hon. gentlemen opposite, and four and a-half times that of the population during their first period in office, as against a decrease of 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent. during the period my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright) was in power. Next, take up Public Works chargeable to Consolidated Fund. Here is an opportunity to exercise economy, but also here is an opportunity to launch out into lavish and unjustifiable expenditure, for the purpose of bribing constituencies—making canals, promising to erect, and erecting public works, spending money lavishly by this means in various constituencies, in order to influence public sentiment in favor of the Government nominees. That power may be used; that power has been used. Perhaps it would be unparliamentary to say that power is being used; but it certainly has been used. I will point out a most striking contrast between the records of the Finance Minister and that of my hon. friend (Sir Richard Cartwright). Hon. gentlemen opposite started in 1868 with an expenditure under this head of \$126,269; in 1874, when these gentlemen went out of power, their expenditure had reached \$1,826,000, an increase of \$1,699,722, or 1346 per cent., making an annual average increase of 224 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., 128 times faster than the increase of population. Then the Reform Administration came into power and, starting with an expenditure of \$1,826,000, in 1874, they had succeeded in reducing that, in 1878, to \$998,594, a reduction of \$827,407, a reduction of 45 per cent., an annual reduction of 11 per cent., against an annual increase under their predecessors of 224 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. Then the gentlemen opposite came into power, and, starting with this expenditure of \$998,594, in 1878, they ran it up, in 1884, to \$2,908,851, an increase of \$1,910,257, or 191 per cent., an average increase of 32 per cent., an increase eighteen times greater than the increase in the population of this Dominion. That is a pretty nice record. These men are entitled, I think, to talk about jobbery, and corruption, and incapacity, when speaking of gentlemen on this side of the House. And next, with regard to Dominion Lands. In 1868 we spent nothing; in 1874 the expenditure was \$283,163. Starting with that expenditure in 1874, my hon. friend reduced it, in 1878, to \$87,628, a reduction of \$195,535, an annual average decrease of \$48,883, a reduction for the period of 69 per cent., or an average annual decrease of 17 per cent. Then our friends opposite administered the affairs of that Department and, commencing with \$87,628 of an expenditure in 1878, they had, in 1884, an expenditure chargeable to income of \$166,890, and chargeable to capital—a device for cooking the accounts and making the expense seem less than it really is—\$723,658, a total of \$890,548, an increase of \$802,920 in six years, an average annual increase of \$133,821, a total increase of 1016 per cent., or an annual average increase of 169 per cent., or ninety-six times faster than the increase in the population. In Public Works chargeable to Revenue—that is the management of our public works, our railways and canals—we started, in 1868, with an expenditure of \$626,286; gentlemen opposite ran up the expenditure to \$2,359,679 in 1874, an increase of \$1,763,393, or 281 per cent., an average annual increase of \$293,898, or 47 per cent., an increase twenty-seven times faster than the increase in the population of the country. Then the incompetents came in and, starting with the expenditure of \$2,359,679, in 1874, in four years they had increased it to \$2,471,437, an increase of \$81,758, or 3 $\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. for the period. Then the gentlemen opposite took charge of the administration of that Department again, and commencing with an expenditure of \$2,471,437, in 1878, they had increased that expenditure to \$3,302,791 in 1884, an increase of \$831,354, or 33 per cent., an average annual in-

crease of \$138,559, or 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. This is the record. These are the comparisons, these are the contrasts that exist between the management of these Departments by the two Governments, and nothing could be more striking, nothing could be more satisfactory as an evidence of the economy and careful management of these affairs upon the one hand, and the recklessness which characterises the management of these affairs upon the other.

What is the significance to us, as a people, of our increasing expenditure and our diminishing revenue? Is there any cause for alarm in the future? Is there any cause for supposing that my hon. friend will be able to boast of surpluses of \$4,000,000 or \$5,000,000 a year in the near future? Is there any cause for fear that he, too, may be troubled with deficits, that he may possibly be characterised by some person opposed to him in politics as the "King of Deficits," as my hon. friend was a short time since? With a scale of expenditure this year reaching \$33,000,000, with a shrinkage in revenue from Customs and Excise of \$3,786,000 in the last year, with these causes in operation, I say that there is reason for grave alarm; I say that there is a danger that our finances may break down; I say that there is reason, good reason, for the inability of the Government to place the \$25,000,000 loan about to fall due; I say that there is good reason for their having a floating debt of from \$13,000,000 to \$15,000,000; I say that there is reason for their being obliged to resort to the desperate shifts which the man in business resorts to whose credit is not good and who goes "shinning" around the streets attempting to raise money to meet a note which is due and is threatened with protest. We have placed ourselves in a position of grave embarrassment, in consequence of reckless extravagance and mismanagement of the affairs of the country. I do not blame my hon. friend, who is the creature, the victim, of circumstances. He undoubtedly has been forced to a great degree into the position in which he is, but, whether forced or not, whether responsible or not, the difficulties which threaten the country are none the less real, and none the less to be lamented.

And, now, a few words in regard to our manufacturing industries, and I am done.

Mr. RYKERT. That is good.

Mr. CHARLTON. I hear the Minister of Customs say "that is good."

Mr. BOWELL. No; you did not.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am afraid he is like the old Scotch elder, who was accused of being hard-headed and not open to conviction, and who denied the accusation, and stated that he was open to conviction, "but," he added, "I would like to see the man who would convince me." That is the characteristic of my hon. friend opposite.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not happen to say anything, so your story does not apply.

Mr. CHARLTON. I am afraid that the warnings I have given have fallen upon that hon. gentleman unheeded, and that they will have no effect upon him or upon the Finance Minister. It troubles me to think that efforts so well meant and truths so palpable should have so little effect upon those to whom they are directed.

Mr. BOWELL. Love's labor lost.

Mr. CHARLTON. I wish to ask this question: Did our manufacturing interests, when the National Policy was introduced, require additional protection? I answer that they did not. They had attained a great development under a revenue tariff of 15 per cent., raised to 17 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in the last two years. I say that, in 1871, if our census statistics are reliable, we had \$125,000,000 worth of material consumed by our manufactures in Canada

that year, that the products of the manufactures were \$221,500,000, that we had \$78,000,000 of capital invested, that \$40,850,000 were paid in wages, that 158,000 people were employed. I say that was a respectable, nay, more than a respectable, that it was a marvellous development of manufacturing industries in a country so young and so poor as Canada was then; and, if the manufacturing industries of Canada had attained that degree of development under a 15 per cent. revenue tariff in 1871, I say that no necessity existed in this country for any additional protection. I say that without fear of contradiction, and I shall point out, before I finish, that the development of the manufacturing industries of this country has been greater and more satisfactory than those of the United States in the last decade under a high protective tariff. What industry have we in prosperous operation in Canada to-day that did not exist before the National Policy came into operation? What branch of manufacturing industry is prosecuted now that was not prosecuted then? We hear people talk of the National Policy—the advocates of the policy—and you would imagine, from their air, from their assertions, from their claims, that the National Policy created the manufacturing industries of Canada, and that before this National Policy was adopted we had nothing of the kind. That is not the case. The National Policy may have accelerated to some extent the development of the manufacturing industries of the country, and it accelerated them, if it has done so, in an unhealthy manner. The stimulation has been unhealthy, and the manufacturing industries of the country are to-day, I believe, in a worse position than they would have been if no such stimulant had been applied. Were not our manufacturing industries prosperous before this National Policy came into operation? A careful comparison of the industries of the United States with those of Canada will prove beyond controversy that the manufactures of Canada, during the entire period of depression, from 1873 to 1878, were more prosperous, were earning better dividends, were more fully employed, than those of the United States. That is an assertion I make broadly; it is one that can be substantiated; it is one that does not admit of denial. Why, then, did we need the protective policy? The very prosperity that came to our manufactures after the passage of the National Policy Tariff was a prosperity due in a great measure to the revival of trade. Not only in Canada, but all over the world, an immense impetus was given to business. It was an impetus that business received, not from the tariff of Canada, not from any tariff, but from the passing away of that long period of commercial depression that sat like a nightmare upon the industries of every civilized nation, from 1874 to 1878, and the prosperity that resulted from natural causes; the prosperity that came from the passing away of that serious depression that weighed upon every industrial occupation, every industrial interest, and every commercial interest in the civilized world—I say the prosperity that was due to the removal of that depression has been falsely attributed to the National Policy; and if the National Policy had not been adopted I firmly believe that the manufacturers of Canada would have made as good progress and would have been in a more healthy condition to-day than they are now under the operation of that policy.

Now, Sir, I have one little fact to present to the House, which I think will convince any candid member that the protection we afford is higher than necessary. One of the arguments of protectionists is that it is necessary to protect the manufacturer because he pays higher wages than are paid in England—it is claimed in the United States that the wages are 60 to 70 per cent. higher than in England. Well, we will admit that it is necessary to afford a degree of protection that will enable the manufacturer to pay double the wages paid in Great Britain—what amount of protection would be required?

Mr. CHARLTON.

What percentage of the cost of the fabrics and wares produced in this country and produced in the United States is chargeable to wages? That is the question. The census returns of the United States show that 17 per cent. of the cost of the products of the manufacturers is the cost of the wages paid to the operatives, and the balance is due to the raw material and other charges. Our census returns show that 19 $\frac{2}{3}$ of the cost of fabrics produced by our manufacturers is chargeable to wages. Well, Sir, if you are going to enable the manufacturer of Canada to pay double the wages paid in England, how much protection does he want to overcome that? Why, he wants one-half of that 19 per cent.; he wants 10 per cent. protection, 10 per cent. higher prices, in order to enable him to pay double the wages paid in England, because the total cost of the wages to him is 19 $\frac{2}{3}$ per cent. In the United States 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. protection is sufficient to enable the manufacturer to pay double the wages paid in Great Britain; and so the people of this country have been deceived as to the degree of protection necessary in order to enable our manufacturers to meet what they claim are the additional burdens imposed upon them as compared with Great Britain.

Now, Sir, I promised a few moments ago to show that the progress of manufactures in this country and the progress of manufactures in the United States had been satisfactory, healthy, and rapid, under a revenue tariff policy. We have seen, in the United States, a period of revenue tariff policy extending from the year 1846 to 1860; and we have seen a period of a protective policy extending from 1861 down to the present date. Now if we take the returns from the United States for the four years between 1846 and 1850, under this revenue tariff policy, and if we take the decade between 1850 and 1860, passed entirely under the operation of a revenue tariff policy, which was well settled and had been in operation four years before the decade commenced, and compare the progress made by the manufacturing industries of that decade with the progress made in the two succeeding decades, we will have the data upon which to form an opinion as to whether manufacturers did really get an advantage under the revenue tariff, and as to whether a protective tariff is essential to their development. Now, I shall not trouble the House with a table I have here, which goes exhaustively into the capital, the material used, the amount of products, the amount paid, the wages, and the number of hands; but I will point out the percentages of increase under these various heads during the three decades:

Capital—1850 to 1860.....	89 per cent.
“ 1860 to 1870.....	109 “
“ 1870 to 1880.....	31 $\frac{1}{2}$ “
Hands—1850 to 1860.....	37 per cent.
“ 1860 to 1870.....	47 “
“ 1870 to 1880.....	31 “
Wages—1850 to 1860.....	60 per cent.
“ 1860 to 1870.....	102 currency
“ 1870 to 1880.....	22 gold.
Products—1850 to 1860.....	85 per cent.
“ 1860 to 1870.....	124 currency
“ 1870 to 1880.....	26 gold.

Now, what do these figures show? They show that the increase in capital, in hands, in wages, in products, was very little greater under the stimulation of high protective duties from 1860 to 1870, than it was under the revenue tariff from 1850 to 1860, and they show that the increase in these various points was very much less under the protective duties from 1870 to 1880 than from 1850 to 1860. The average increase for twenty years was less than the average annual increase in the ten years under a revenue tariff. That is the record of the United States with regard to protection vs. a revenue tariff. It is worth while mentioning in this connection, that the popular vote in the United States in 1880 was

526,000 in favor of a revenue tariff, and that in 1884 a revenue tariff President has been elected by the popular vote after twenty years' trial of protection.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CHARLTON. Yes; it is worth hearing. It is suggestive. It points to a moral that we would do well to heed.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The language Mr. Cleveland used was just such language as would be used on our side of the House as to this policy.

Mr. CHARLTON. The language he used, the language his party uses, the language his supporters use, is that the tariff of the United States is an unjust and an oppressive tariff, and that duties should be levied for revenue purposes only. That is the plank on which Mr. Cleveland was elected President of the United States. We come now to the growth of manufactures in Canada, and I ask the hon. Minister's attention to the statistics I am about to quote. They are very suggestive also. The more you look into them the more hollow the pretensions of the hon. gentleman seem. I will make a comparison with respect to the growth of manufactures in this country during the last ten years. It may be claimed that a part of this growth is due to the National Policy. I do not know to what extent the hon. gentleman would make that claim. But eight years of the ten years between 1871 and 1881 were under a revenue tariff. The change came in 1879, and you may fairly assume that the influences exercised by the National Policy, whatever they were, were not fairly brought into play until the expiration of a year, at least, and so nine of the ten years were passed under a revenue tariff policy. I assume that, I assert it, that of the decade between 1871 and 1881, nine of the ten years were under a revenue tariff, and whatever progress was made by the manufacturing industries of Canada, it was largely due to the operation of a revenue tariff policy. Let us see what the progress was. Here are the figures:

CANADA.			
<i>Capital invested.</i>			
1871.....	\$77,964,000	1881.....	\$165,302,000
	Increase.....		\$87,338,000. Per cent. 112.
<i>Material consumed.</i>			
1871.....	\$124,907,000.	1881.....	\$179,918,000
	Increase.....		\$55,011,000. Per cent. 44.
<i>Products.</i>			
1871.....	\$221,617,080.	1881.....	\$309,616,000.
	Increase.....		\$87,999,000. Per cent. 39.
<i>Hands employed.</i>			
1871.....	187,942.	1881.....	254,935.
	Increase.....		66,993. Per cent. 35.
<i>Wages paid.</i>			
1871.....	\$40,851,000.	1881.....	\$59,429,000.
	Increase.....		\$18,518,000. Per cent. 45.
Ratio increase of population...20.			
Ratio increase of Capital exceeds	Ratio increase of Pop.	5½ times.	
" " Material " " " "	" " " " " "	2½ " "	
" " Products " " " "	" " " " " "	2 " "	
" " Hands " " " "	" " " " " "	1½ " "	
" " Wages " " " "	" " " " " "	2½ " "	
Increase exceeds U. S. last decade,	Capital...80 p. c.—or threefold.		
" " " " " "	Material. 7 p. c.		
" " " " " "	Products 13 p. c.—½ more.		
" " " " " "	Hands... 4 p. c.		
" " " " " "	Wages... 23 p. c.—or double.		

That is the record with respect to the progress made by manufactures in Canada: first, up to 1871 under a clear and distinct revenue tariff policy, and second from 1871 to 1881 under a revenue tariff for nine-tenths of the period at least, which shows a vastly greater development of manufacturing interests in this country than was acquired in the United States under a high protective tariff from 1870 to 1880.

Wherever we may look we cannot fail to be impressed by the fact that a satisfactory and rapid development of the manufacturing interests of this country has been secured under a revenue tariff policy, and that an equally satisfactory and an equally rapid development of the manufacturing interests of the United States has also been secured under a revenue tariff policy. The manufacturing industries of the United States were in a stronger and more healthy condition in 1860 than they were in 1884. The exports of the manufacturers of that country were relatively larger than they are now. The exports of cotton goods in 1860 were larger than they have ever been since, except one or two years; and if the progress made from 1850 to 1860 under the revenue tariff policy had been maintained till 1884, the development of the manufacturing interests of the United States would have been as great as it is to-day. Will the hon. Minister assure me that his policy has benefited any considerable class in this country? Will he tell me it has benefited the lumberman? I know it has not. Will he tell me it has benefited the fisherman of his native Province and of Nova Scotia?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. No; no man of common sense will say so. Will he tell me it has benefited the laborers of Canada?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will he tell me it has benefited the cotton operative, who is working on short time and at reduced pay, and whose average earnings are \$45 less a year than in 1878? The laborers will tell him, no. Will the hon. gentleman tell me it has benefited the farmer?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. CHARLTON. Will he tell me that the National Policy is not, in some measure, responsible for the present depression in prices?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. CHARLTON. I say yes; and I will demonstrate it. It is true that, as a rule, you cannot raise or lower the price of produce by the operation of a tariff; but a policy may be adopted by a country which, in the end, will produce important results, either in advancing or in depressing the prices of produce. England is the great market for Canada and the United States. England buys her food and she produces the fabrics that the world consumes. She exchanges the products of her forges, looms, and mills for the produce of the farmers of the new world. That trade is a trade of mutual exchange, and it can be carried on only as an exchange. England cannot be excluded from the markets of the United States and Canada, and continue to draw from those countries her supplies of food. She must be able to give to those countries the productions of her labor in order to take from those countries the products of their labor. The United States, for twenty years, and Canada for six years, have adopted a fiscal policy of enmity to England, a policy the effect of which is designed to exclude the products of British labor from the markets of these countries. What has England done? Could she continue to buy her supplies of food from this continent and pay us in gold? Could she continue to sail her vessels to our ports in ballast, and charge double freight, because there was a cargo only one way? Has she not looked round to procure food supplies in exchange for the products of her labor? Has she not spent millions in constructing a railway system in India, so that she might reach the wheat fields at the base of the Hymalayas, and exchange with the Hindoos British products for a food supply? Yes, she has done it. She now consumes millions of bushels of Indian wheat a year, and she has been driven to this course by the hostile tariff policy of this country and the United States; and

when I assert that this policy has had a direct influence in depressing the price of agricultural produce in Canada, I assert what is patent to any man who examines the facts. Sir, the hon. gentleman has reduced the price of every bushel of wheat the Canadian farmer has to sell, of every bushel of farm produce he has to sell—he has reduced it by the operation of this policy, which has placed us at variance with our natural customers, and driven from the markets of Canada the people who are the consumers of our surplus food products. This has been the operation of the National Policy, a policy which has not only imposed direct taxes on the people of this country, in the shape of Customs duties, but has imposed indirect duties, in the shape of an enhanced cost of the ordinary articles of consumption of the people of this country, and imposed this additional taxation in the shape of a reduction in the price of farm produce. Not for one hundred years has wheat been lower in England than it is to-day, because she has reached countries where that article can be produced cheaply. Not for many years has the price of wheat been lower than it is in Canada to-day, notwithstanding the vaunts and boasts of hon. gentlemen, that they would afford agricultural protection to the farmers of Canada. They offered them benefits and blessings. They have conferred on them curses instead.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple more extracts to read, and I read them for the purpose of reminding the Government that they boasted that they had certain powers which we now call on them to use. We call on them to redeem the promises they made, and exercise the powers which we were informed they possess. What are those powers? In 1878 Sir Charles Tupper, in a speech in this House, a speech which I heard delivered myself, made use of the following language:—

“The hon. gentleman ought to know that if Governments are good for anything they are good to increase the prosperity of a country by Acts of Parliament, or to meet difficulties in which a country is placed, from time to time, and which require legislative interference.”

And again, in 1878, the same gentleman made use of this language:

“The hon. gentleman may say that the prosperity of the country cannot be obtained and promoted by Acts of Parliament. We deny it. We say that you may make the very taxation necessary to sustain the public credit by meeting the interest on the public debt and discharging the ordinary administration of public affairs, a means of so fostering our industries as to give to the people the money that is required in order to pay the taxes.”

Now, here are two very important powers. The first power is to give prosperity by Act of Parliament, and the second power is to make the taxes of the country a means of giving the people the money required to pay the taxes. Now, we call upon the Government to exercise those beneficent powers. It was said once by a celebrated and pious king, “If I forget thee, oh Jerusalem, may my right hand forget its cunning.” Have these men forgotten their duties? They made promises which the Deity alone could fulfil. Or has their right hand forgot its cunning? or are they like the gods of old, upon whom Elijah called? Have they gone on a journey—have they gone on a journey, or are they asleep? Why, in the present juncture of affairs, with the present difficulties confronting us and surrounding us, and over us—why, with the financial gloom which is settling on this country, are not these gentlemen giving us prosperity by Act of Parliament, as they declared they could? Why are they not making this vast volume of taxation, which presses so heavily on the country, a means by which the prosperity of the country may be increased, by furnishing the money to pay these taxes, as they said it would. Sir, I am afraid we have little hope that these promises will be fulfilled. I fear, Sir, they are like many other promises, that they are, in fact, like all the promises made by the hon. gentleman, with reference to the operation of the National Policy, fallacious, foundationless, false. But, Sir, I think we must turn to the sad reality and face the difficulties that confront us.

Mr. CHARLTON.

I think we must realise that we cannot secure the blessings that their promises offered to us. If we could, all would be well. But in place of these blessings being likely to be ours we look abroad on an immense debt, on an enormous load of taxation; we look abroad on our swelling expenditures; we see the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate drinking up millions as the thirsty sand drinks up water, and calling for more. We see, in the near future, difficulties which may well appall the stoutest heart. We see a Government, backed by a following that seems ignorant, careless, and unconcerned as to the difficulties and dangers that threaten us; and Mr. Speaker, all we can do here is to protest—all we can do here is to call the attention of the Government to these difficulties and dangers; all we can do is to implore them to retrace in some measure their steps, and endeavor as far as they can, by prudence in future, to avert the calamities which recklessness in the past promises to impose on us.

Mr. McLELAN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 11th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

REPORT OF THE FACTORY COMMISSION.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire once again to call the attention of the Government, if they are the responsible parties, or of the Printing Committee if it is the responsible party, to the fact that the report of the Factory Commission has not yet been distributed. A very considerable time ago we saw advance sheets of that report in the hands of an hon. member who has taken part in the debate. Therefore there would seem to be no reason why, with due expedition, the report should not have been printed and placed in the hands of members with a view of being used in the debate.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I think the chairman of that committee stated the other day that instructions had been given to have it printed and distributed with the least possible delay.

Mr. BLAKE. That is always done.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot account for it. I thought the hon. member who was speaking on the other side was reading from manuscript; I thought it possible he might have taken the manuscript out of the office and might have delayed in returning it.

Mr. BLAKE. I noticed it from this distance, and saw he was reading printed matter.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We are as much annoyed by the delay as the hon. gentleman.

BROOKLYN BREAKWATER, N. S.

Mr. FORBES asked, Has wharfage been collected at the Brooklyn Breakwater, Queen's County, N.S.? If so, how much has been collected, by what vessels, or by whom paid, and to whom paid, from 1st January, 1881, to 1st January, 1884?

Mr. McLELAN. Wharfage has been collected at Brooklyn Breakwater, Queen's County, N.S. \$6.20 paid to wharfinger, Mr. F. T. Gardner, up to 1st January, 1884. Wharfinger does not give names of vessels, nor by whom paid, in his statement of account. Wharfinger appointed by Order in Council of 20th October, 1882. Of the \$6.20 mentioned, \$4.96 was deposited to the credit of the Receiver-General, and \$1.24 retained as commission. Since 1st January, 1884, Mr. Gardner has collected for wharfage \$12.87, of which \$10.30 has been deposited to credit of the Receiver-General and \$2.57 retained as commission.

THE POLARISCOPIC TEST FOR SUGAR.

Mr. VAIL asked, Whether the Government has, as promised last Session, investigated the question of adopting the polariscopic test for sugar? Whether the Government has reached a conclusion as to the propriety of adopting that test? Whether it is intended to propose to Parliament this Session the adoption of that test?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government have investigated the question referred to and have reached a conclusion, but it is not the present intention of the Government to ask Parliament to adopt that test.

HOMESTEADS WITHIN THE RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, How many homesteads have been entered within the Canadian Pacific Railway belt up to 31st December last, between,—1. The first and second principal meridians. 2. The second and third. 3. The third and fourth. 4. The fourth and fifth.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to this question, and will give the hon. gentleman the statement without any motion.

LIGHTHOUSE ON DISCOVERY ISLAND, B.C.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) asked, What has occasioned the delay in the construction of the lighthouse on Discovery Island, B.C., as provided for in the estimates 1884-85; at what particular spot is it to be located and upon whose recommendation?

Mr. McLELAN. It was late last Session when it was decided to erect a lighthouse at the point named. It was necessary to obtain the fullest possible information and to prepare the necessary plans. There were a great many other plans on the list ahead of this, and the time of the engineer was fully occupied with them. The plan is now ready, and tenders will be called for in a short time. The site selected is on the south slope of Pandora Hill, and the lighthouse was located by the agent of the Department.

SATUMA ISLAND, B.C.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to erect a lighthouse on the east point of Satuma Island, B.C.? If so, when?

Mr. McLELAN. The Government have not concluded to erect a lighthouse at that point.

BUOYS IN VICTORIA AND NANAIMO HARBORS.

Mr. BAKER, (Victoria) asked, What was the total cost of taking up, laying down and removal of the buoys, respectively, in the harbors of Victoria and Nanaimo and the sand heads of Fraser River?

Mr. McLELAN. The cost of the buoy service at Fraser River was \$1,064.49, and Nanaimo, \$49.20; Victoria and Esquimalt, \$21.66. The cost of taking up and laying down was not obtainable in the Department this morning, as the vouchers are before the Committee of Public Accounts.

CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. YEO asked, Is it the intention of the Government to spend the sum of \$5,000 voted last Session for the Cascumpec Harbor improvements?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Although the sum of \$5,000, voted two years, was not revoked last Session, this matter is now receiving the attention of the Government.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—TIMBER DUES.

Mr. CASEY asked, What amount has become due to the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company as timber dues? How much has been paid of this amount by said company, and at what dates?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government claim \$100,000, or thereabouts, from the company. The company dispute the claim, and say they are not liable for it. No payments have been made.

LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N.S.

Mr. FORBES asked, Is it the intention of the Government to replace the automatic buoy off the harbor of Liverpool, Queen's County, Nova Scotia, which either sunk at its moorings or parted them and went adrift in November last, with another automatic buoy or bell buoy, or by a fog whistle on Western Head or Coffin's Island, at the entrance of said harbor?

Mr. McLELAN. The matter is now under the consideration of the Government. It was found difficult to keep the automatic buoy moored. The Government are now considering whether to have an automatic buoy or some other kind.

THE SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, When will the plans and reports of the engineers, respecting the Short Line, be laid on the Table of the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Ere long.

THE LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR OF QUEBEC.

Mr. CASGRAIN asked, Whether His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec took the same oaths of office as his predecessors; and, if not, what oath did he take?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Lieutenant-Governor took the oath of allegiance and the oath of office; but not the oaths of office.

W. INGLES BRADLEY.

Mr. SOMERVILLE (Brant) moved for:

Return showing the number of days W. Ingles Bradley, clerk in the Department of Railways, has been registered on the departmental attendance book since July 1st, 1884; also showing the number of days attendance for which he has received payment, and the total amount paid, together with the name of the departmental officer certifying the account.

Mr. POPE. There is no objection to this return being brought down. The hon. member will find Bradley's name registered in the book on every day he worked in the Department, but he will not find his name registered there for every day when he worked for the Department outside.

Motion agreed to.

LAND CLAIMS BY BELL AND KAVANAGH.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved for:

1. Copy of all Orders in Council or Departmental Orders respecting S.E. ¼ Section 2, Township 10, Range 19 W. 2. Copies of all claims

made to said lands, and the action of the Government thereon. 3. Copies of all petitions, papers and correspondence with the Government by one Joseph Bell and one J. C. Kavanagh, and all other persons, and all replies thereto respecting said lands.

He said: Certain papers have been sent to me by Mr. Bell, of Brandon, Man., or rather by his solicitor. He complains that he has not been justly dealt with by the Department of the Interior, with respect to his claims for this lot. The facts, as I gather from the papers submitted to me, are as follows:—A person, whose name is not disclosed in the papers sent me, located upon the south-east quarter of section two, Township 10, Range 19 W., some three or four years ago. It is alleged that he made certain improvements on the land, built a small shanty upon it, and cultivated the land to some extent, but did not comply fully with the law with regard to homesteaders. It is alleged that a person by the name of J. C. Kavanagh, of the Town of Brandon, having discovered that the original locatee had not complied with the settlement duties jumped the original locatee's claim. He made application to the Crown Land Agent, at Brandon, and on the production of certain evidence he was allowed to make entry for the lot; in other words, as I understand it, Kavanagh—as I suppose he had a perfect right to do at that time—having found the land unoccupied and improved to the extent required by law, took advantage of that fact, and jumped the original homesteader's claim, and thus had the benefit of whatever little improvements he had made, small or great, but not sufficient, as I understand, to comply with the terms of the law. I do not complain of this, nor does, I believe, Mr. Bell or his solicitor, because the land not having been occupied, and the improvements not having been made as they ought to have been made, of course Kavanagh, if he was a settler, had a perfect right to jump the claim, get the entry and take advantage of any improvements made by the previous locatee. I believe it is over two years since Kavanagh jumped the claim of the original homesteader. Now, Kavanagh having jumped the claim of the original homesteader on the ground that he had not been an occupant of the land six months in every year for three years, and had not made the improvements, having taken possession of the land on that technical ground, Kavanagh himself was bound to obey the law. He was bound, if he was an actual settler, to remain on the land six months of every year for three years, and make the improvements required by law. Now, it appears that the law requires that every homesteader shall remain continuously for six months out of every year for three years on the land, that he shall build a house of given dimensions, and shall make a given quantity of improvements each year. It is said that Kavanagh, who got possession of the land in the way I have indicated, never did reside on the land at all, although it was over two years since he made the original entry, that he never built a house on the land of the dimensions required by law, or made any improvement of any kind. Now, this J. C. Kavanagh could not well do that, because, as I am informed, he is postmaster at Brandon, living in Brandon, while the land referred to in this motion is situated some four miles from the city, and Kavanagh never did reside for a single hour on this quarter section, and never made, it is alleged, one dollar's worth of improvements on the land. Now, it is further alleged that on the 18th of August of last year, a person by the name of Joseph Bell, who left the Province of Ontario last fall and went up to Manitoba to settle there, discovered this quarter-section vacant, and having made enquiries amongst his neighbors, was told that it had not been occupied for two years by anybody, he examined the improvements and found that the improvements required by law had not been made on the land. He then made application to the Crown Land Agent in the town of Brandon for the land, doing as Kavanagh before him had done, jumping

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

the claim of his predecessor. He supplied satisfactory evidence of the facts to the agent—that the land was unoccupied for about two years, and that the improvements had not been made, and the Crown Land Agent, as in duty bound to do, proceeded to make entry for Mr. Bell. It so happened that the post office in Brandon and the Crown Land Agent's office are not far apart, and singularly enough while Mr. Bell was in the act of having his entry made in the Crown Lands Office, Kavanagh's clerk entered the office with papers made out by Kavanagh himself, asking for the cancellation of Kavanagh's entry, and that the entry should be made for Kavanagh's clerk. The clerk produced papers in the office drawn up by Kavanagh asking that his (Kavanagh's) claim might be cancelled, and that the clerk might get an entry for the lot. However, the agent paid no attention to the application, and the entry was made in the name of Mr. Bell. If the matter had stood there Mr. Bell would have had no ground of complaint. The fact I have just mentioned, as far as I know, is established by a letter written by Mr. Todd, solicitor for Mr. Bell, to H. H. Smith, Inspector of Dominion Lands in Winnipeg, Manitoba, in which the following occurs:—

"In writing you on the 25th I forgot to mention the fact that at the same time, or while Mr. Bell was in the Land Office filing his cancellation papers, Mr. Kavanagh, by some means, heard of it, and immediately sent in his own clerk with papers made out to cancel the same quarter section, in his (the clerk's) favor. This fact shows positively that Mr. Kavanagh knew that he had not complied with the terms of the Act and could not legally hold the place."

Now, such are the facts so far as they are detailed to me; and I say that if these facts are correct it is quite clear that the action of Kavanagh in sending his own clerk to cancel his entry in favor of the clerk, is clear evidence that he knew that he had no right to the land, that he was not entitled to hold that quarter section under the law and the regulations of the Department. He was anxious that the entry should be cancelled to himself and be made out to his clerk. Now, this Mr. Bell is evidently not a speculator. That he intended to become an actual *bonâ fide* settler, I think, is clear enough from the communication of the 25th of September last, sent to the Inspector of Dominion Lands at Winnipeg, in which the following passage occurs:—

"Mr. Bell and his wife came out here from Ontario with a view to taking up land and becoming a *bonâ fide* settler, and in looking around found this place not occupied, but entered by cancellation of a former entry by Mr. J. C. Kavanagh. On making enquiry, he found that Mr. Kavanagh had never lived on the place or otherwise complied with the terms of the Act for homesteading. He, therefore, at once applied to have the entry cancelled, and filed his papers accordingly."

Now, Sir, the Statute, as I understand it, requires that an actual settler must remain on his land six months in the year and make certain improvements, unless he gets leave of absence. On the 18th day of August, Mr. Bell made his entry in the Crown Lands Office at Brandon, and his entry was received by the Crown Lands Agent. But sixteen days afterwards, Mr. Kavanagh made application for leave of absence; and having produced his medical certificate, he obtained leave of absence. Now, it is quite clear that before the leave of absence was obtained, Mr. Kavanagh had no right at all to this quarter section; and I think the Department should not continue Mr. Kavanagh's rights under a leave of absence granted to him sixteen days after another person had obtained an entry for this same lot. Now, Mr. Bell has been for some time endeavoring to obtain satisfaction from the Department, but so far has not been able to get any. He has written to the Department at Winnipeg, has seen the agent at Brandon, and has communicated with the Department here; and as a last resort he communicated with the First Minister, believing that if he wrote to him, the matter would be attended to. The First Minister, of course, replied to the letter, simply I think referring Mr. Bell to the Department of the Interior, from which, so far, he has been unable to

obtain any redress. Now, all these facts have been established by a number of individuals who live in the neighborhood of the land, and who are thoroughly conversant with all the circumstances; and the whole neighborhood, so far as I am informed, are in favor of Mr. Bell getting this quarter section rather than Mr. Kavanagh, for the simple reason that the latter is looked upon as a speculator. He is known to be a Government official, and believed to be an official speculator there, taking advantage of the position the Government has given him as postmaster of Brandon to secure this quarter-section upon which Mr. Bell wishes to settle as a *bonâ fide* settler. Now, Sir, we have these facts. We have one man who left the Province of Ontario with his family and went to the North-West, and who, finding this lot vacant took possession of it as an actual *bonâ fide* settler, desiring to become a permanent resident of the country. On the other hand, we have Mr. Kavanagh, a well paid official of the Government, the postmaster of Brandon, who is not engaging in farming operations, whose business is not farming, and who, as long as he remains postmaster of Brandon, can never become a settler on this land. Thus far Mr. Bell has struggled in vain to get satisfaction against this official speculator. These are facts, as they appear from the papers sent to me, some of which have been copied from documents sent to the Government. There are three affidavits made by responsible men in the neighborhood, one a justice of the peace and the other two farmers, detailing these facts. Petitions and remonstrances have been made to the Department of the Interior and to the Government, and so far without success. If these are facts, and I believe they are, this man, Mr. Bell, has not been treated in a way that we would expect settlers going into the North-West with the view of making their future home there ought to be treated. It appears to me that he has been treated with great injustice and harshness. If men from the Province of Ontario or any other Province, or immigrants of any class going into the country, are to meet with obstacles and difficulties such as I have mentioned, we need not be very much surprised if the tide of immigration to that country is not as great as we have reason to expect. Now, the First Minister knows that a man like Joseph Bell, an active, vigorous, persevering fellow, if he does not get what he considers fair play there, will very likely do as others have done, leave the country, and leave not on the best terms with the Department or the Government of the country; and a man who leaves the country because he has received harsh treatment, will do it more harm than half a dozen agents can undo in a year. I trust that the First Minister will examine these papers himself, if he can spare the time from the multiplicity of his engagements, and if he will bring to bear upon them, as I have no doubt he will, a fair judicial mind, I believe he will have no hesitation in awarding the homestead to Mr. Bell. It is intolerable that an official of the Government should be allowed to speculate in lands and keep out an actual *bonâ fide* settler, as Mr. Bell is described to me to be. I therefore trust that the bringing down of the papers may prove to be unnecessary by reason of the First Minister dealing with the case and doing justice to Mr. Bell, by giving him the land which he is now unable to get.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection to this motion passing and the papers being brought down at once. I did not gather from the hon. gentleman that Mr. Bell brought his case before the Land Board.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Yes, he communicated with the inspector. I read the letter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Then I suppose the case is before the Land Board. A great many complaints were made, and of necessity made, about delay in the settlement of cases with reference to claims in the North-West, because

they had all to be sent down to head-quarters at Ottawa. To avoid that, and to enable such matters to be settled as speedily as possible, a Land Board was formed, of which Mr. Pierce is inspector. This board has done its work steadily and on the whole satisfactorily. They have decided an infinity of cases without coming here, and it is obvious to every hon. member that unless there is an evident case of injustice, it is only unprofitably taking up the time of the House to make it a court of appeal. Complaints of injustice should not be brought here when there is no evidence or authority to show that they were laid before the board, or that the board had rejected a claim improperly, or that there has been unjustifiable delay. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman in his statement that if Mr. Kavanagh has actually forfeited his claim, and that Mr. Bell has thereupon agreed to the terms of the statute and made the entry, no leave of absence to Mr. Kavanagh can restore Mr. Kavanagh's claim. I shall, however, look into this matter.

Motion agreed to.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY RETURNS.

Mr. HESSON moved for :

Statement showing—1st. The number of returns ordered by this House relating in any way to the Canadian Pacific Railway, since the date of the contract with the Government; 2nd. The number granted, and the number refused by the House; 3rd. The cost of preparing such returns, with the names of persons calling for same; and 4th. Said statement to include all returns so called up to the 18th day of February, inst., with the estimated or probable cost of preparing same.

He said: My object in asking for this statement is not to prevent reasonable information being given, as the Government is always and ought always to be ready to give, but if possible to prevent calling for returns, which in many cases are absolutely useless. The matter was brought to my notice in connection with one of those returns. I had the curiosity to go to the Department, and there I found that a great deal of money had been wasted in preparing those returns. 180 orders already have been passed, of which something like 80 have been brought down, and the balance will no doubt come in due time. So far as I can find out, in the British House of Commons, with a population of some 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 of people to care for and provide and enquire for, the returns brought down in one year in this House are equal in number to those brought down in six years in that country. This shows the quickness and ease with which orders are passed by us, and I think it is quite possible we are wasting a great deal of money in that direction. Only last evening we had the pleasure of listening to an hon. gentleman opposite as he dwelt upon the extravagance of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. HESSON. If I am not to refer to that, I have of course to get around it in some other way. There is no doubt that as a general rule complaint is made against the Government from time to time by hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that there is gross extravagance in the Departments, and that as the Departments are within the control of the Government their expenses are therefore chargeable directly to the Government. If they were to attempt to refuse these orders, I presume the insinuation would be made that the Government desired to cover up some information that it was proper for the people to have. Therefore the Government dare not raise any objection, and members on this side of the House are generally delicate about making any suggestion on that score, lest it might be said they were endorsing the action of the Government in refusing information. There is not a member on this side of the House who is not delighted to get all the information possible on these subjects, and we do not blame members on the other side for asking for reasonable information, but it ought to be such information as is not only

of interest to the gentleman who asks for it, but to the country. A return was asked for on January 30th, 1834, the order was passed by the House, and the work was undertaken during the recess, as it was of such a character that it was impossible to prepare it for that Session. It was brought down on the 19th February, during this Session, and that return has not been examined by one single gentleman, not even by the gentleman who called for the information. For the satisfaction of the House I present to it that return, and I would like to have it placed in the hands of the gentleman who called for it. We have here 4,099 pages of foolscap a good deal of the fool about it, I fancy—and the gentleman who called for it has never seen it, that is the member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). It will be in the recollection of the House how much that hon. gentleman complains of the Government for its expenses. I have taken the opinion of competent men in regard to the cost of this return, and I find that it must have been over \$800. The leader of the Opposition smiles in his usual manner, but I venture to say that some poor employé has been ground down to the lowest in order to make the amount so small. Imagine 4,099 pages of foolscap, over $8\frac{1}{2}$ reams of paper. I have sent the return to the hon. member for North Norfolk, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat, because, I suppose, he wanted it, and yet he has not thought it worth his while to call and see it. It was under lock and key; I made enquiry and saw it, but the hon. gentleman who moved for it has not thought fit to examine it, and yet he complains of the expenditure. I think, when the sum of \$10,000 a year is spoken of for these returns, that must be under the mark. It is impossible to calculate what they cost over that. Each Department gets out its own returns, and employs extra clerks to do the work, and only the Department itself can know what it costs. I do not wish to prevent the furnishing of information, which is really necessary—I want that to be distinctly understood—but I do want to prevent that sort of useless waste. The House can easily understand what that return may cost, allowing 20 cents a folio, and there are 170 quires of paper into the bargain.

Mr. BLAKE. I have been somewhat amused with the hon. gentleman's motion, and the way he supported it. The hon. gentleman has moved for the returns connected with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He says his reason is to see what the cost has been; he does not want to waste money, and he is going to show there has been a waste of money, and he proves the waste of money by producing an example which has nothing at all to do with the Canadian Pacific Railway, but which I believe has to do with the timber limits in the North-West. According to the hon. gentleman's view there has been a wilful waste in making returns as to timber limits in the North-West, and that is a good reason for sustaining the motion with regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway. I should be happy to have seconded the hon. gentleman's motion if he had done me the honor to ask me to do so. I am quite willing to bear along with the hon. gentleman and the other 209 members of this House, my share of responsibility for the motions which the House has unanimously called for upon the subject of the Canadian Pacific Railway; but how the hon. gentleman by his motion will be able to ascertain which of these returns, if any, was a useless return, I do not know. After the papers come down we will find the number of returns, and the cost of them, although I hope the cost will not be estimated at 20 cents per folio for copying, as the hon. gentleman has estimated, because that would make somebody very rich, and it will not be the proper cost of this work. I say you will find a number of returns and the cost, but where will you find the occasion upon which the House has erred in ordering the returns, and which particular return is in the interest of the public? The hon.

Mr. HESSON,

gentleman has had this motion on the Table a good while. It was on awhile ago, but he was not here when it was called, and it was dropped. He renewed it, and he has been for some time at work to prove instances of extravagance, and after all his exertions he is no nearer the Canadian Pacific Railway than the timber limits in the North-West as to cases of extravagance. The distance which he has reached, however, does not touch the question; he is not even dangerously near it, as the American statesman was once said to be, after speaking an hour and twenty minutes. It is a good thing to know how much these returns have cost upon a proper estimate, but it will not enable us to judge wherein we erred in ordering them. The hon. gentleman has said it is a delicate thing for members of the Government to decline to grant a return. No, Sir, it is not a delicate thing; if the motion be an improper motion, it is the duty of the Government to point out that it is so, and where the House does not choose to say it is an improper motion, they are responsible equally with the other members of this House for the return being granted. The hon. gentleman says it is a delicate thing for the Government to do, and because it is a delicate thing, therefore he does it. But it is not a delicate thing for them at all. Any hon. gentleman who sees that a proposal is being made by this House which is a waste of money and extravagant, has not merely the right, but is also bound, to point it out, and to raise his voice against it—to protest, as the hon. gentleman has to-day protested, against wilful waste and extravagance, and to record his dissent in a proper way by speech if not by motion. The hon. gentleman himself is a party to all these returns; he and I together have agreed that these returns are proper which he now thinks are improper. As far as I myself am concerned, my opinion is that the returns which have been moved for in relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway are not merely proper, but that it was highly in the public interest that the information should be obtained. I do not know that the hon. gentleman has pronounced with reference to any particular one of them, that he and I erred in agreeing that the motion should be made. When he does suggest with reference to any particular return that he and I, in the partnership which we have established in this matter, committed an error, why, then, that partnership may be dissolved, and he and I may be disposed to differ; but up to this time I have not heard any statement as to any one of these returns having been ordered in error.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), in making this motion, expresses his desire to economise public funds. I think every hon. member in this House entirely concurs with him in that wish. I think, however, he has succeeded in establishing to the House that there has been an unwise expenditure of money, but he has not, perhaps, succeeded in placing that expenditure at the door of those hon. members whom he wishes to inculpate. He states that an hon. gentleman who moved for papers here, which were produced, has not, up to this time, perused them. I should like to know how he could have perused them since they were produced. Because, up to this moment they have not been perused, he infers they are never going to be perused. He finally infers from all this that \$800 has been wasted because of the motion made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). All that the hon. member for North Perth has established is that the Government have obeyed the order of this House for producing certain papers at a cost of \$800, which is, I think, according to the tariff, \$600 more than they ought to have cost.

Mr. McMULLEN. I think it was \$750 too much. I can say with regard to the paper produced in answer to the motion of the hon. member for North Norfolk, that I was requested personally by that hon. gentleman, to go through and examine those papers in company with another member of this

House, and went through them. I think that is strong evidence that the hon. member for North Norfolk did not order those papers for no purpose. I have ordered some papers myself in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I am sorry that in the estimation of the hon. member for North Perth I should have been guilty of impropriety in doing so. Perhaps it would be well after this, when an hon. member desires to make a motion for returns that the motion should be submitted to the hon. gentleman to decide whether he considers it in the interests of the country that the House should have that return or not. He appears to be willing to sit in judgment on the Opposition members in this matter; he condemns strongly the course they have taken in asking for these papers. I acknowledge that he has had considerably more parliamentary experience than I have had myself, and I would have no objection, for the purpose of saving money, that the House should submit these motions for his personal consideration that he may decide, in the wisdom his greater experience gives him, whether it is in the public interest that the return should be granted. I do not think the hon. gentleman has any right to find fault with us on the score of expenditure. Many people are employed during the Session in preparing these returns; I do not know whether the hon. gentleman has any friend of his employed in that connection—possibly he has, possibly he has not. However, I may state once more that the papers moved for by the hon. member for North Norfolk were examined by myself and another gentleman at his request, and out of those papers he got the information for which he asked.

Mr. TROW. I can corroborate the statements made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. These papers were examined by several members of the House; I, myself, devoted several hours to their examination on behalf of the hon. member for North Norfolk. In our perusal of those papers we found some correspondence of interest to the hon. member for North Perth; we found several documents with reference to a particular friend of his, residing in the city of Toronto, anxious to obtain a timber limit, and that particular friend happens to be his own son-in-law. The hon. gentleman should be the last to call in question documents of that nature when called for by hon. members.

Mr. HESSON. No doubt the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat took a little longer to examine the papers when he found them so interesting. He might have found, also, some information of considerable personal interest to himself if he had looked through them carefully. But apart from that, I leave it to the intelligence of this House if it is possible, for even such clever gentlemen as those who have declared they have been acting as deputies for the hon. member for North Norfolk—and we all know that nature has not been less liberal to them in that respect than to other hon. gentlemen—that it was possible for them to grasp and comprehend what those papers meant during the few moments they lay upon the Table of the House. We have the assurance of the gentlemen in charge that there is but one gentleman in this House besides myself who has examined those returns which were sent up to the room where they are usually kept. My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, takes me to task for not having come more closely to the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway returns. I went to the room with the view of looking at those returns, to ascertain, if possible, if there was any information on the subject there, but the first thing I met was this Jumbo of a return, which prevented me from looking any further. I was convinced that I had come across a huge elephant, and that, if the first return I reached comprised 4,099 pages, it was beyond my power to examine much further. If the gentleman, in the few

minutes the return was on the Table, was able to get at the information it contained, I cannot understand it. I have the assurance that neither that gentleman nor any one else had called at the room where these returns were kept under lock and key, and that only myself and another member of the House had been there. I hope the leader of the Opposition is as sincere as he pretends in his desire to keep down the expenditure when he asks that the question should be referred to some parties in this House who should be the proper persons to judge of the value of these returns.

Mr. BLAKE. I did not say that.

Mr. HESSON. Then the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) did.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps he did.

Mr. HESSON. He said the question should be referred to myself. Did he recollect that he is here, like myself, to watch that unnecessary expenditures are avoided as far as possible. If we can gather the value of a return at all, I think it would be by the gentleman who called for it thinking it worth while to spend some time over it and give the information which it contained to the public. It is stated that my name was included in that return as an applicant for timber limits. That is no greater discovery than might be made in regard to any member of this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. HESSON. There may be some exceptions, but they are very few. A list was published before, and nearly every member was included in that as an applicant either for himself or for a friend. I may say that I have no interest in any limit or in any foot of land the Government possesses. If, however, I can obtain any grant for any of my constituents, I have a right to do so, and I shall feel it a privilege to do that for my constituents or my friends. The wish of the country was that that region should be developed, that the limits should be developed and the land settled, and whatever facility can be given in that direction is perfectly justifiable. The member for North Norfolk must have had some object in moving for this return, and that object ought not to be lost in a year. It is nearly a month since the return was brought down, and, if he could not find time to investigate it, he could not have thought it very valuable. If a gentleman gets a speech in, when he is asking for an order of the House, and that is all he wants, it would be far better to let the order drop than to put the country to this unnecessary expense. I should like to have this information for the benefit of the public. I did not ask for information in regard to all the returns, but, on the question of the Canadian Pacific Railway, I thought it necessary that we should know whether it was desirable to spend almost as much in getting returns as in lending them sums of money.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I should like to enquire from the hon. member from North Perth (Mr. Hesson), as he seems to have devoted some attention to the subject, whether among those returns as to timber limits is included a certain celebrated correspondence which has lately appeared, known as the Mitchell-Macpherson correspondence, because, if so, he greatly underrated the value of the return which has been brought down. I have not had time to examine the return, but I should like to know whether it includes that correspondence.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Three or four of these motions for returns are going to take up all the afternoon.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I heard some one say that this motion would take all the afternoon. If so, I am not to blame for it, and I am quite sure I do not occupy much of the time of the House. What I have to say I mean to say, and I have no fear of intimidation even from my friends on

this side of the House. I do not think the hon. member now interrupting me will gain anything by doing so. If Mr. Speaker cannot keep order, I will take my seat. I am sorry these returns were placed on the Table of the House. Their appearance has certainly had a very depressing effect on the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), so much so that he was constrained to quote the lines of Watts :

"No foot of land do I possess,
No cottage in the wilderness."

And the hon. member for South Perth, who is usually jolly and pleasant, looked at those returns on the Table and was no longer able to smile. I understand the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has come into the House and sat down right behind them, and he will soon be as solemn as a tombstone. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. McMullen), a genial and smiling gentleman, also looks depressed; he has spent three or four hours on these returns. Now they have been piled before the genial face and countenance of the hon. member for Ottawa County (Mr. Wright) to see if they will not take the smile out of his face. It is very unfortunate that these returns should have been brought in here. I have not had the pleasure or the misfortune to look over them, and so they have had no effect on me. One word about the main question, as to asking for returns. I sympathise, I cannot help sympathising, largely with the Opposition in this House, having been myself in Opposition for seven or eight years, in asking for information on all subjects connected with the welfare, happiness, comfort and business relations of the people of Canada. It is a very wide subject, and one that can be elucidated in many ways; but who is to tell how far one is to go? No doubt those hon. gentlemen experience, as I experienced when in Opposition, difficulty from receiving letters from constituents and from absent friends, even from Government friends, who do not wish to embarrass Government supporters by asking them to take action, asking that certain returns be moved for. Sometimes the practice may be abused, but it is very difficult to determine how far it should be allowed to go. Hon. gentlemen want the most complete information that can be furnished, and in that view it is possible they may ask for returns which, when they come down to this House, are found not to elucidate the subject in hand. It is a matter you can hardly control, and I sympathise with any member who is requested by his constituents or by the humblest citizen of Canada to ask for certain returns; and though they may prove afterwards to be almost useless, yet in the discharge of an important public duty the member has a right to ask for them. I do not think, therefore, we can curtail this expenditure very much, on account of the wide range of subjects with which we have to deal, and the pressure brought by parties outside of this House who ask that grievances be enquired into, and there is no mode by which you can make such enquiry except by asking for the returns, which afford the member making the motion an opportunity of speaking on the question, or if he does not wish to speak he can ask that the information be brought down. While I sympathise with the hon. member for North Perth, who found these returns useless, and who experienced a depressing effect by looking at them, as indeed have all other members who have looked into them, I think this is one of the evils that seems to be attendant on parliamentary procedure, namely, that some returns will prove useless, but on the other hand there is no other way of securing the beneficial results which follow from motions for returns.

Mr. FAIRBANK. I think the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) has done the House a positive service by pointing out this afternoon the enormous bulk of the returns brought down in regard to timber licenses in the
Mr. WOODWORTH.

North-West. These returns furnish a better proof of the magnitude of the business done in that direction than any which hon. members yet possess. It will be a wonder if there is a bush in the North-West which is not under license.

Mr. McCRAANEY. I have spent parts of several days looking over these returns, and I consider that no more useful returns have been brought down to the House this Session. I think if some hon. members had known that all this correspondence would have been brought down they would have been more careful in criticising this return in regard to timber licenses. I understood the hon. member for East Huron (Mr. Farrow) to state yesterday that nine-tenths of all motions made came from the Opposition side of the House; but I find in looking over the paper to-day that 93 motions are asked for, 34 of which are made by Government supporters. I find that through the Session nearly one-half the motions are made by Government supporters. It is necessary in the public interest that we should procure information on different subjects, and I am satisfied it is in the interest of the country that these returns should have been prepared, although they are said to have cost \$800. I think it is money well spent, although I have no hesitation in saying that I could find a man who would have done all the work for \$50. I merely wish to make this statement as the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) said the returns have not been examined. I have examined them during parts of several days.

Mr. COCKBURN. I desire to express one thought in connection with this matter. If a proper system of disposing of timber limits by public auction were in operation it would save all this trouble and expense.

Motion agreed to.

THE FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLIDATED LOAN.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Copies of all Orders in Council, correspondence or papers of any kind in possession of the Government relative to the retirement of the 5 per cent. consolidated loan, maturing upon the 1st January, 1885.

He said: In placing this motion in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words on a subject of considerable importance. It will be within the recollection of the House that about thirteen months ago, or thereabouts, when we were discussing the question of an advance or loan of \$30,000,000 to the Canadian Pacific Railway, I took occasion to call the attention of the House and the Government as strongly as I could to one fact that of itself, I thought ought to have deterred them from making that particular loan, or, at all events, the whole of it, at that particular time. I pointed out then that in view of the large funding operations that were inevitable, and of the fact that the Government of Canada would undoubtedly be obliged to borrow large sums of money, in any case, for the purpose of paying the subsidy due to the railway and for other purposes, it was extremely unfortunate that the Government should have felt compelled to come down last year to ask us to loan that money to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that there was serious danger that they would hamper and impede the action of the Finance Minister in refunding. Now, Sir, I am sorry to say that that warning was neglected, that to a considerable extent the evil consequences dreaded appear likely to come upon us, although I think that the case was plain and clear enough, and that under the circumstances the hon. Finance Minister should have felt called upon to take much greater precautions than ordinary. Lest I should misrepresent the hon. gentleman in any way I desire, Mr. Speaker, with your leave to read the statement recently made by him with respect to the steps he is taking for the purpose of refunding the 5 per cent. debt, and of providing for our further liabilities. The hon. gentleman spoke as follows:—

"I think it very probable that the members of this House would like to know the course that the Government are to pursue with reference to the maturing liabilities bearing 5 per cent. interest, as well as to this floating debt. There are \$25,000,000 of the present 5 per cent. loan in the hands of the public. The balance of about \$7,000,000 is really held by the Government in the sinking fund, and therefore, of the loan which matures in June next, \$25,000,000 must be provided for either by the payment direct to the holders direct or by some other arrangement by which other bonds will be exchanged. I am not in a position to state definitely what course the Government will take, but it has been suggested and it is now under consideration, though it has not been fully decided upon, that the Government should offer to those who hold these 5 per cent. bonds a loan to be paid in 7 or 10 years in redemption of the 5 per cent. debentures that they hold, at such a rate as may be considered in the interest of Canada and such as will induce them to exchange them, and the Government look upon this proposition somewhat favorably because, in 1891, or we hope shortly after that, when the Canadian Pacific Railway has been completed and it is established that there is a profit and a value in that railway, arrangements will be made by which the past mortgage which we hold upon it at present may be relinquished and we may get the money back, and, if we took a long period of debentures, 30 or 50 years, we would have to go into the market and buy back debentures at a very high rate. At any rate, it would put the Government in a position, with a very short time intervening, to make arrangements for these \$25,000,000; and then it is suggested that by Treasury bills we should extend the temporary loans made in Canada or in England for six or twelve months, so that in fact the Government will not be required to go into the London market with any debentures in the present calendar year except for the redemption of the \$25,000,000 at 5 per cent. interest due on the 1st July next. At all events, we feel that we shall be in a position to provide for this in some shape or form in the interest of the country and without materially depressing the value and character of our securities."

Now, Sir, that is a statement which deserves consideration. I did not feel disposed to enlarge upon it during the Budget debate, because this motion was coming up, and I thought it was much more convenient both for the hon. Finance Minister and myself that it should be discussed apart and upon its own merits. Now there is no use in denying that there is an uneasy feeling in the country at present in business circles, largely produced by the fact that it has appeared since the opening of this House that we have an unusually large floating debt and an unusually large sum maturing at a fixed date on the 1st of July; and further, that there are large liabilities accruing from month to month for which no provision has been made. I cannot say, Mr. Speaker, that that uneasiness is at all likely to be allayed by the statement made the other night which I have just read. Let us consider the proposals which the Finance Minister makes to us. First of all, he says that if he can persuade the holders of our 5 per cent. securities to exchange them for a short loan it is his intention—and the Government are favorably disposed to consider the proposal—to issue a short loan at seven or ten years. Then, Sir, he tells us that as to our floating liabilities of twelve and a-half millions he proposes to renew these for periods of six and twelve months, but he does not say a single syllable as to the other liabilities which are accruing, and which will (and I am open to correction if I overstate the case) which I believe must amount to several millions of dollars, and very probably to ten or twelve millions. According to the hon. gentleman's statement he has not yet paid the whole of the thirty millions of dollars to the Canadian Pacific Railway; I think he still owes them on that loan about four millions or thereabouts. He also owes, or it was so stated in the House, about four millions of dollars more on account of the subsidy, which is distinct from the loan, and there are other liabilities which will undoubtedly considerably swell the sum total for which he will have to provide in all probability in the course of the next few months. Now, Sir, I must say that the expedients which the hon. gentleman proposes appear to me to be very dubious. First of all, I have my doubts—and I think the hon. gentleman must admit that that doubt is not without reason—whether he will be able to carry out the exchange he proposes with the holders of our 5 per cent. securities. As a general rule short loans of seven or ten years are not looked upon with much favor in the English market.

He may be able to do it, but I should think the thing was decidedly doubtful. In the next place, it is well known to those who have studied the stock exchange market in London that they do not like to have many securities of the same country, of whatever class they may be, and they are sure to object to the introduction of a new security, such as the 4 per cent. bonds, running for seven or ten years, when they now have the same bonds running for sixteen or twenty or twenty-five years, and when we have recently introduced a new security in the shape of our 3½ per cent. bonds. Moreover, the House will remember from the papers brought down by the hon. gentleman that this business of issuing new loans is attended by heavy expenditures. I do not think that he himself supposes that he will be able to float his new loan, if he has to float it, without paying commissions, brokerages, and other expenses. Now, Sir, we had to pay £67,000 sterling, or about \$330,000, for commissions and brokerages on the five million which he negotiated the other day. There were besides allowances amounting, speaking roughly, to about £30,000, so that in negotiating a loan of about five millions the cost was £100,000 in round numbers, or about \$500,000. It would be very inexpedient that we should go to all that expense for a loan running for seven or ten years, and yet, from the circumstances to which I will call attention, I think it is too likely, if the Finance Minister has to issue a short loan, that he will be compelled to pay these heavy charges again, and that whoever succeeds him or whoever may be in office seven or ten years hence, will, when that time comes, have to pay for another loan; because I think the hon. gentleman is assuming rather too much when he assumes that we can rely on the thirty million dollars which were advanced to the Canadian Pacific Railway being punctually paid in 1891 or even in 1894. Of course I am bound to suppose, when the Finance Minister declares that he is going to base an important financial transaction on the assumption that seven, or it may be ten, years hence the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are going to pay these thirty millions back that he is best entitled to represent the expectations or intentions of the Government; but I have observed very recently, in organs which are usually supposed to know something about intentions of the Government, some statements which are wonderfully inconsistent with any proposition pointing to the repayment of those thirty million dollars in 1891. Now, I have also to say to the Minister of Finance that I believe he will find that all those renewals are likely to hurt our credit. It is not a good sign, as my hon. friend beside me very properly remarked, that a merchant is obliged to renew his paper. It is a very bad sign when the Finance Minister of Canada is obliged to borrow money for five, six, or eight months, and then to come and tell us that he is likely to be obliged to renew those bills again. I am afraid, Sir, that from the statements made we can only deduce this conclusion, that the 3½ per cent. loan which was floated has proved in a certain sense a failure. No doubt the hon. gentleman has got his money; but I can only conclude from the statements he has made that he is aware that that loan is still in the hands of the middlemen and is still unabsorbed in the London market; otherwise, I am utterly at a loss to understand the statements he has made, and still more the action he has had recourse to. Now, Sir, I am afraid that a very serious error of judgment indeed has been committed in this matter. I am afraid that the Minister has committed two errors. He knew that this 5 per cent. loan of \$25,000,000 as he calls it, was to mature on the 1st of January, 1885. It was for our credit, it was to our interest, that the money should have been paid on the 1st of January. It is unfortunate that it was not done. I think the Minister, if he possibly could, ought to have brought out another loan in October or November, 1884, in order to provide for the payment of that sum when it matured. That would have been

the wise course; that would have been the course that would have sustained our credit best; that was the course which he himself intimated he intended to pursue, and it is very unfortunate that he did not pursue it. If the case be, on the other hand, as I suppose, that the Minister of Finance was unable in October, or November, to float a loan which would enable him to retire our bonds maturing on the 1st of January, then I say he has committed a very grave error of judgment indeed, seeing that, finding himself obliged to borrow so large a sum of money as \$12,500,000 from banks in England and banks in this country, he should have given notice to pay off this 5 per cent. loan on the 1st of July next. If it was impossible for him to float another loan in October or November, that ought to have been a warning to him not to have all these liabilities maturing together on the country at the same time; and I cannot but regard it as unfortunate, either that he did not provide, as he might, I think, have done, for the payment of our 5 per cents. at the date at which they mature, or if he found that impossible, that he should have complicated the position by giving the notice he did of the payment on the 1st of July next. I quite recognize the desirability of paying off that 5 per cent. loan; but it is very questionable whether it is desirable to pay it off at the expense and to the injury of our credit, which will result from renewing the \$12,500,000 which he has borrowed at short dates. Now, I think all this is very much to be regretted for another reason. A most splendid opportunity has been thrown away of refunding our loan on terms exceedingly advantageous to Canada. There can be no doubt whatever in the mind of anybody acquainted with the situation of the finances of Canada, that a very much better bargain could have been made for us if we had not made that advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway—if the Finance Minister had been in a position to go to London a few months ago with nothing to provide for except the refunding of our debt and the raising of a comparatively small sum of money; and as it was a piece of most extraordinary good fortune befell the hon. gentleman which saved him, I suspect, from serious inconvenience, but which might, under other circumstances, have been handled in such a fashion as would have redounded very much to his credit and very much to the profit of the people of Canada. Almost at the moment when he was floating his last loan, the English Chancellor of the Exchequer had declared his intention of reducing English consols from 3 per cent. to 2½ per cent. That declaration gave a great impetus to all other good securities in the London market, and afforded the Finance Minister an opportunity to place our loan on the market on very favorable terms. I think it is not too much to say that if he and the Government had not chosen to hamper themselves by their injudicious advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and by the other advances they were obliged to make for the purpose of inducing the House to swallow that measure, he could have made an infinitely better bargain for Canada than he was able to make. Not only has the hon. gentleman lost that opportunity (which in the nature of things can hardly be expected to recur), but it is only too probable that the hon. gentleman for the time being—I hope not for long—has failed to establish our new issue of 3½ per cents. on anything like a firm basis. It is quite clear that he has failed to get rid of the sinking fund. That, I think, also was a serious error. I think our sinking fund is altogether too large for the wants of this country, and it adds unnecessarily to the expenditure and the amount of money we have to raise by way of taxation on the people. Now, Sir, even if the hon. gentleman does succeed in renewing the \$13,000,000, it is still only too obvious that he will have to effect a large loan. He admits that he has to provide \$25,000,000 on the 1st of July next. He has also, if I understand his position at all, to provide \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 additional for the additional capital expense to

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

which we are pledged, and that without taking into account a large amount of possible liabilities, which are computed, I see, by the Deputy Minister of Finance, in the report of the finances laid on the Table, at something like \$6,000,000, exclusive of a payment of \$200,000 a year, running for fifteen years. Now, I want to call the attention of the hon. gentleman himself and of the House to this plain fact. He has, as I say, compelled himself to make a large loan in any case. Were he to take up his floating debt, were he to provide for the \$10,000,000 or \$12,000,000 which I believe will require to be expended on capital account, in addition to the \$25,000,000 which he must redeem, it is clear that in order to put himself in a good position he would have to negotiate a very large loan. If he negotiated on the same terms as before he would require to borrow, between this and the 1st of July, about £12,000,000 sterling, very nearly \$60,000,000, in the English market. If he renews his temporary loan of \$12,000,000, he will still require to borrow a large amount of money. Supposing he places it at 3½ per cent., he will have to borrow from \$45,000,000 to \$50,000,000, as the case may be. In any case, he will require to borrow a very large sum. Now, he is going to do that under circumstances of the most disadvantageous kind, whereas, by proper management, he might have done it under circumstances of a very favorable nature. First of all, it is not well that he should go into the English market with the knowledge, on the part of English capitalists, that he is obliged to pay a large sum of money on a given day. That, as every business man will see, is a disadvantage to him. In the next place, he has practically exhausted all his other resources. He cannot go on borrowing, either in England or here, to an indefinite extent; he has borrowed already twelve and a-half millions and he will probably in the interval have to borrow more. Thus he has left himself without resources in the event of circumstances occurring which would make it unadvisable to float his loan at a particular day. I must remind the hon. gentleman that it is unfortunate, under the circumstances, that he should have attempted to float a loan in Canada in 1883 and should have failed. That loan should not have been allowed to fail.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. What loan?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The Canadian 4 per cent. loan, which the hon. gentleman attempted to float in 1883.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not attempt to float any loan in 1883.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I myself was a subscriber to the loan; it was a domestic loan.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I had quite forgotten that; I thought you were speaking of English loans.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. As it was a failure, I understand the hon. gentleman has good reason to forget it. I pointed out at the time I thought it was unfortunate. That loan should not have been allowed to fail, because it is not well, when you are going to a foreign market, that it should be known the only attempt you made to float a domestic loan was a failure. Then the hon. gentleman has run another risk. It is well known to the hon. gentleman and to every one who pays the slightest attention to public affairs that Europe to-day is in a disturbed condition, and that there is a probability when the hon. gentleman goes to float a loan its condition may be much more disturbed. I recollect, in 1876, what a serious contingency that was; I recollect in 1876, on the occasion of the last loan I had to float in London, that very great care had to be observed and great precaution taken to obtain a favorable moment to place it on the market. It was but a small loan of two and a-half million pounds sterling, or

twelve and a-half million dollars, yet we were obliged to watch with the greatest care for a favorable moment to launch it on the market; and had we not succeeded in taking advantage of a very short lull, had we delayed issuing the loan for a bare forty-eight hours, very considerable loss would have resulted to the people of Canada, from the fact that at the end of that very short period disturbances were renewed. It is further unfortunate that we should have to float a loan, in view of the statement the hon. gentleman recently made, which cannot escape attention, namely, that unless he credits to revenue \$500,000 from Dominion lands, which ordinarily belongs to capital account, a serious deficit is pending. I hope he will be right and that I will be wrong, and that the deficit will not be as serious as I am afraid it will be; but there is no doubt that, according to any proper system of book-keeping, instead of the surplus of \$150,000 which the hon. gentleman claims, there is really a deficit, on his own showing, of \$350,000. There is but too good reason to believe, from looking at the English stock reports, that the hon. gentleman's former loan is not yet absorbed; and he knows, as well as I, that that, in itself, is always a serious obstacle to be encountered in floating a fresh loan. Moreover, he told us, in his place here, that Canada had many enemies in the London market. I am sorry to hear it. I am sorry, too, that the course of the Government has not been such in all respects as to conciliate some of those persons; but I am afraid the hon. gentleman may, in this respect, be speaking the truth. Then what is the inference to be drawn? It is that a man going to the London market where, he says, he has many enemies, should have neglected no precautions, exposed himself to no unnecessary risks, and have done everything he could to prevent possible failure. I am sorry to say that the proceedings of the hon. gentleman are far from appearing to have been taken with a view to guard against misfortune; they appear, on the contrary, to have been taken in such a way as to expose him to a check at almost every turn. I do not suppose he will be unable to get his money, but I fear it will be found that the result of the hon. gentleman's operations will be this, that we will be obliged to pay a much larger rate for the money than we might otherwise have got it at; and as that will go on for a matter of five and twenty or fifty years, unless indeed he effects the short loan of which he speaks—which I doubt very much—it is quite clear there will be a very serious loss inflicted upon the people, from which this generation at least will suffer very considerably. I cannot help expressing my belief that one of the penalties we have to pay for that unfortunate advance made last year to the Canadian Pacific Railway is that by this advance we lost the finest opportunity ever given to any Canadian Finance Minister of affecting a brilliant financial *coup* in London. Not having been there I speak with reserve, but I believe, had the Finance Minister been able to go to London, and had not gone weighted with the entanglements and embarrassments inflicted on him by the advance to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was possible, at that particular time, by the use of proper means, to have put a Canadian 3 per cent. loan upon the market on fairly favorable terms. Of course I am aware that that could not be done after what had been done by this House; but let it be remembered that we lost very heavily, indirectly, in consequence of that particular advance. I will not attempt to compute, it would be impossible to compute, the total loss we may sustain in consequence of these operations. I believe, however, that loss will be found to be very heavy. I will be very glad, indeed, if it be proved that I am mistaken, and if it be proved that we escape in this particular instance without much loss; but I say that if we do it will be due to sheer good luck, and in no respect to any foresight or sagacity in the administration of our affairs. It is quite true that, as regards the advance to the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, the hon. gentleman shares with his colleagues the responsibility of that measure; but as I have pointed out, the subsequent complications are of his making. I repeat, I think he has committed a grave error in judgment in what he has done. He ought either to have provided at the proper time, the 1st of January, for the redemption of the 5 per cent. or not have complicated the matter by giving the notice which he has unfortunately given, and I call the attention of the House to the position in which he now is. From the statement recently made by him and from the published statement in the *Gazette*, it is quite clear that against our great mass of liabilities in notes and Savings banks deposit, we hold the bare minimum in gold and guaranteed securities provided by law, so that there is nothing to fall back upon in case of necessity. It is quite clear also from the *Gazette* returns that the Finance Minister has practically at this moment very little on deposit in the banks. You cannot strip yourself entirely of available funds; a country like this, carrying on great works, must have considerable sums on deposit in the various banks; yet I do not believe the hon. gentleman has more in the banks than he requires to keep there to meet the ordinary calls on the Treasury. There is another point which seriously aggravates the awkwardness of the position. On looking at the *Gazette* returns the House will see that the banks of Canada at present hold \$4,000,000 of legal tenders, payable in gold, beyond what the statute requires them to hold. The statute requires that they should have a cash reserve of \$20,000,000; of that they are required by law to hold 40 per cent., or \$8,000,000 in legal tender notes. As a matter of fact, they hold \$12,000,000 in legal tender note, so that there are \$4,000,000 of those notes for which they are fully entitled, under the hon. gentleman's own regulation, to demand gold from the Treasury. More than that there is no law, there is no rule, there is nothing in the world to compel them to hold this \$20,000,000. They may run down their cash reserve, if they like, and they might like for many reasons to run it down to \$12,000,000, or even a smaller amount, and in that case a still larger amount of legal tenders would be set free, and it would be in their power to demand them. I have pointed out that the hon. gentleman has already exhausted his other resources by borrowing very largely at short dates from banks here and from banks in England also, for payments which will have to be made at fixed dates, which will very soon mature, and I may point out to him that, although I do not myself anticipate that any very serious immediate trouble will arise from demands on the part of the Savings Bank depositors, yet it is quite possible, and ought to be guarded against, that should there be a serious stringency in this market, considerable sums might be withdrawn from him for the purpose of investment elsewhere, for all which he would have to provide. Now, I must confess that I listened with considerable astonishment to the statement he made a few days ago; and, on calmly reading it over, it does appear to me that the hon. gentleman has gone out of his way to invite disaster in this particular case. I tell him that he has neglected all those precautions which a man in his position ought to take, and he has neglected them in spite of the clearest and most emphatic warning and, if we do escape serious inconvenience—I will not speak of disaster—it will be simply because the chapter of accidents and sheer good luck has befriended us.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. There is no objection to the motion offered by the hon. gentleman. The information that he seeks for will be brought down with great pleasure. The hon. gentleman has pointed out to the House and to myself, as Financial Minister, the great risk we are running, with reference to the credit of the Dominion of Canada and the difficulties that are ahead of us. Well, I might content

myself with allowing his speech to go to the country, and simply stating to him that I will place the experience of the last five years and the result of the negotiations of the present Minister of Finance against his operations, and let the public decide in whose hands they think they are more perfectly safe. I think I might do that with safety. I must admit, and I think any candid man will admit, that going into the English market for \$22,500,000 more than you would otherwise require, as was required in the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway, does not increase the value of our securities. That is, that the price supposed to be obtained for the securities that would be floated for the redemption and for the exchange, or paying off the 5 per cent. securities, would not likely be as favorable as if that loan had not been required. I think I admitted this when the Canadian Pacific Railway proposition was under the consideration of the House, and when the hon. gentleman called attention to the fact that we had \$25,000,000 maturing of 5 per cent. securities, which had to be paid off in January next. I pointed out then, and I think it will be so found, that the worst that could happen to us would be that, as it was in the hands of the Government to say when that would be paid off, we might postpone that for a short time, until a favorable opportunity came for its redemption. The hon. gentleman who spoke last night referred to this as an overdue debt of \$25,000,000. I want to call the attention of the House, in this connection, to the fact, that that was a loan floated, I think, by Sir Alexander Galt, or, at all events, by the Finance Minister of Canada, twenty-five years ago. It was a fifty year loan, and it was optional with the Government to redeem it in twenty-five years, at three months' or six months' notice, and the time has arrived when the Government could give that notice and redeem it if they thought it in the interest of the country to do so. When I was in England, in June last, and floated that loan, notwithstanding that it was known that we were coming in June or July, or January next, or shortly after the loan was floated, for \$25,000,000 more, we got a price equal to 2 per cent. per annum on a 4 per cent. loan of \$25,000,000, or $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. more than we ever got and 11 per cent. better than was obtained on any loan ever floated by the hon. gentleman opposite. I admit that there are responsibilities connected with the liabilities, and great responsibilities on the Finance Minister. In September, I was anxious to give the notice to pay off the loan in January if it were in the interests of the Dominion of Canada to do it, but we know that the bank rate at that time was 5 per cent., and it was not considered desirable by our agents to give the notice then, in the interests of the Dominion, expecting that a higher rate would be obtained when the bank rate was lowered, so the notice was given in the end of December to pay the debt on the 29th June next. I will venture to say that, had the Government given notice in September and put a loan on the market in October or November, when that high rate of interest prevailed, and had not realised as much as we had in June on the $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. loan, the hon. gentleman opposite would have been the first to condemn the Finance Minister and the Government for placing the loan on the market at an unfavorable time, when it was in the option of the Government to say when they should place it, whether they should give three or six months' notice, and might select their own time. We know that the rate of interest was very high at that particular time, and I think the correspondence, when it comes down, will show that the action taken by the Government was taken upon the advice and recommendation of our agents, who are watching with Sir Charles Tupper, the state of the market and what it is in the interest of the Government to do. I admit that the responsibilities are great, but I am not afraid that the credit of the Dominion of Canada does not stand in a posi-

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

tion that will enable us to avail ourselves of the most favorable time, either by a temporary loan, a six or a twelve months' loan, if it is considered in the interests of the country to do it. If it should be found in May or early in June that it is better to float a loan to cover the whole of it, the Government will do it. If, on the contrary, it is thought better to tide over six months and wait till January next, when the circumstances of the money market may be more favorable than they are in May or June next, then the Government will take that course. I admit that the additional loan of \$22,500,000 renders it not so easy for us to obtain the money on quite as favorable terms as if we had not gone into the market for that sum, but I have no fear whatever with reference to our being able to raise the money necessary to meet the maturing liabilities in a manner which will be in the interests of the country. If disaster comes, if we should find that the circumstances of the country are such that we have made sacrifices, and lost money by not placing it in the market last year, then it will be time enough for the hon. gentlemen opposite to censure the Government, and then they will have some data upon which to found their charge; but at the present time, I think it is just as well that we should take a fair and reasonable, and if you will, a bright view with reference to this subject, at the same time using, as we are doing, every necessary precaution, in order that we may see that no serious difficulty will arise in meeting our maturing liabilities. There is no objection whatever to this motion, and the information will be furnished at the earliest possible date.

Mr. BLAKE. I quite agree with the hon. Finance Minister that it is proper at this time, and I will go further, and say it is proper at all times, to take a fair and reasonable view of our situation; but to say that a fair and reasonable view will necessarily be a bright view is another question. The hon. gentleman asks us to go a little further, and not only take a fair and reasonable view, but to take a bright view, too. The hon. gentleman has entirely omitted to notice a very important part of the statement of my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). The hon. member for South Huron pointed out that the hon. gentleman, when giving us a *resumé* of the financial state of the country, and as it is to be during the year now commenced, adverted to the circumstance that he had between \$12,000,000 and \$13,000,000 borrowed on short dates, in different banks here and in the old world. He pointed out that the hon. Minister had stated that his scheme of finance with reference to that \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000 was not a settled scheme, but the inclination of his mind was that he would make a short loan to redeem those current obligations, a loan of from seven to ten years, feeling, as he did in his heart, that in the year 1891 he would be encumbered with an embarrassment of riches, that when the golden shower of the Canadian Pacific Railway reimbursements should take place, he would not know what to do with his wealth, and he thought it was expedient to provide a source into which he might pour these millions which he expects to receive from the company in the year 1891. Therefore, provident as he was, provident as he always is, careful to provide for contingencies more or less remote, and which may be in the region of the probable, or even of conjecture, the hon. gentleman, I say, suggested, as amongst the probabilities, a short loan for this \$12,000,000 or \$13,000,000. The reason why he was to provide for them this year was obvious; they could not be held over in their present condition very much longer, and he stated that Treasury bills might be emitted so as to prevent even a short loan from being proposed during the current year. Well, now, what my hon. friend from South Huron pointed out a moment ago was, that the hon. gentleman did not then, any more than he has done this afternoon, take into account

the current liabilities on capital account, the payments which we are making from month to month, the remaining payments in round figures of \$8,000,000 to be made to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the remaining payments, amounting to some millions, to be paid for the Government section of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and the other expenditures upon capital account to be made during the current year—these also have to be provided for upon credit of one kind or another. My hon. friend made a rough estimate of what the amount is. The Finance Minister entirely ignores that, he gives us no information about it, he does not think it worth while to mention it. Perhaps, just as he forgot the domestic loan a little while ago, he has forgotten the existence of those current liabilities. Yet he will be reminded of them in a very disagreeable way, if he does not provide ways and means to meet them. The situation is complicated by the circumstance that every month of this year, or, at any rate, for several months, until September and October next, there are considerable current demands upon the Treasury which are to be met, not out of the current revenue, but by borrowing in some shape or other. It is not a short loan, therefore, of 12,000,000 or 14,000,000 of money, but it is a loan of some kind or other, of a considerably larger number of millions, which is to be made in order to complete the hon. gentleman's scheme of finance. Now the hon. gentleman pointed out that the 5 per cent. loan is not overdue—no, he had an opportunity of allowing the 5 per cent. loan to stand, or of giving notice when it was to be called in. I remember very well, so long ago as the Session of 1883, when the hon. gentleman stated his scheme of finance, finding it was important to prepare for the redemption of the 5 per cent. loan, so long ago as then, he gave us in general terms his notions of finance; so long ago as then he asked for parliamentary authority to act. He thought he would be able to obtain exchange from the present holders of the 5 per cent. loan, or a very large proportion of the loan. He stated to us across the floor that his assurances were that we would be able to exchange at least about one-half, and he asked us two years ago for authority to negotiate in that sense. What he has done since then we do not know; what the arrangements have been with the existing holders of that loan he has not told us; but he was able to assure us two years ago, and to give us more assurances than he is able to give us to-day upon that subject. In the fall of the same year in which he made that statement—no, in the next Session—he came to us with another statement, and in the fall of that year it was stated that the hon. gentleman's domestic loan had fortunately failed on account of the necessity of providing funds to redeem the 5 per cent. loan, which had pressed upon the hon. gentleman's mind in the Session of 1883, having passed away. Why? Because the financial geniuses who preside at present over this country had devised a scheme by which the Canadian Pacific Railway itself was going to provide funds for the payment of the 5 per cent. advance, by which the Canadian Pacific Railway was going to pour into the pockets of the people of this country, into the public treasury, the sum of \$22,000,000 or \$25,000,000, and thus it was entirely unnecessary for the hon. gentleman to borrow in Canada, it was unnecessary for him to borrow in England, in order to provide for the redemption of the 5 per cent. debt. It was a brilliant and glowing prospect, he says. All his organs made the most of it. From Dan to Beersheba it was pointed out how the wonderful policy of the Finance Minister had succeeded, how wonderful the policy of the Government was; that not merely had they succeeded in making a contract which would secure the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway within its limited terms, and without any further demand being made upon the country, but actually they had it so arranged that that company was going to be a source of financial strength

to the Dominion itself, was going to pour almost uncountable treasures into the public purse, out of which our debts were to be redeemed; and there was great glorification and boasting over this result. But that bright prospect which the hon. gentleman called our attention to, and in which he was gratified to delight himself for some time—that prospect failed; and instead of being relieved from the necessity of borrowing here, and there, and everywhere, instead of being relieved from the necessity of making a domestic loan, instead of being relieved from the necessity of providing means for the redemption of the 5's, instead of keeping his Treasury full by means of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he was obliged to come down to Parliament a few short weeks afterwards and propose to empty the Treasury in order to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway; and he did so. He has been obliged to admit, this afternoon, that in consequence of that operation, irrespective of its direct effect, irrespective of the risk assumed in the obligation which was incurred, but also in view of its indirect effects, he was obliged, candid man, which he declared to us he is, to acknowledge that not merely that loan, not merely the loan which was necessary in order to provide for the Canadian Pacific Railway advance, but also other advances which it made necessary to provide for in order to keep up Canada's credit and meet Canadian obligations, were impaired as to the rate at which money could be borrowed, by his being obliged to make such a very large loan. And yet, Sir, we find the hon. gentleman says, in face of all that, in the face of these changes of finance, these changes of policy which succeeded one another almost as rapidly as the shifting scenes of the kaleidoscope—although they are neither so regular nor so brilliant as those which we see in the kaleidoscope—those shifting forms have assumed, at present, a shape. That hon. gentleman having just had to borrow a very great many millions of dollars in order to meet in part the Canadian Pacific Railway debt, that hon. gentleman having made that loan in England, having then been obliged to borrow further sums from the banks here and from the banks in London, has given notice of the redemption of the 5's on 30th June; and he himself, across the floor of the House, declares publicly that it may be necessary, that there is a possibility of his being obliged to make a short loan, as he says, to tide that over for six months more, in case there is an unfavorable condition of the market. Yes, the hon. gentleman used the term, tide over for six months, and I took a note of the phrase. He said the rate of interest may be high, the circumstances may be unfavorable, and we may make some arrangements to tide it over.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No. What I said was this: We were considering a proposition of issuing Treasury bills to tide over; but the market might be in such a condition that we might make another arrangement and float a loan, instead of carrying that over for six months more, until 1st January.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. That was only for the \$13,000,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blake) has not understood me. The proposition is, that we should offer to holders of the present \$25,000,000 loan bonds or inscribed stock at a certain rate of interest for other ten years.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And Treasury bills for \$13,000,000.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAKE. But I understood the hon. gentleman to say that, if the market was unfavorable, he proposed to tide over the matter with respect to the \$25,000,000 for other six months.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No. The hon. gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. BLAKE. That is what I understood the hon. gentleman to say. Although he commenced operations two years ago with respect to the redemption of the \$25,000,000, although he told Parliament two years ago that it was important to get parliamentary authority so long beforehand, in order that this large operation might be conducted in due time and with due deliberation, we have as yet no information from the hon. gentleman that he has made arrangements for the 5's with the existing holders of that loan. All those negotiations which the hon. gentleman told us two years ago he had almost entered into, all those assurances that he said he had obtained from holders of the securities, seem to have gone for nothing, and seem not to have been renewed. What is done is this: With the large sum on call and short date which the hon. gentleman has already taken up, with other sums which will necessarily be taken up some two months hence, and other sums during the course of the year, the hon. gentleman proposed to issue Treasury bills, or adopt some short-time device for the carrying of our call or short due debt, in order that he may issue a loan to redeem the long due debt. What he should have provided for was the debt which was absolutely due, or shortly to become due, with his bank borrowings and borrowings of that description, and then have provided for his long loan. I can understand the difficulty in which he found himself, for he will be told, and properly told, that but for the scarceness of funds, and for the loan to the Canadian Pacific Railway, he could have redeemed those \$25,000,000, and have had money at 4 per cent. instead of 5, and have saved 1 per cent. interest in consequence of the operation. It is so; for even during the six months for which the hon. gentleman is providing, from 30th June to 1st January, there is, according to his own statement, a loss of at least the difference between 5 per cent. and 4 per cent., because he tells us that even under disadvantageous circumstances he can issue securities bearing interest under 4 per cent. We are, however, keeping alive a security at 5 per cent., and, therefore, we are losing 1 per cent.; and I can well understand that the hon. gentleman is very anxious to cause this loss to disappear at an early day. But the difficulty is, that he has surrounded us, I will not say overwhelmed us, with so many obligations of such a varied nature, made at such short dates, that it would be proper to provide for the debts payable at such short dates before attempting to deal with a debt not payable for a considerable time.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 23) to amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. Williams.)

Bill (No. 24) to incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Railway Company.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)

Bill (No. 38) to amend the Acts relating to the Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. Ferguson, Welland.)

Bill (No. 52) respecting the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company (Reported).—(Mr. Dawson.)

Bill (No. 39) to incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Bill (No. 54) to confirm the Union of Canada Congregational Missionary Society and the Congregational Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.—(Mr. Abbott.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Canadian Pacific Employes' Relief Association.—(Mr. Gault.)

Bill (No. 79) to incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Tupper.)

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. KIRK. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that an Order of the House for a return connected with the operation of the Canada Temperance Act of Nova Scotia has not been complied with in any respect. The Order asked for a return for the year 1884, for the several counties in Nova Scotia. The return brought down is only for one county and is for the year 1881; moreover, it does not give the name of the physician who issued certificates. In no particular does it follow the Order of the House.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I will look into the matter.

Mr. McMULLEN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister to the fact that two returns in connection with superannuation, ordered the 6th of February, have not yet been brought down.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have asked for the returns according to the Order of the House, and am waiting for them, and, when I get them, will bring them down.

REPRESENTATION OF THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved second reading of Bill (No. 45) respecting the representation of the Territories in the House of Commons. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I do so in the earnest hope that I will receive the assistance of the Government and the assistance of hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as that of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. As a member of this House, somewhat conversant with a considerable portion of the Territories of the North-West, I may say that I very earnestly desire the progress and prosperity of that great country. As a private citizen, having some interest in various ways in the North-West Territories, I fully believe in the growth, in the progress, and in the prosperity of that portion of the Dominion, unless that progress be checked and that prosperity be stunted by bad management, bad laws, or bad administration of laws; and I may say, that both as a private citizen and as a member of this House, I earnestly desire that the people of the North-West Territories, who have been accustomed in the country from which they emigrated to manage their own affairs in their own way, may be allowed to work out their own destiny in the North-West, by giving them, not only local self-government, but full representation in this Parliament. We know well that the position which our settlers in the North-West now occupy is an anomalous position. It is an unjust position; it is, in my judgement, an unfair and an unreasonable position. We know that to some extent, in the Territories, there are very considerable centres of population, and we know that there is throughout the whole of the North-West Territories a very large population to-day. These settlers, as a general rule, I may say universally, are men of intelligence, men of activity, men of energy and indomitable zeal—men who have been accustomed in the older Provinces, from which most of them came, not only to self-government, but to representation in the fullest sense of the term, men who have been accustomed to representation in the Local Parliament and in this Parliament. Unfortunately, in their new home in the North-West Territories they have not got the rights and privileges nor the advantages they had in the Provinces from which they came. It

is known to those who take an interest in Manitoba and the North-West, especially the North-West, that the Territories in the North-West were created by an Order in Council of 8th May, 1882, and it was alleged by the First Minister that the said Territories were so formed for the purpose of encouraging immigration. One cannot but regret that, to some extent, at all events, the anticipations, I may say, perhaps, the reasonable and fair anticipations, of the First Minister, have not been fully realized with respect to the immigration to the North-West Territories. The Minute of Council was submitted to Parliament by a message from His Excellency, and received the assentment of Parliament on the 16th May, 1882. By this Minute of Council or Order in Council, a large portion of the North-West was divided into four territories. The first was called Assiniboia, with an area of 95,000 square miles; the next was the Territory of Saskatchewan, with 114,000 square miles; then there was the Territory of Alberta, with 100,000 square miles; and the Territory of Athabasca, with 122,000 square miles. The First Minister, when submitting this message to Parliament, in the Session of 1882, said that the proposed division was in the public interest, for the convenience of settlers. He also intimated that the divisions were provisional, that he expected a large tide of immigration to flow in there, and that these Territories would subsequently become Provinces, and that Parliament would be asked to assent to that proposal. I say again that we have reason to regret that the tide of immigration has not been as full and as free as we all had reason to expect it would be at the time the First Minister presented this message to Parliament. We can only hope that in the years to come the tide of immigration will rush in there more freely than in the past. Unfortunately, although I have reason to believe that there is a very considerable settlement in each of the Territories to which I have alluded, and in two of them, at least, a very considerable population, the first step has hitherto not been taken for the purpose of giving our settlers in our own North-West either local self-government in the true sense of the term or representation in this Parliament. It is true that, during the last Session of Parliament, one of the senators in another chamber drew the attention of the Government to this all-important and all-absorbing question to the people of the North-West. The hon. senator enquired as to the advisability of granting parliamentary representation to the inhabitants of the territorial districts in the North-West, and also if the Government had taken or intended to take the same into their consideration. The senator who propounded this enquiry to the Government was the senator from Niagara. On that question—for it appears they discuss questions in the other chamber, their rules being different from ours—an important discussion took place, and during the course of that discussion the Minister of the Interior made use of the following language:—

“I am sure it will be gratifying to the people of the North-West Territories to have had their interests and institutions submitted to the House so ably as they were by my hon. friend from Niagara, and discussed in this House so intelligently as they have been. It will show them that they are not, in their remoteness from the capital, forgotten by the legislators who sit in this Parliament, and it will, I am sure, impart a feeling of confidence to them, and increase the assurance which they feel that their interests and their feelings will be earnestly considered by the Government and also by Parliament. That is all that I feel called upon to say with respect to the enquiry of the hon. gentleman.”

You will observe that, in the observations the Minister of the Interior made upon the occasion to which I have just referred, he assures the people of the North-West that their interests and their feelings will be fully considered by Parliament; but, up to this hour, so far, at all events, as I am aware, no practical, no substantial step has been taken by the Government, looking to legislation in that direction,

and so far their demands, what I believe to be the fair and reasonable demands of our settlers in the North-West Territories, have been unanswered and unheeded by the Government. True, the Minister of the Interior gives them a sort of vague assurance. He tells them that, although they pay the taxes of the Dominion, still they are under the care, the paternal care, of a paternal Government, and they ought to be satisfied with that; that they are remote from the capital where we carry on the legislation of the country, but their interests are not forgotten by the Parliament of Canada; that their interests and their feelings will be considered by the Government and by the Parliament of Canada; and that is all. Now, I make bold to say that hon. gentlemen are much mistaken if they think that the people in the North-West Territories are going to be satisfied with assurances without having those assurances practically carried out. They have been accustomed, as I stated before, in the Provinces from which they came, to manage their own affairs in their own way. In their new homes in the far North-West they expect at least the same advantages they had in the Provinces from which they came. There they have no such advantages. They have not the rights practically of local self-government in the true sense of the term, and they have no voice in the legislation of this House. These people are there in what may be called a position of pupillage, of servitude. They have not got the rights we have here. By my Bill, I propose to release them from that condition of servitude, I propose to give them all the rights and all the liberties that British subjects, living in a free country and under a free flag, are entitled to; I propose that they shall have representation in this Parliament, and that they shall have that representation at the next Session of this Parliament. Bear in mind that our settlers in our North-West are in an inferior position to the settlers in the Territories of the United States of America. There they have a sort a representation, a sort of hermaphrodite representation in Congress. They send representatives to Congress from the territories, who have an opportunity of discussing public questions affecting the territories and taking part in the legislation there. I propose by my Bill that our settlers in our North-West shall have a better representation and a fuller representation than they have in the United States Congress. If the object of the First Minister, when he placed the message of His Excellency before Parliament and formed a portion of our North-West into districts, was to encourage the tide of immigration to flow in there, surely the hon. gentleman cannot expect that the tide of immigration will flow in as fully and as freely as he would wish it to flow, unless he places the settlers in the North-West in, at all events, as favorable a position as they are in the countries from which they came. In the United States of America they have what is called territorial representation but, if we stop at territorial representation, we stop just where the United States of America stopped, and I think we stop a little short of the end that we should aim at. In the United States of America the general Government can deal with the territories practically as the Congress sees fit. It is not until the territories are merged into States, or are formed into States, that they have the full rights and the full advantages, and the full privileges of government or of representation; and it is when formed into States, and then only, that they are given all the rights of free men living in a free country. By the fourth article of the American Constitution, it is declared that Congress shall have power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories or other property belonging to the United States. The power of Congress over the Territories has a two-fold character. First, as regards the property, the right to guard and improve the property, to prepare it for sale, and to sell it; and secondly, the power which concerns the government of the people residing within the territories

before those Territories are formed into separate and independent States. In the United States, Congress has established the Governments of the territories, or a sort of Government in the Territories, and Congress assumes the full power to govern them until, as I have said, the territories are merged into States. The Federal Government there appoints the executive officers and the judges, but the people have a right to elect members to the General Assembly when the population reaches a certain point. The Assembly has the right to pass laws for the government of the territory, subject always to the veto of the United States Government. Each territory of the United States of America, as soon as it has a population of 5,000 male inhabitants of full age, is entitled to send members to their General Assembly, and the public domain, there as here, is under the control entirely of Congress. Now, these territories, as I have said, have the right to send representatives to Congress, and these representatives have a voice in the public affairs that are brought before Congress. They have all the rights, powers and privileges that belong to a representative from a free and independent State, except the right to vote. On the first Monday of every week it is the bounden duty of the Speaker of Congress to call over the names of the territories in alphabetical order, and then the representative from the territory has a right by law, because he has a seat in Congress, to present petitions; he has a right to present memorials, a right to introduce bills affecting public interest, and his rights as a member of Congress only stops short at voting. Now I say that in the United States that principle, as far as it goes, is a sound one. The moment the territories have a population large enough to entitle them to have a General Assembly of their own, that moment they have a right to send their member to Congress. The principle is a sound one, that the citizens who are expected to pay their share of the taxes, who are expected to yield a willing submission to the laws, who are expected to yield submission to the sovereign power, shall have a voice in making the laws they are bound to submit to, and in the imposition of taxes they are bound to pay. I hold the principle is a perfectly sound one, that taxation without representation is tyranny of the worst kind; and yet that is just exactly the way that we have been dealing with our people in the North-West territories for the last three years. A moment ago an hon. gentleman opposite asked about the population of our Territories; I shall speak of that shortly. I lay down this proposition, however, that I believe the population of two of our territories is larger than the population of any territory in the United States of America when it was allowed to send a representative to Congress. I am not sure that the population of all the territories is not large enough, upon the principle adopted in the United States, to warrant this Parliament in giving the people of the North-West Territorial representation. I find, Sir, that when New Mexico was organised into a territory, on the 9th of September, 1870, it had an area of 124,000 square miles, and a population of 61,000. With the sole exception of New Mexico, I believe our North-West Territories, two of them, at all events, contain now a population far in excess of the population of the territories of the United States when they were given representation in Congress. Colorado was admitted in 1881 with an area of 105,000 square miles, and a population of 34,000, in round numbers. Nebraska was admitted in May, 1854, with an area of 122,000 square miles, and with a population, in 1850, of 10,716, and in 1863 of 12,519. As will be seen, the population in that State in thirteen years, from 1850 to 1863, only increased by some 3,000 souls. Much as we may have to complain of the scarcity of emigration into the North-West, nobody will pretend to say for a moment that the population has not increased at a much more rapid ratio than it did in the Territory of Nebraska, and in many other territories of the United States. Washington was

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

admitted in 1853, with an area of 71,000 square miles, and with a population, in 1850, of only 1,201 souls, and in 1860, ten years after, with 11,000 souls. Utah was organised, in 1850, with an area of 109,000 square miles, and a population of 11,380. Dakota was organised in 1861, with an area of 152,000 square miles, and a population of 14,181. I will not venture to state what the population of Dakota is to-day, but I venture to say it is far up in the hundred thousands. It is not yet formed into a State, with full sovereign powers, but it is proposed shortly, I believe, to organise it into one of the United States. But when it was organised into a territory and entitled to send a representative to Congress, the population of Dakota was only some 14,000. Arizona was organised in 1863 with an area of 130,000 square miles and a population of 9,658. Idaho was organised in 1863, with an area of 310,000 square miles, the largest, I believe, of the territories of the United States, but with a population, in 1870, of only 20,000 souls. Montana was organised in 1864, with an area of 146,000 square miles, and a population, in 1870, of 20,000. Wyoming was organised in 1868, with an area of 97,000 square miles, and a population of 9,000. It will thus be seen that the area of the territories of the United States is just about the area of our own territories in the North-West, with the sole exception of one territory; but I say the population of these territories when they were organised and entitled to send representatives to Congress was much less than the population of our North-West Territories. Now, Sir, not only is this true with respect to the territories of the United States, but it is true with respect to our own Provinces. We know that the population of Prince Edward Island, when admitted into the Confederation, but little, if at all, exceeded 100,000, and it was admitted with all the rights of an independent Province, and with a representation in this Parliament of six members. Now, I ask the First Minister, I ask the Government, I ask this House, if there is any reason why Prince Edward Island, with a population of somewhere about 100,000, should be entitled to send six members to this Parliament, who favor us with their opinion, their advice and their solemn protest occasionally, and who record their votes in Parliament, when we leave our own settlers, exceeding in number the population of Prince Edward Island when received into the Union, without a single representative in this Parliament, who can raise his voice in defence of the rights of the territory or who can record his vote for or against any proposition that may be submitted. When we admitted the Province of Manitoba into this Union, with the full rights of a sovereign Province, it had a population of barely 15,000, with a representation in this Parliament of four members. We admitted British Columbia with a white population of barely 15,000, and with a representation in this Parliament of six members. I ask if there is any reason why the First Minister and the Minister of the Interior, or the Government, should have for years excluded these men from what I believe to be their fair, their just right, to representation in this Parliament, knowing, as the hon. gentlemen must know, that the population of those territories to-day far exceeds the population of the two Provinces I have last mentioned. Public opinion in the North-West is ripe for this change; it has been ripe for the last two years, and public opinion is pronounced. Public men in the North-West of all shades of political thought, men of all classes and in every corner of the four territories carved out of the great North-West, have been pressing, and still are pressing, on the Government this change. The hon. gentleman knows that during last year the council of the North-West, in a minute of council sent to the Government here, pronounced strongly in favor of the representation of the territories. The hon. gentleman knows that the people of the North-West have spoken in the loudest possible way, in the only way they can speak, by petition, by resolution, by memorial and by remonstrance sent to the Government, insisting on the

Government doing an act of simple justice by giving them representation in this Parliament. The First Minister knows that during the last fall and early part of this winter, at every centre of population in the provincial districts of Assiniboia and Alberta, public meetings were held, at which resolutions were passed upon this subject. And the hon. gentleman knows that it is not a mere political movement. He knows that the majority of the people who attended these meetings were his own supporters, and they passed the resolutions which have been transmitted to the Government of which the hon. gentleman is the head. A meeting was held at Calgary, on 29th November, 1884. The meeting was a large meeting; it was a purely non-political meeting. The resolution was moved by an official of the Government, appointed by the Government, and paid by the Government—the registrar of the district. At that meeting the following resolution was passed:—

"That settlers in the District of Alberta here assembled, declare this our meeting to be strictly and positively non-political, and that our only desire and intention in holding this meeting is to tender to the Dominion Government the benefit of our opinions and partial experience about matters in which we believe such opinions and experience may be of use and benefit to the Government in dealing with the various matters and subjects about which resolutions are about to be submitted to this meeting."

This resolution, as I have said, was moved by an official of the Government, a paid supporter of the Government, a man occupying an important position there. It was thought desirable, in order that the Government might be made aware of the fact that the movement to secure representation was of a purely non-political character, to recite that fact in the resolution. That resolution was followed by another resolution, of which the following is a copy:—

"Whereas, in the opinion of this meeting, the time has arrived when the North-West Territories, from the rapid increase in population, and the extraordinary development of their vast resources which have taken place in the last few years, are entitled to representation in the Dominion Parliament;

"Therefore, Resolved, That the Dominion Government be respectfully requested to introduce, at the next Session of Parliament, such measures as may be necessary to provide for a fair and just representation of the present provisional districts, into which the North-West Territories are divided in the Federal Parliament; or to obtain from the Imperial Parliament, during its present Session, such amendment of the British North American Act as may be necessary to accomplish that object—should such a course be deemed necessary."

There you see that at this meeting, presided over by a friend of the Government, the resolution which I have read, moved by a friend of the Government, and a large majority of those present, as is alleged, being friends of the Government, and the meeting a purely non-political one, a resolution was passed asking the Government, as a matter of right, to give territorial representation in this Parliament. I find in the *Regina Leader*, the organ of the Government in the capital of the Province of Assiniboia, edited and owned by a friend of the Government—a tolerably well-paid friend of the Government, too—an account of a meeting held at Wolseley on 20th November, 1884, at which the following resolution was passed:—

"Whereas we, the settlers of the municipality of Wolseley, in the North-West Territories, have learned with pleasure that it is the intention of the Dominion Government, at the coming Session of Parliament, to introduce a measure for the representation of the North-West Territories in the Federal Parliament of Canada,

"And whereas we have good reason to believe that the present population of the District of Assiniboia is at least 60,000 souls.

"And whereas, owing to the fertility and richness of the soil, the population is scattered all over the said district, and a representation of two members would be entirely inadequate to the arduous duties to be performed.

"And whereas we believe that we are entitled to just representation and that great good would result from said representation.

"Therefore, be it resolved, That in the opinion of this meeting, we should have not less than four representatives for the District of Assiniboia."

I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that in Assiniboia alone persons who are able to form an opinion on the

subject, and who live among the people there, claim there is a population of 60,000 in that territory alone. It is quite clear, from what was said by the mover of the resolution, Mr. G. L. Dodds, a merchant residing in that charming town of Wolseley, that he must have had some assurance given him by some member of the Government that the Government proposed to introduce a Bill this Session to grant them representation—an assurance from some Minister of the Crown who, during last fall, paid a flying visit to the North-West Territories. I trust the Minister who gave Mr. Dodds the assurance that the Government proposed to deal with this question will see that the assurance so given is carried out. I may say that I waited some time to see what action the Government proposed to take in this matter. No reference was made to the representation of the territories in the Speech from the Throne. No action was taken by the Government, with a view to secure representation, and seeing that no action was taken by the Government, I took it upon myself to introduce this Bill, and to ask the House to assent to the principle of the Bill, that the territories should be represented in this Parliament. Similar resolutions were passed at other meetings held last fall and during the early winter in the territories. I will not trouble the House with reading any more of the resolutions. All I propose to say further is, that it appears to me, from the press published in the territories from one end to the other, that in every nook and corner, wherever settlers are located, there is a universal demand in favor of the representation of the territories. Let me refer to a speech delivered at Ottawa, at one of the festive gatherings that are occasionally held here, by a friend of the Government, and under the nose of the Government, by a supporter of the Government, the editor and proprietor of the *Regina Leader*. The speech is reported by the correspondent of the *Regina Leader* at Ottawa, said correspondent is believed to be the editor of the *Leader*, Mr. Davin. It was delivered at a dinner of the Old Guard Club. I do not know what the Old Guard Club is, or who are the distinguished gentlemen composing it; but this orator of the evening goes on to discuss various matters connected with the North-West; and I say to the hon. gentleman that nobody can give a better or more reliable or more correct opinion of the wants and necessities of the people of the North-West, and especially of the District of Assiniboia, than Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin, and here, at this festive gathering of the Old Guard Club, he spoke with reference to the representation of the North-West. He said:

"He spoke on the question of representation at considerable length, referring to two meetings which had been held in the North-West in favor of representation, one at Wolseley and one at Moosomin. The men, he said, who spoke at those meetings would do credit to any assembly in the world. Mr. Perley, of Wolseley, was an eloquent speaker. He referred to a resolution proposed by Mr. G. L. Dodds in favor of representation, which affirmed that there were 60,000 people in Assiniboia. There were 120,000 in the whole North-West. As to the policy to be pursued, he said he agreed with Mr. Thompson, who spoke at the Wolseley meeting, that it was not desirable to make the whole of the North-West Territories into one Province. Either of two courses should be taken—to give the North-West six representatives representing territory, or else create three Provinces with three local governments, or one might create Assiniboia into a Province and let members go from the Saskatchewan and Alberta for a short time as representing territory. Mr. Robert Bobier, at the meeting at Moosomin, had proposed a resolution in favor of Provinces, which was carried unanimously. But the great thing was to get representation. Did they suppose 120,000 people were going to be held in leading strings? Were they—an *immigration d'élite*—a select immigration—the flower of the old pioneers of Canada—to remain 'disestablished and disendowed' and outside the pale of the constitution? Did they think it was possible? Or if possible, that it was politic? It was not possible, and if it was possible, it would be most impolitic."

Sir, I agree with the orator of the occasion. I say that the hon. gentlemen cannot resist the claims of the settlers of the North-West, and if they could resist the claims of the settlers, they should not resist the fair demands made by

them, in temperate language, to the Government and Parliament of this country. Sir, I suppose from what Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin said on that occasion, that he was not speaking without authority, that he was speaking by the book, because on the same occasion that gentleman stated, with reference to erecting the new buildings at Regina, that he held it in black and white, over the signature of a Minister of the Crown, that these buildings were to be erected in the spring. But, Sir, we have some observations made by a Minister of the Crown: The gallant knight who presides so worthily over the Public Works Department, paid a visit to the North-West during last fall; and, of course, the advent of so distinguished a gentleman created a little excitement in the North-West. He was feasted and he was fed, he was dined and he was wine, and on one of these festive occasions, the hon. gentleman being—I was going to say in good humor, but I will not say that, because I never saw him otherwise—but being present at a festive gathering, he made use of the following language:—

“So far as any complaints made or changes wanted were concerned, he had everywhere said, as he now said: ‘Come to us. Let us know your wants. We are your Government. We have at our backs, and have had for years, a strong majority, and that majority it is our duty to use for the good of the country.’”

Sir, that is a fact; the hon. gentleman stated nothing but the strict truth when he made that statement. They have had—the hon. gentleman has had—at his back for a number of years, a large following in this House; and he invited the people of the North-West to lay their complaints at the foot of the Canadian Throne and they would receive every consideration at the hands of the Government. Well, these people have been so laying their complaints for two or three years. Last Session they did so emphatically and decidedly, clearly and distinctly, and I ask the hon. gentleman now to redeem the pledge he made to the people of Calgary when he delivered the address from which I quoted this extract. He went on:

“Sir Hector, continuing, referred briefly to the questions of representation in Parliament and a representative Local Legislature as amongst the changes asked for. While he, as but one of the fourteen Ministers composing the Government, could not indicate its policy or give any pledges on its behalf, he was understood to concede the justice of our claim to a voice in the Parliament which makes our laws and collects our taxes, and also to favor such an increase in the number of elected members in the North-West Council as would transform it virtually into a representative body. He could only promise that all these matters should have the best consideration of the Government, and, if at all possible, the views and wishes of the people should be met.”

Now, Sir, it is quite clear from the speech—if the hon. gentleman is correctly reported, and I made the extract from a Calgary newspaper—that the most solemn assurances were given by this Minister of the Crown to his followers who met him on that occasion, that all they had to do if they had well founded grounds of complaint was to lay them at the feet of the Government and they would receive every consideration. On the question of representation the hon. gentleman ventured to give his own opinion, and in no unmistakable terms. I call on the hon. gentleman to carry out to the people of the North-West the assurances he gave them on that occasion when he was visiting the North-West Territories. Sir, I tell the hon. gentleman that unless these fair and reasonable demands of the people of the North-West Territories are assented to, they can hardly expect that peace and contentment, progress and prosperity will continue in that country. Now, Sir, at all the meetings held in the North-West Territories there was pointed out very clearly and very correctly the anomalous position that the people of that country occupy—the unfortunate position they occupy—the injustice of the position in which they are placed. Sir, they are taxed by this Parliament, for the purpose of carrying on the Government of this country, for the purpose of carrying on the great public works of this country; they are taxed to pay the national debt of this country, in the creation of which they had no

Mr. CAMERON (Huron).

voice, and upon all these matters they have no vote now. They are taxed as a part of this great Dominion, and we expect them to submit quietly without grumbling or complaint. Sir, although we pass laws affecting all the material interests, the progress and prosperity of that country, they have no voice in this Parliament; they cannot advise; they cannot protest; they cannot counsel with us, and they cannot vote for or against any proposition that may be submitted to the House. We, by an Act of Parliament, open the pockets of the people of the North-West Territories, and we keep their mouths closed for the want of an Act of Parliament. I am introducing an Act of Parliament which will open the mouths of the settlers; hon. gentlemen have passed Acts of Parliament opening their pockets. Here in this Parliament, and every Session of this Parliament, we are constantly passing laws which materially affect the progress and prosperity of the country away to the west of us—laws affecting the interests, the ultimate prosperity and the growth of that country; and yet, Sir, we exclude the people who, above all others, are interested in the character of these laws, from a voice in that legislation—we exclude them from having a vote as to whether it shall or shall not pass. We who live, some of us at a distance of 2,000 miles from these territories, assume to know more about the country than the people do themselves. We are here in Ottawa framing laws, passing laws, moulding laws, which effect the material prosperity of the people in the North-West Territories and we expect them tamely and quietly to submit to those laws, and still we tell them in the same breath, You shall not have a voice in the framing of those laws, or a vote in the imposition of the taxes you are called on to pay. We assume that we know more about the country than the people living there. I ask how many members of this Parliament have visited Manitoba? How many have set foot in the prairies of the great North-West? How many Ministers of the Crown have ever visited the North West? How many Ministers of the Interior ever visited the North-West Territories? I am mistaken if a single Minister of the Interior ever visited that country. But if they did visit it, their visits have been like angels visits, few and far between, and they have been very short. It is true, Sir, some members of Parliament and some Ministers of the Crown, in a palace car, surrounded with all the luxuries of modern life, and accompanied by a few choice companions, have sometimes taken a pleasure excursion through the country to the foot of the Rocky Mountains; but they saw nothing of the country and learned nothing of the country, except what they saw from the car windows. They delivered a few speeches from the car platform, in reply to congratulatory addresses presented to them by their followers; but to say that they saw the country by passing over it on the railway I say is not possible. Very few of them have visited the centres of population or have visited the people in their prairie homes. At all events, no Minister of the Crown has been in the country long enough to make himself thoroughly familiar with the wishes and wants of the people there. We know perfectly well that what would be in the interest of the older Provinces would not be in the interest of that magnificent inheritance which we possess in the North-West; what might suit us might not suit them, and what might suit them might not suit us. It is impossible for a Minister of the Crown to legislate intelligently with regard to the North-West Territories without making himself acquainted with the wishes and necessities of the people there. And yet we undertake to do all that. Need we be surprised that in this condition of affairs the people in those territories should grumble and complain, and that during the last fall and the early part of this winter they should have held numerous meetings, protesting against being kept longer in a state of tutelage

and servitude, and insisting that the Government shall carry out their assurances that the people of the North-West Territories shall get representation in this Parliament. Let hon. gentlemen reflect for a single moment on the consequences of it. Do hon. gentlemen expect that the people who are called upon to pay the taxes we impose upon them, and to yield obedience to the laws passed in this Parliament, will long remain in a peaceful and contented state? Hon. gentlemen will find themselves mistaken if they think so. They will learn, and the country will learn with sorrow, that until this right is granted to them there will continue to be complaints of a very serious character from the people of the North-West. One can easily understand that. Suppose we undertook to-day to exclude from the House by a simple resolution the six representatives from the island of Prince Edward. This Parliament can do wonders in that respect; we have elected before now a member by resolution, and I suppose by resolution we can exclude one. Suppose by resolution we excluded the six members from that Province from having a voice in this Legislature, what would be the consequence? The consequence would be, first, a solemn protest, and then open rebellion. And yet we treat our people in the North-West Territories just in that way, and we expect them quietly and tamely to submit to this sort of proceeding. Suppose we said to our friends from British Columbia: We have no need of you in this Parliament; we can get on without you; you have been born in the country, or you have lived long in it, and you know more about it than we do; but we can pass our laws without you, and we don't want you; we who are thousands of miles from the country know better its wishes and necessities than you do who live there. What would the people of British Columbia say? Would they tolerate it? Not for an hour. And yet that is what we are doing in the case of our people in the North-West. We are taxing them, and we are compelling them to obey the legislation of this House, and yet we expect them to submit to our taxation and to yield obedience to our laws. The thing won't do. Hon. gentlemen will have to solve, and solve quickly, this question of representation in this Parliament. A question has arisen as to the population of the territories. We cannot tell what the population is, nor shall we be able to tell for years to come, with any absolute certainty. It is a floating and shifting population. It may be doubled or quadrupled in two or three years. I hope it will; but it may be less than it is now. Hon. gentlemen have taken steps to procure a census of those territories; but it will not be taken, in the ordinary course, for a year or two, and if we are to wait until the census returns are published the territories cannot get representation for two or three years. We know not what the population may be at that time. It may be 50,000 and it may be 500,000; yet in the face of the petitions and protests of the settlers, their asking for this representation, we shall no doubt be asked to wait until the census returns are brought down, and until we have some certainty of what the population is. I say to deny the people of the North-West Territories representation, and representation now; is to deny them one of the clearest rights a British subject is entitled to, and I hope the First Minister will not deny them that right. Assiniboia, according to the statement I read a moment ago, is claimed to have a population of 65,000; I honestly believe that it cannot be less than 50,000. The territory of Alberta is said to have a population of 40,000. It is difficult to form an idea of what the population of the other territories is, but it must be very considerable. Now, the two territories I have referred to have a large population—a population four times that of Manitoba when it was admitted into the Union with representatives in Parliament of four members, and nearly four times what British Columbia had when it was admitted into the Union with six members; and the two territories together have a population far ex-

ceeding Prince Edward Island when it was admitted into the Union with six members. And yet we deny representation in this Parliament to those people who have made their homes in that country, and intend to spend the remainder of their lives there. Now, I propose in my Bill, that they shall have representation in this Parliament, and representation at once. I give the provincial district Assiniboia, with 65,000, two members; Alberta, with of 40,000, one member, and I give each of the other territories one member—five members in all. I do not think that representation is too large. In my opinion it is too small, and when hon. gentlemen deal with my Bill, and I trust that they will, as I believe they will, from the assurances given by one of the Ministers of the Crown, give Assiniboia three members, Alberta two, and each of the other Provinces one. I propose by my Bill that these people shall be relieved of the disability under which they now suffer, and shall be enabled to send representatives to this Parliament who will, on the floor of this House, declare the wants and wishes of the people of the North-West. I ask the First Minister if, when he is carrying his Bills through this Parliament, having reference to the North-West, he would not be materially assisted if he had the counsel and advice of men who have lived in the country for many years and are thoroughly conversant with its necessities. The hon. gentleman can give me but one answer to that question. I propose in my Bill that there shall be an election before the 1st of December next, in order that the representatives from the North-West Territories may be present at the next Session of this Parliament, and the next Parliament also. I want the Government to give them representation, and to give them representation for the next two Sessions of this Parliament. The details of the Bill I do not propose to enter into. I move the second reading of the Bill, with the earnest hope that it will become the law of the land. I believe that if the Bill passes it will tend very largely to allay a large amount of the discontent and dissatisfaction that exists in the North-West Territories, because one can easily see that if the people have representatives in Parliament, through whom they can make known their wishes and wants, they will not have the same grounds of complaint that they would have if the legislation was passed behind their backs and sometimes against their solemn protest. I move the second reading of the Bill, believing thoroughly that its passage will tend to allay to a large extent the discontent and dissatisfaction which now, to some extent, prevails in the North-West Territories; I move the second reading of the Bill, believing that by giving representation to the territories we are doing a simple measure of justice to the people of the North-West Territories; I move the second reading of the Bill in the earnest hope that it will become law, believing that if it should become law the people of the North-West Territories will be satisfied that this is an earnest, on the part of the Parliament of Canada, of our desire to mete out to them the same justice that we mete out to other portions of the Dominion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would have wished that the hon. gentleman, when he introduced this Bill, had favored us with the remarks which he has made this evening, as I would have then been prepared to answer the able argument he has just made. Under these circumstances, this being an important measure, I would desire to postpone my remarks to another day, and beg therefore to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion (Sir Hector Langevin) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

MARITIME COURT OF ONTARIO.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 11) to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario—(Mr. Allan.)

(In the Committee.)

On section 1,

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. When this matter was discussed before it seemed to be the general opinion of the House that it should not apply to supplies but only to repairs. I propose that the words "or for necessaries supplied to any such ship" be struck out. I propose also that this Bill should not have a protective effect, that the clause providing that the maritime courts shall have jurisdiction be made to apply to claims arising after the passage of this Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. RYKERT. I move the following amendment, of which I have given notice:—

This Act shall not apply to any claim for building, equipping or repairing of any ship, made or incurred before the passing hereof.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported.

HOLES IN ICE ON FREQUENTED WATERS.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I regret that I was not in my place when this Bill—Bill (No. 22) to amend the Criminal Law, and to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes cut in the ice on any navigable or frequented waters—came up for the second reading, as I think I could have explained some objections made to it by hon. members; but since I have heard what has been said and objected to, and upon consulting members of the Government and others in the House, I have considered it would be advisable to move:

That the Order for the House to go into committee be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to a select committee, composed of the following gentlemen: Messrs. Hall, Ives, Landry (Kent), Davis, Wells, Girouard, Beaty, Cameron (Victoria), Fleming, and the mover.

Motion agreed to.

EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES.

House resolved itself into committee on Bill (No. 6) to further amend the law of evidence in criminal cases.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. McCARTHY. I propose to move the amendment of which I have given notice to the fourth clause. I propose to add to the clause the following words:—

Provided, that so far as the cross-examination relates to the credit of the accused, the court may limit such cross-examination to such extent as it thinks proper, although the proposed cross-examination might be permissible in the case of any other witness.

This is to prevent the accused being cross-examined as to character. The witness puts himself in the box, and is liable to be cross-examined as to his past history and character; and, in the case of an accused, he may be condemned, not, perhaps, because he was guilty of the offence with which he is charged, but because his general character may be such as to cause him to be punished for his past offences. I think that is unreasonable and unfair. I further propose to add:

In case an accused person, tried before a jury, does not tender himself or herself a witness, or become a witness on the trial, no observations shall be allowed to be made at the trial by the prosecutor or by the counsel for the prosecution, as to him or her not so tendering himself or herself as a witness, or not being a witness, nor shall any adverse inference be drawn against the innocence of the accused by reason thereof.

It leaves it optional with the accused to go into the witness box or not, with this legislative declaration, so far as it will be of authority, that his not going into the witness box will not be taken against him.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am sorry to say that I cannot assent to the proposition of my hon. friend. The first Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

amendment he proposes to make is to limit the cross-examination, that is, as far as I understand it, that when a defendant goes into the box to give evidence on his own behalf the counsel for the Crown is not to be at liberty to cross-examine him, to ascertain whether he is credible or not. His mouth is to be closed on that subject, unless with the assent of the judge. It appears to me that that is hardly a reasonable or fair thing. If a man sees fit, when on trial, to offer himself as a witness, he ought to be precisely in the same position as any other witness. I do not think that, if I spoke for an hour, I could express this in better language than that of Lord Bramwell, in the letter I quoted to the House on the second reading of this Bill. He is no mean authority on a question of this kind, and he says:

"I send you a copy of the Evidence Bill, which passed the Lords this Session. It is the same as they passed last Session. It is, I believe, the same as was brought in by the Government and passed the Commons last Session, with one exception, namely: in that Bill was a provision that the defendant in a criminal case, when called as a witness, should not be cross-examined as to his past career and character."

Now, that is the amendment of the hon. gentleman, except as to the action of the judge—

"This was contested in the Commons, but carried by a small majority. It is clearly wrong, and I believe contrary to the opinion of our Attorney-General. If a man presents himself as a witness, there ought to be a power to see what he is worth as such. There cannot be opposite rules for ascertaining that—one where the proceeding is criminal, another where it is not. If the question is whether the defendant assaulted or libelled the plaintiff or prosecutor, and the defendant tenders himself as a witness, it is manifest that he should be dealt with in the same way, whether the proceedings be by indictment or civil action. No doubt it puts the defendant in an awkward dilemma, if not being called or being subject to such enquiries, but I dare say there may be convictions, not because the man has committed the offence charged, but some other—not many. There is no help for it. And remember that it is hard upon a prosecutor of good character that he should be put on an equality with one of bad character. Remember also, that the prosecuting counsel may always say to the jury: My client has been asked no question to show he is untrustworthy; I could not ask such questions of the defendant."

The effect of that amendment would be to leave it discretionary with the judge how far the cross-examination should go, but a counsel would in that case ask no questions at all, because he might be stopped any moment. It seems to me very unfair, when a man goes into the witness box to pledge his oath to a certain state of facts, that the jury should not have an opportunity of judging what weight they should attach to that man's evidence. They can only do that by a thorough cross-examination. He may be a gaol-bird or a penitentiary-bird, he may have been guilty of the most serious offences, he may have been convicted for perjury twenty times, and yet you cannot ask him a question as to that. That is not fair, or just, or right, and I do not think it would help the administration of justice to add such a provision. The fourth clause of my Bill does, to some extent, give a protection. It says:

"Provided also, that no person so charged, being a witness on any hearing of such charge, shall have the right to refuse to answer any question, on the ground that it would criminate him or her, as to the offence charged, unless the court before whom such hearing shall take place shall think fit."

He has got a certain protection there. I think it is all the protection he is fairly entitled to, and therefore I shall have to oppose the amendment of the hon. member.

Mr. McCARTHY. The amendment which I propose leaves the matter practically for the judge or the court who hears the person cross-examined to say whether the cross-examination is going too far or not. It is well known to many members of the House, and it has been often felt by laymen, that the right of cross-examination is rather excessive, too indefinite, and that parties who go and tender themselves as witnesses are subjected to cross-examination into the history of their whole life, going into matters which have no direct concern with the question before the

court, and in point of fact putting the witness through a terrible ordeal. If the unfortunate man who is accused of the offence, and of which he is supposed to be innocent, is to undergo that ordeal, it will nearly always prevent him from coming forward as a witness. Now the court will have a right to say whether the cross-examination has gone far enough, or too far, and the court will allow it to go as far as it thinks proper and necessary for the elucidation of truth and for the purposes of the trial; but the moment he thinks the Crown officer is going too far he can at once interfere and stop him. I think this is a fair principle, because this is all an experiment, an experiment which, I dare say, any person who has been in the habit of defending prisoners, will find it embarrassing to act upon. I dare say my hon. friend, who generally acts for the Crown, and not for the accused, would find it troublesome, if he was acting for a prisoner, to decide whether he would put him into the box or not. Of course, I respect the authority my hon. friend has referred to; but, after all, we are at liberty to follow our own judgment, even against the opinion of so distinguished a lawyer as Lord Bramwell. This amendment is a suggestion of one of the Chief Justices of the Province from which I come, in the very language drawn up by him, and I submit it to the committee as a proper limitation upon the general right of cross-examination.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I think there is a difficulty in applying this law which will be increased by the amendment which is proposed. I believe the evidence of the accused is bad evidence, and that he should not be examined. While I do not think the evidence of the accused should be accepted, still, if he is to be examined, I do not see how the amendment proposed by my hon. friend who last spoke, would tend to the elucidation of the truth. If the accused, or the prisoner, chooses to go into the box as a witness, he should be examined as to his credibility like any other witness. I think it would be a mistake to adopt the amendment. I believe the principle of the Bill itself is bad, but this amendment would make it worse. I see there are two or three amendments to be proposed, and it might be better to refer them back to the select committee from which this Bill comes.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). The select committee appointed to examine and report upon the Bill have fairly considered the whole question, and they thought it better to refer the Bill just as it passed the English House of Lords, where the matter had been fully and fairly discussed for several Sessions; in fact, they thought it better to make no change of any kind. The Bill before you is a *verbatim* copy of the Bill passed by the House of Lords.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Were these amendments now before the Chair discussed in the committee?

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). No.

Amendment (Mr. McCarthy) to section 4, negatived.

On proposed amendment (p. 496) as section 5,

Mr. McCARTHY. That clause was reported, I think, by my hon. friend as chairman of the former committee, in these very words. I do not know why he has changed his opinion about it, unless he is so enamored of the opinion of the House of Lords that he thinks we cannot alter or go beyond it. It does appear to me that this is a very fair provision. The accused can be called as a witness if this Bill becomes law, and if he is not called the fact will always be used as a strong argument against him by the Crown prosecutor, and I think it is not fair, this being experimental legislation to a great extent, that he should be subjected to that option.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If the Bill is to pass at all, that clause ought to be inserted in it. But I have great doubt as to the expediency of passing this Bill, great doubt as to

the principle involved in it. But if we are to have the Bill, that clause certainly should be inserted in it, in my opinion.

Mr. DAVIES. I do not agree with the hon. members in that respect. The object of the Bill is to further the cause of justice, to get at the truth, and I cannot see why a man who is competent to testify to the truth or falsity of the facts alleged against him, if he chooses to go upon the stand, that we should shut him out. He has the privilege of going; if he does not choose to take that privilege, then he must take the consequence of it. One would suppose we were legislating entirely in the interests of persons accused. If the man will not go he has no right to complain. The jury will draw their inference, at any rate.

Mr. McCARTHY. The accused may be perfectly innocent of the charge, but he may be subjected to a cross-examination as to other matters, which it would be very inconvenient for him to answer, and that might prejudice his case before the jury. We all know that when a person is a bad character or has been mixed up in discreditable transactions, it would be of great prejudice to him to have these facts brought out in a cross-examination upon another and distinct offence altogether.

Mr. TUPPER. I am opposed to the amendment, simply because, as I pointed out before, it is impossible to enforce it. You may put it upon the statute, but, as a judge in the State of Maine stated, in his charge to the jury, it is absolutely impossible to carry it into effect. That presumption would be drawn against every man who did not do what he was virtually challenged to do by this kind of legislation. He would be called upon to stand a cross-examination, and he would have no choice about it. I think hon. gentlemen who are presenting this Bill should, in order to be consistent, carry out to their conclusion the arguments which have been urged, namely, that there should be no distinction in these cases from civil cases. I disagree with hon. gentlemen who have expressed that opinion; but that opinion is, I think, consistent with the spirit that actuates this kind of legislation. I direct the attention of the House again to the differences of opinion among those hon. gentlemen who support the Bill, in order to show how we ought to hesitate in regard to accepting it. The opinions of Lord Bramwell on this subject have not obtained, as yet, in the House of Commons; he has suggested this course, but other gentlemen who have framed other Bills have drawn them differently. Those Bills are now all receiving calm consideration before the Grand Committee of the House of Commons. We have heard in this discussion additional reasons for hesitating. We have got along very well without this legislation, and we can afford to wait and be guided, not merely by the decision at which the House of Lords has arrived, but by the decision of the whole Parliament of Great Britain, of which we may be able to obtain the benefit next year.

Mr. MILLS. I think the proposition contained in the amendment is a reasonable one. It seems to me that when the House is not prepared to go so far as to compel a prisoner to give evidence, we should not use moral compulsion to place him in a position in which we will not put him by law. He should be protected against animadversions for non-appearance.

Mr. BOSSÉ. I am very much struck at what seems to be the impracticability of this amendment. What law can be passed to prevent an inference being drawn by a jury, and the verdict given as a result of that inference? I am, too, at a loss to know what legislation will prevent such a result. This remark is only as to the amendment under consideration. Other considerations also apply to this amendment. Last year I had occasion to oppose this Bill, and I cannot allow it to pass this year without entering my protest against the whole of its provisions. I had occasion

to read the report of the discussions in the House of Lords in England upon the Bill when it was presented, and especially the observations of Lord Bramwell; and with all due respect to so high an authority, I must confess that I am at a loss to see the weight of reasoning which has been brought to sustain his measure. Those reasons are far from convincing, to my mind. They are very few and can be stated briefly. One of the main reasons for the Bill is, that in some cases only one witness is heard and the prisoner's mouth is closed. It is also stated that it would be very wrong to allow the lawyer in the case to make a statement which the prisoner could not make, and that it is wrong also to allow the defence to state that the prisoner's mouth is closed. Each of those three reasons seem to fail. What is the fact when only one witness is heard? If only one witness is heard, surely there will be no conviction, unless his evidence is sufficiently strong to convince the minds of the jury that the prisoner is guilty. If that evidence stood alone, and if it was not corroborated by other evidence or circumstances, and if it was not sufficiently strong to satisfy, without corroboration, the minds of the jury, surely there could not be a conviction. There is, therefore, no harm in allowing the law to remain as it is—that there may be a conviction when there is only one witness heard and the prisoner is not heard, if the evidence of the witness is sufficient to satisfy the minds of reasonable men that there should be a conviction. We are told, it was stated during the debate, that it may be said in the defence that the prisoner's mouth is closed, that the prisoner has not had an opportunity to give his own story. We all know what little effect this kind of defence has upon the minds of jurymen; and if the prisoner himself is not at liberty to make his statement with his own lips, surely his lawyer is there to make it for him, if there is anything to be said, and it will be said better than if the prisoner uttered it. There are two other reasons given, and I have heard them repeated in this House by supporters of the Bill. The first is, that bad convictions will be fewer under the new system than under the old system. But this is begging the question, by assuming the fact that there will be fewer convictions under the new system than under the old. We affirm a fact which is not proved; and we are not giving any reason to show why those convictions will be less under the new than under the old system. Again, we are told that juries ought to know all the facts. Every one knows that the main, and in fact, the only object of a trial, is to arrive at all the facts. It is again begging the question to say that if the prisoner is heard all the facts will be better known than if he is not heard. Let us consider, for a moment, what will be the result of the examination of the prisoner. He must be submitted to cross-examination. It has been attempted to curtail the cross-examination; and how can it possibly be curtailed? The object of cross-examination is to ascertain whether the witness is or is not worthy of credence, and if he can be believed under oath. The test of his credibility is the cross-examination, and if that cross-examination is to be curtailed, how are we to ascertain whether the facts stated in the examination-in-chief have been truly and fairly stated? This will raise in the mind of every one an uncertainty as to the veracity of the witness, so that it will be held that no reliance can be placed on his evidence. If that cross-examination is applied to the prisoner, we have, in order to know what its effect will be, to distinguish between the two classes of prisoners who may be brought to the bar. Is the man timid, and unaccustomed to all the form and pomp of a criminal trial? In such a case there are very many chances against one, not only that the truth will not be elicited, but that the whole of the prisoner's bearing and answers will tell against him. If, on the other hand, a man is a hardened criminal, a jail-bird, a man accustomed to

Mr. Bossé.

trials, all the chances will be in his favor. He will have more chance to carry to the minds of the jury the conviction that he is in reality what he seems not to be—that he is in reality an innocent man, but a man who is awed by the position in which he stands, by the pomp and form of a trial. One question solves the whole matter. What good is to be derived from this law? None, to my mind. Who is to believe the man who is put between his oath and imprisonment for a longer or shorter period—perhaps imprisonment for life? Who is to believe the man who is placed between his oath and his own existence? Who is the jurymen who is going to rest his own verdict upon evidence given under these deplorable circumstances? I submit that the truth cannot be elicited and that no faith can be attached to evidence given under these circumstances. One result of passing this Bill will be certain—that there will be a terrible augmentation of the crime of perjury; and another result will be to accustom people to believe that by perjuring themselves they can save themselves from conviction. I see evils which will result from this measure, and I can see no good which can possibly result from it; and for these reasons I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). This seems to me to be an unfair and a cowardly way in which to deal with this Bill.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am perfectly in order.

Mr. DESJARDINS. I beg that the chairman will ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his expression; it is insulting.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I say I am perfectly in order.

The CHAIRMAN. I do not see that the hon. gentleman has any right to say that the step taken by the hon. gentleman is cowardly.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). Well, Sir, if that is your ruling I submit to it, but I am satisfied I am in order all the same.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). I am in perfect order. I say that it is not a fair way—and I suppose that is in order—to deal with a Bill of this kind. After a full discussion the principle of the Bill was affirmed by the House, and now when we are trying to get the Bill into shape, the hon. gentleman moves that the committee rise without reporting the Bill, which would, of course, kill the measure. That is a habit which has crept into this Parliament during the last few years, and not a very creditable one, in my opinion; and if hon. gentlemen are opposed to the principle of the Bill they can move against the Bill, or move an amendment; but Parliament has adopted the Bill, it has decided that in some shape the principle of the Bill should be assented to by the House. The hon. gentleman who spoke last was not here when the Bill was read the second time, but that was not our fault, for he should have been here, and then he would have had an opportunity of discussing the principle of the Bill. At present we are discussing an amendment of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), as to whether there should be any comments made by counsel on a prisoner not giving evidence, and upon that amendment the hon. gentleman moves that the committee rise, and thereby kill the Bill. Now, I do not think that that is a fair way of doing.

Mr. McCARTHY. I trust that the motion made by the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Bossé) will not prevail. I think this Bill is an important one. It has passed its second reading, not only on this occasion, but on another occasion, and it is one which, at all events, according to experience in the Province of Ontario, will not, I think, be fraught

with the great dangers which my hon. friend from Quebec (Mr. Bossé) thinks would result. All that has been said by my hon. friend who so ably addressed the House with regard to perjury, was urged before in England; it has been urged in this country, as to the admission of defendants in civil cases to give evidence, and although it might possibly add somewhat to the crime of perjury, nevertheless, I am quite satisfied that the result, on the whole, has been good, and that the object of a trial has been attained, that object being the elucidation of the truth. The object of a trial is to ascertain whether a man is really guilty or innocent, and it does appear to be an extraordinary way to arrive at that result to say that the party accused is not to be at liberty to tell his own story. If he is innocent, certainly that story, under cross-examination, will tend to his acquittal. But, if on the other hand, he is merely committing perjury, the result, I think, in almost every case, is that the fact that he is not telling the truth is ascertained by the jury under cross-examination, and by the appearance, the manner and demeanor of the witness. The principle of the Bill, therefore, I think, is a good one, and I trust it will be allowed to become law. As to matters of detail, of course we may differ; but the House having passed the second reading, I trust that the motion before the committee to rise will not prevail.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). I regret to have to differ from the hon. gentleman who last spoke, and I speak, like him, on behalf of the Province of Ontario. I confess that my opinion is that the Bill will be productive of more harm than good. The principle of the Bill seems to me to be an utter contradiction of the well-known principle of English criminal law, that no man shall be required to criminate himself. That principle hitherto has been supposed to be the basis of the administration of criminal justice in England, and to mark the distinction between the manner in which it is conducted there and in France and other continental countries. If the Bill passes, the practical effect is, that a man shall be required to criminate himself. If he tender himself as a witness and is cross-examined, he necessarily can be convicted out of his own mouth, and if he does not tender himself, then his failing to do so is certainly making him criminate himself, and therefore I think that it is an entire contradiction of that salutary maxim of English law, that no man shall be required to criminate himself. I do not understand that my hon. friend from Huron (Mr. Cameron) is quite correct in saying that a principle of a Bill is asserted because it is allowed to be read a second time—that, in fact, no question as to the principle of the Bill can be raised if it is read the second time, and that if an hon. gentleman does not happen to be in his place in the House when a Bill is read a second time he is to be precluded from objecting to it thereafter, at any stage, because the principle is admitted. I refuse to accede to any such position. I was not here when the Bill was read the second time, and if I had been present I would have opposed it, for reasons which I could have given; but I do not think I have lost my right or my duty—for I feel I am discharging a duty in opposing the Bill—because I was not present when the Bill was read the second time. I shall, therefore, support the motion of the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Bossé).

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is that the committee do rise.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I am thankful to the hon. member

Some hon. MEMBERS. The question has been put.

The CHAIRMAN. No; I have not put it.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member who preceded me for having answered the assertion of

my hon. friend for North Simcoe, that the opposition to this measure only came from the Province of Quebec. I am sure the views expressed by the hon. member for Quebec Centre will find adherents from all parts of the Dominion.

For my part I can say that it is, as a student of English criminal law, that I disapprove of the provisions of the Bill. I know that the House has already expressed its opinion on the measure at its second reading, and if I ask the attention of the House for a moment, it is less in the hope of reversing the vote of the other night than to register my protest against a measure which I believe to be hasty, uncalled for and dangerous.

We are told it has passed the House of Lords in England. So it has. Still I do not know, I do not think it has, nor that it will become the law of England yet. Even if it had, my opinion would not be changed. I have carefully read what has been said in this House on the different occasions when this Bill has been brought before it; I have read what was said in the House of Lords upon the question, and I am still uncompromisingly opposed to this measure; and examining it with the light of a long experience in Crown cases, I cannot refrain from saying that I think it is a bad measure, a very bad measure. The more so, because it will tend to propagate amongst those who, in a great measure, administer the criminal laws, I mean the jurors, that exaggerated, unhealthy sentimentality, that misplaced sympathy, which often brings the most honest people close to complicity with criminals. An exaggerated fear of danger is called pusillanimity; an exaggerated fear of error easily becomes weakness and dangerous leniency, and the original idea of this legislation is to be found in that exaggerated fear of judicial error.

Say what we may, it is not in the austerity of the morals of the people, in the stern reprobation of crime, and the inexorable determination of punishing it, that we find that nervous sensitiveness in favor of imaginary victims of judicial error.

The general tendency is unfortunately in the direction of relaxing the severity of the law, both in the detection and punishment of crime.

You are arguing in favor of the best and most complete evidence in criminal cases, and you forget that, by this legislation, you are attacking in its foundation the principle that has guided the world in the selection of a criterion for truth in matters of evidence; the intelligent declaration of a disinterested witness. "Interest is the measure of actions" says Pothier. That maxim, in its broadest sense, which is not the sense which Pothier gives it, is in a large measure the rule of the acts of men. It has passed into the language, "You cannot well appreciate that question, you are interested in it." "You would not show so much passion in the matter if you were not interested in it." And language is there the true interpret of human belief.

You are introducing, in the process of finding the truth, an element which the verdict of humanity has rejected. I do not speak of exceptional cases; I know that a trifle would lead one to perjury whilst another would not save his own life by means of a false oath.

Laws must take the average of men with their average moral value. The multiplicity of occasions where an affirmation on oath has been declared necessary has been the consequence of a laxity in the moral sense of the people, and in vulgarising the oath, if I might use that expression, you have minimised its solemnity and sanctity.

And strange to say, general as the use of the oath has become, the repression of perjury has not, in any way, increased in the proportion of the number of cases where it is committed.

Unnecessarily multiplying the number of cases where an oath is administered is multiplying the number of opportunities for perjury, and diminishing in the same rate the average value of an oath, and, as a consequence, rendering

more difficult the search for truth. The uncertainty of the evidence is far more dangerous than the scarcity of witnesses. To know all is not more important than to know well. You say you want to throw more light on the object you have in view. Take care not to mistake color for light, and render your object less distinct than it was before. The art of dissimulation would play an important part in your process of bringing out the truth, and the less scrupulous would have an unfair advantage over the plain truth talker. Truth is depicted naked. In our days, and with most men, you will find that a well-dressed fiction has more chance of being accepted, and of moving its auditors.

Do not tell me that in the confusion of falsehood and truth, of disinterested evidence and prejudiced declarations, of virtue-cloaked rascality, and clumsy sincerity, the piercing eye of justice shall distinguish the right line between innocence and guilt! I answer you with the impartial judgment of a long experience in those matters: It would be a mistake even with learned and cool-headed judges; how much more would it be with an unguarded, credulous jury. Honesty here adds to the danger in the case of an artful criminal.

As it is, the detection of offences is becoming more and more difficult, owing to that laxity of the moral sense of the people. How much more will you render it by introducing a new and powerful element of delusion in the evidence?

Do not tell me that your law is demanded by public opinion, on account of the number of victims fallen under the irremediable errors of justice. I have been practising for over twelve years in one of the great centres of the judiciary districts for Crown cases. My practice, for the number, variety, and importance of cases, has been considerable. Well, Mr. Speaker, I say without vanity, I have yet to learn that an innocent man was punished in cases above police offences, while I would hesitate before assuming the responsibility of saying that all my clients were innocent who were acquitted.

As long as the unanimity of the jury remains necessary for a verdict, you may be sure that the number of guilty parties who are acquitted will represent an enormous proportion of the number of the accused. Of the twelve men empannelled to try a prisoner, you may rely that, on an average, six will lean towards an acquittal on the natural impulse of sheer sympathy; three of those six will persist in their disposition to acquit, through some bias of mind, spirit of contradiction, and sometimes a partiality for the ability of the counsel; it is not uncommon that, in the end, some friendly connection, some sympathy of association, some old spite against the prosecutor, the Crown counsel, and even against the judge, will carry one or two of the jurors towards an unjustifiable acquittal. Well, of those one or two evil-disposed jurors the courts generally have reason, by the stern proposition, that there is no evidence to justify an acquittal, and that the presumptions raised for the prisoner's defence are devoid of foundation. Very often the absolute impossibility of finding a word in the declaration of the witnesses to support the theory of the innocence of the accused is the last and only argument of the honest against the prejudiced juror. Give the latter the excuse of hiding himself behind the sworn declaration of the prisoner, and you will see the increase of disagreements of jurors.

Unfortunately, in discussing these delicate questions, sentiment is apt to take the place of cold reasoning, and one is disposed to take as a glorious rule the more sentimental than intelligent maxim, that it is better that ninety-nine criminals should escape than that one innocent should be punished. The only good rule is that all criminals should be punished and all innocents acquitted. The perfection of laws and of tribunals would perhaps bring that rule to be a fact. Next to perfection, the laws must be such as to pre-

vent, as much as possible, the escape of criminals as well as to exempt innocents from being unduly punished. And if, through the frailty or wickedness of men, an accident happens and a wrong conviction is obtained, it is no reason for altering the laws; the fault was not in the law, it was in the perversity of human nature.

Let us go further. You are afraid that with a good law and a good judge an accident will happen, and the liberty, the honor, or the life of a good citizen will be lost. And to prevent that accident, which you know is not one in a thousand, you open a door through which hundreds of criminals will pass. Have you thought, in your humanitarian dream, that each of those criminals that your tenderness lets loose is a dangerous enemy to the liberty, the honor, the limbs and the life of good citizens? Have you put in the scale the number of children perverted, of families dishonored, of wounds inflicted, of murders committed, by the hundreds of desperadoes whom your imprudent philanthropy has spared and emboldened?

It has been said that the fear of being found in fault by a strict cross-examination would deter the guilty party from offering false evidence. This is a fallacy too flattering for the lawyer. We must not forget that we are all in search of the best means of finding the truth in the intricacy of conflicting evidence in a criminal case. The worst evil to be feared is the escape, unpunished, of the consummate criminals. We have already said that, as a rule, and we must not legislate for exceptions, as a rule the innocent is well protected. Well, the habitual frequenter of the courts, the clever scoundrel, who has made a study of crime and of the means of evading the law in committing it, will add your law as a special branch of his study, and a most useful addition to his means of escape will it be. He knows that he can give his testimony, that he can give it when all the witnesses have been heard. He can build his criminal machinery with unfinished pieces, to which his own testimony will so naturally fit as to give it the most natural appearances of innocence and truth. Nay, more. The legislator must not forget that the manufacture of evidence by accomplices, by friends, by the paid servants of criminals, is an important factor in the struggle of crime against society. Let me tell you that your law will give, I was going to say, too great a protection to that unenviable kind of industry. The witnesses are not scarce, unfortunately, and the criminals can have their choice of those infamous beings swarming in the moral slums of society. They are not wanting in number; they only want the courage; they are afraid of detection. They can build for their principals the most ingenious contrivances to mislead justice, but their coward rascality fails when the danger of detection begins, because detection means possibility of punishment. But give them the chance of having their story, in the material part of it, completed by the prisoner, and you will see their audacity increasing with the diminution of the fear of danger, their ingenuity reviving with the greater chances of success. Where the witness is frightened the prisoner will not hesitate. Shame for shame, he will choose the shame of perjury to that of the penitentiary. The fear of detection is nothing for him. All the chances are on his side. What is a prosecution for perjury against a conviction for felony. Your statutes, I never understood through what leniency, only terms perjury a misdemeanor. The accused, when on his trial, has the privilege to sit near his counsel, amongst the gentlemen of the long robe. And do you think that the hardened criminal, for the punishment of whom you are equally interested in finding the truth, as for the protection of the good citizen, do you think that that hardened criminal is not aware of all that; and knowing it, do you believe that he will hesitate? No; he will confirm the evidence of his accomplices; he will complete it without any danger for them. Danger for himself, do you say? Does he not

know as well as yourself that the Crown seldom prosecutes for perjury, and then only when some private interest is at stake to press the action of the Crown. Does he not know that impunity in those cases would be the rule, prosecution and punishment the exception. He will perjure himself, knowing that if his perjury does not save him, the Crown shall not follow him after his conviction; and that if his perjury saves him, the Crown prosecutor will let him go in disgust, with the remark of that witty Attorney-General, "Oh! let him be discharged, your honor, we will have a chance to convict him next term."

You ask also that the wife may be a witness against her husband. Have those who have framed this law thought of the great evil that it will cause? I do not want to repeat remarks that have already been made in this House in respect to the cruelty of bringing a wife to testify against her husband. I take the lowest class of people, the most numerous of those who appear before the criminal courts. I speak of classes that have been deprived by poverty and vice, vice engendered by intemperance, by poverty. I say that according to the experience of those who have pleaded in those courts, when a man, through drink or poverty, has lowered himself to the commission of crime, you may still find in the mother of the children of that depraved man a sense of honor, a remnant of virtue; and you would bring that unfortunate wife, who has to support all the ignominious conduct of her husband, into the presence of that ruffian, and ask her to expose herself to the danger of being brutally treated by her husband if she gives evidence against him! or else to stifle the sense of honor, the remnant of good reputation that still remains with her, by giving false evidence!

In the most important cases, in those cases where the criminal has put all his ingenuity, the difficulty is to have clear and positive evidence. Circumstantial evidence, in many cases, is the only evidence upon which such criminals are convicted. I speak from experience and with a deep feeling of justice, when I say that circumstantial evidence will be completely destroyed by this legislation. Circumstantial evidence, with jurors weak as they are, will be useless against the clever rascal who will come before the court in the witness box, and will make, on his oath, a plausible declaration that he is not guilty. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I speak with a deep sense of duty towards society when I say that we are not prepared for this legislation; that by its enactment you encourage perjury; you give a premium to it; more than that, you render it necessary. The amendment proposed by my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy) having been refused, there shall always be a presumption of guilt against the accused who does not proffer his evidence.

I resume my objections: You force upon the jury a depraved source of evidence; you multiply the occasions of perjury; you push the criminal into deeper depravity; you encourage clever rascality and you create a presumption of guilt against bashful innocence; you encourage unscrupulous jurors; you give a premium to the manufacture of false evidence; and all that, in order to protect innocents whose danger is only in your imagination, and who are fully protected by the law as it stands at present.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I have never been in favor of the principle of this Bill. I know very well that there is a very great diversity of opinion among the judges of Ontario with respect to it. My own idea is, from what I do know, that the majority of the judges are really opposed to the principle of the Bill. As I have stated already, I am not in favor of it myself. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the able speeches that have been made on the floor of this House, both *pro* and *con*, and I must say that the more I hear in reference to it the more confirmed I am in the opinion that it would be a very great mistake to make this the law of the land, at the present time. A Bill similar to this has been before the House of Lords, and passed on

one or two occasions, but it has never become the law of England, and I think we are safe enough in waiting until we have the experience of it, when it becomes the law of England. It appears to me that this Bill breaks down many guards that are around a person who may be charged with crime. I do not altogether agree with my hon. friend the Secretary of State in the arguments he has brought before the Committee, because I think that the chances are rather that the effect of this Bill would be to militate against the prisoner than in his favor; but that is the way men differ, and we see things through different spectacles, as it were. For instance, although it is the law in Ontario—and I speak for Ontario only—that either party can be put in the box in a civil case, yet we have also another privilege there, that of putting the parties out of the court, so that they cannot hear the evidence given by the opposite party. Of course, in a criminal case, that could not be, because the prisoner must be before the court and the jury while the case is being tried, and therefore, in support of the view of my hon. friend who has just spoken, it might be said that a cunning knave might well understand how he could put himself in the box, and make a point in his own favor. With reference to that, I think the chances are very much that it would be against the prisoner. Then there is another thing. According to present law and practice, if a prisoner has been convicted previously, the prosecutor cannot put that fact before the jury until after the prisoner is convicted, and then evidence may be given that he has already been convicted and the court can take that into account in passing sentence. If this Bill becomes law, the proposed amendment of my hon. friend for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) with reference to cross-examination being rejected, there is nothing to prevent the Crown counsel from asking the witness—as he is a witness then—Have you not already been convicted? Have you not already been accused of other crimes? Now, if it is proper that a prisoner being put into the box can be asked this question, it is just as proper that the Crown should be allowed to prove, before the case is closed, that he has been convicted of another crime. I have therefore come to the conclusion that the Bill ought not to pass.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I hoped we would not have this discussion a second time. The principle of the Bill was amply discussed in this House some days ago, and was affirmed by an overwhelming majority. To-night we find some hon. gentlemen who were not here at that time coming up after the Bill has been fully discussed, and moving that the committee do now rise, and by that means strangle the Bill. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) was called to order because he happened to say that the effect of this motion was to strangle the Bill; and he was quite right. Immediately after he sat down, hon. gentlemen who are interested in this motion got up and boldly affirmed that it was their intention that this Bill should not be law—that the principle of it should not become affirmed. The hon. Secretary of State went into a long, elaborate and eloquent argument against the Bill. He took it on all sides. He was kaleidoscopic; he looked at it though red, white and blue; he left nothing unsaid that could be said, but he did not touch anything that had not been already said with regard to the Bill, and all his objections to which had been fully met here. He took the ground that the Bill gave an undue privilege to the accused, who would be likely to get off by false testimony. He told us that what he wanted was disinterested testimony. Did he ever see that on earth? I wonder what angelic being he ever cross-examined in the box, who gave disinterested testimony. I would like to see the face of that lady or that gentleman. I have been in practice for some years, and have cross-examined a good many witnesses, but I have failed

to find one so angelic as to go into the box, free from all mundane influences, ready to march on the road to the celestial country, who would give unbiased and unprejudiced testimony. Why, Sir, it is an Arcadian phantasy, born of the poetic brain of the Secretary of State. He will not find that, here in Canada. Why, Sir, in London, in Liverpool, in Birmingham, in all the cities of Great Britain, the principle of this Bill is law, or is likely very soon to become law. Certainly the House of Lords passed it, and had all this discussion upon it, and as I said the other day, they are conservative enough, the Lord knows. They knew that in all these cities of Great Britain, these unwhipped, unbaptized rascals were floating about, that this combination of witnesses would be bad; that the picture the Secretary of State gave here, of four or five men marching into the box, one after another, with their story all concocted and all planned out, with the finishing touch to be given by the chief conspirator, the accused—the House of Lords knew this picture would be realised, and they knew it would be done on a large scale if done at all. Still, they gave the accused the right of going into the box in a country where they have half a hundred rascals to our one. Therefore, I say to the Secretary of State that everything he has urged against this Bill in our purer atmosphere of Canada, could have been urged with tenfold greater force in the House of Lords, where the Bill passed. The Attorney-General in England did not think it beneath his dignity, nor beneath his great talents and the high official position he occupies, to introduce into the House of Commons every letter, every line, and every sentence of this Bill, and ask that the people of England have this as law. Yet, my hon. friend thinks that in Canada, where we have so many rascals—though we have only four or five millions of people—the Bill will call forth a long line of criminals, marching into the box to deliver their stories concocted outside. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) also used that argument. He was not here when this principle was discussed, but he says: I am against the Bill, and I am with the Secretary of State; I am going to fight this Bill to the doors. He said that the innocent man would be convicted; the Bill would operate against the criminal. He does not agree with the Secretary of State, and if we strike a general average between them, we may, perhaps, get at what is right. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron) made out a very strong argument for the Bill, from the *Main vs. Beamish* case, where, as the law stood, if it had only been a case of assault, all the parties would have been heard; and where, because Beamish happened to strike Main on an artery, and the effect of that was death, the Mains were permitted to go upon the stand. These disinterested gentlemen, these poor, angelic creatures, without any self-interest, went upon the stand and swore away the honor and lives of men who were as innocent as they were. Why, that case alone demands the interference of the House of Commons. It is a wholesome rule that nine guilty men should escape rather than that one innocent man should suffer. I say again that this question having been debated in all its stages in the great country to which we owe allegiance, and which is a conservative country, and having passed the House of Lords with such a large majority, it is hardly the thing for hon. gentlemen in this House to ask us to stultify ourselves by giving a vote different from the one we gave the other day. They cannot strangle this Bill without stultifying themselves by giving a vote diametrically opposite to the one they gave a few days ago. Therefore, although we have heard the speech of the Secretary of State on the same side as the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson), notwithstanding the flow of eloquence by the former, to which I listened with the greatest pleasure, yet it will have been a waste of time, unless hon. gentlemen

Mr. WOODWORTH.

are prepared to stand up and vote different from what they did a few days ago on the principle of this Bill.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. The hon. gentleman has been unfair in his appreciation of my remarks and those offered by the hon. member for Hamilton. We have not differed. We have agreed in condemning the Bill, and we have shown it is doubly bad. The hon. member who has last spoken has tried to make a joke. His argument is nothing but a joke. The hon. gentleman said this: "The Secretary of State has spoken of disinterested witnesses, but where can he find them?" If all the witnesses were bad in the cases in which my hon. friend has been engaged, he must have been in very bad company. I have seen, in the administration of justice, disinterested evidence given; and it is because I know that in this honest country there are disinterested witnesses, and that we can get a proper trial and verdict from a jury, that I object to mix good, disinterested witnesses with bad. The hon. gentleman has said that the English legislator had not been deterred by the number of criminals in such cities as London, Liverpool, Glasgow and Dublin, and that legislation has been passed in England, giving those criminals the privilege of testifying in their own case. Legislation has not been passed in England. The Bill has passed the House of Lords, but it is not yet the law; and I hope it will not become the law. I trust the good sense of the House of Commons will prevent that result. The hon. member has dwelt upon the depravity of those large cities; but that fact does not destroy my argument. He knows that I am standing on firm ground and he was obliged to appeal to prejudice. He said that hon. members should not vote against the motion, because they would stultify themselves; that they should not listen to an argument, but look at the Votes and Proceedings; that they voted a certain way at page so and so, and they should not expose themselves to be placed on the hustings in the position of having once supported a measure and then voted against it. I did not make an appeal of that kind to the House. My remarks were offered more for the purpose of registering my dissent from such legislation and for expressing the views which I felt it to be my duty to place before the House, than for any other reason.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The hon. gentleman says my argument is a joke. I did him an injustice. He has been reading some light literature, and that is where he got his disinterested witnesses. It was the case of the Irishman who, after three or four witnesses had gone in to the box, was asked if he had any witnesses. He replied that he had eleven men who would swear that they did not see him do it. They were disinterested witnesses.

Mr. McCARTHY. I rise more for the purpose of reading a quotation than for answering the argument of the Secretary of State. He has gone back to the doctrine, which was exploded many years ago, that interest was sufficient to exclude a witness from giving evidence, because he might commit perjury. He also adduced another argument, which is an equally exploded one, that where a witness of that character went into the box, the jury are unable to discriminate and judge whether he is telling the truth or not. Allow me to read from the recognised authority on the law of evidence, Judge Taylor, the recognised work in England and Ontario and all English-speaking countries:

"In rejecting the evidence of parties to the record and other interested witnesses, the law acted on the presumption, not only that such persons, sooner than make a statement which might prejudice themselves would commit deliberate perjury; but that if they did so, juries would be incapable of detecting the falsehood. A more baseless calumny upon the veracity of witnesses and the intelligence of juries, cannot be imagined."

Let me read a further extract:

"Although at the time when these sections first came into operation learned judges might have been found who, taking the cautious view of

the subject, were inclined to regard the examination of parties as a questionable, if not a very dangerous experiment. It is believed that, at present, every eminent lawyer in Westminster Hall will most readily admit that this change in the law has been productive of highly beneficial results."

Of course, that only applies to civil procedure, but what is good there must be equally good for the elucidation of truth in criminal matters. The prisoner probably may be induced more readily to commit perjury; but I venture to say this is the experience of every lawyer—and there are some lawyers here who have practised, even as long as the Secretary of State, although they have not always been Crown prosecutor, and I am afraid if counsel are always on one side they become liable to look at things merely from that standpoint. I have heard and I have known of certain learned judges who, when at the bar, were always defending prisoners. I have known certain other learned judges who, when at the bar, were always prosecuting. I believe that the particular bent which they acquired in practice has followed them on the bench, and I find one judge nearly always in favor of the accused, and another judge just as certain to take a strong view against the accused. I am afraid it is so with the Secretary of State.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. That is contrary to the state of the case. I appeared seven-eighths of the time for criminals.

Mr. McCARTHY. Then the hon. gentleman was in very bad company. In our Province there certainly are innocent men sometimes accused. It is hard that the chain of circumstances which may point to the guilt, and which may yet be perfectly explained by the evidence of the man who must know one way or the other, cannot be explained by the accused. I think the hon. gentleman will find that the introduction of this law will not be calculated to do as he thinks—enable the accused to be acquitted. The hon. member for North Victoria (Mr. Cameron) agreed with the Secretary of State in opposing the measure, but for exactly a contrary reason. The Secretary of State thinks the accused will get the benefit of this legislation.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not say so. I said the criminal, the scoundrel, would get the benefit, while the honest man would be placed in a contrary position.

Mr. McCARTHY. Well, but the accused may be a scoundrel, as the hon. gentleman says, but the accused may be improperly accused. That is the object of a court, and that is what a jury is there to ascertain—whether he is a scoundrel, whether he is a guilty man or an innocent man, and what the hon. gentleman says is that the court and the jury are wholly incompetent to draw that line and to make that determination. Well, I differ from him altogether. I do not propose to occupy the time in discussing the matter at length, although it is a subject which, from the days of Jeremy Bentham, has occupied a great deal of attention in England. As hon. gentlemen know, the ablest jurist of England to-day, Mr. Justice Stephen—and I think I may so call him, without any disrespect to Lord Bramwell and other jurists—are in favor of this change.

Amendment (Mr. Bossé) that Committee rise, negatived.

Mr. McCARTHY. I hope the hon. gentleman will now accept the amendment which appears to be the general sense of the committee—the fifth clause of which I have given notice.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). So far as I am personally concerned, I am disposed to accept that amendment.

Amendment to section 5 agreed to.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I believe that I may now move the addition to the Bill of which I have given notice. The House is well aware that on two or three occasions a Bill has been introduced by myself, with a view of amending the law of evidence, in order to give persons

an opportunity of giving evidence who have an objection to taking an oath. That Bill has been before the House on several occasions, and it appears to me that it is quite unnecessary to introduce a new Bill. This being a Bill on evidence, it appears to me to be a fair proposition that if the House is in favor of my amendment it might be made part of this Bill. I therefore move that the clause of which I have given notice be added to the Bill. It may be that the amendments proposed by me are more lengthy than there is any necessity for. I have had the advantage of a consultation with the Deputy Minister of Justice with reference to them, and he has suggested that there is no necessity to have the clauses quite so long as they are, that they can be very much curtailed, and with the leave of the House I would therefore strike out certain parts and merely propose this:

If any person called as a witness in any court established by the Parliament of Canada, or in any proceeding, civil or criminal, over which the Parliament of Canada has legislative authority, or requiring or desiring to make an affidavit or deposition in the course of any such proceeding, refuses or is unwilling, from alleged conscientious motives to be sworn, or shall declare that an oath is not binding on his conscience, the court or judge or other presiding officer or person qualified to take affidavits or depositions may, upon being satisfied of the sincerity of such objection, permit such person, instead of being sworn, to make a solemn affirmation or declaration in the words following, that is to say:

I, A. B., do solemnly, sincerely and truly affirm and declare, that the taking of an oath is (according to my religious belief, unlawful, or is not binding on my conscience, as the case may be), and I do also solemnly, sincerely and truly affirm and declare that, etc.

Which solemn affirmation and declaration shall be of the same force and effect as if such person had taken an oath in the usual form.

I therefore beg to move that this be added as the sixth section of the Bill. I may mention as, no doubt, the House is well aware, that in Ontario this is the law, so far as civil cases are concerned. Now, I am well aware, from expressions which have been made use of in this House on former occasions, that there are many hon. gentlemen who are opposed to the principle of my amendment. But it appears to me that when they come to consider the whole facts they will find that these objections are not well founded. As I heard the hon. gentleman from Quebec say to-night, the great object of all evidence is to get at the real truth of the matter. Now, it is a fact that if a person who is produced as a witness has scruples against taking an oath, he may object to be sworn and, more than that, supposing he does not object to being sworn himself, his evidence may be objected to. Now, it appears to me that if a person tells what he knows, on a solemn affirmation, that is as binding on his conscience as if he swore on the Gospels, I think the experience of all judges, at all events, is, and it is the opinion of the great majority of the judges in Ontario, that this is a very desirable amendment of the law. I hope this House will see the desirability of accepting the amendment I have proposed.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry my hon. friend should have proposed this amendment to this particular Bill. It is a repetition by which this Bill itself, I think, and the proposal of the hon. gentleman, both suffered shipwreck in a former Session. Measures upon three different matters in connection with the criminal law were referred to the same select committee, and that committee, in its wisdom, combined the three different propositions in one Bill, and the result was that when the Bill got back into the House the opponents of each of these different propositions combined in their opposition to the whole measure, and the measure went down under the stress of that combined opposition. I think it would be very much better that the proposition of the hon. gentleman, which is a very important one, and one to which I am quite prepared to give my assent and vote, as I did before, should come up on its merits, disembarassed by the opposition that may obtain to my hon. friend's Bill, and that my hon. friend's Bill should not be embarrassed by the opposition which may obtain to the hon. gentleman's pro-

posal. If, however, the hon. gentleman persists in moving it, I would suggest that, having stated his intentions, it would be better to move on the report, when the votes can be recorded, than to propose the introduction of the clause in the committee, when he cannot obtain in a formal manner the sense of the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). The reason I proposed this now is that it appeared to me that it was not in the same position that it was in on the occasion the hon. member for West Durham refers to, because there were several subjects introduced in that Bill, one of which was not a matter of evidence. For instance, there was in the other Bill an amendment proposed to the criminal law, which is now before the House, with reference to ice holes.

Mr. BLAKE. Oh! There is where the Bill went down.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). That is exactly where it went through. Now, this Bill is entitled: "An Act to further amend the law of Evidence in Criminal Cases," and that would be the title of the Bill if I introduced my amendment in the shape of a Bill. However, I am always ready to receive a suggestion from my hon. friend opposite, upon a matter of practice, although I cannot always receive his suggestions on political matters, and as some of my hon. friends behind me seem to think his suggestion is a good one, I will withdraw the amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. McCARTHY. I desire to move a short amendment, of which I have given notice, and which I think the House will accept without objection. It is to enable a wife to give evidence against her husband in those cases in which, according to the law as it stood in the Statute Book in 1869, the husband is answerable for not supporting his wife. It has been decided in the Court of Queen's Bench of Ontario that the wife, who is the only person that can know about the matter, is not a competent witness, although she is a competent witness in cases where her person or liberty are concerned. I move to add the following clause:—

In any prosecutions against a husband for not providing for his wife necessary food, clothing or lodging, wilfully and without lawful excuse, or for refusing or neglecting to provide the same, his wife shall be a competent witness, as if the prosecution was for an offence affecting her liberty or person.

I think that this is a very reasonable amendment, and I do not think there will be any objection to it.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). We recognise the principle in the Bill, that a wife shall not be a competent witness, except in certain cases. If the wife should be competent to give evidence against her husband in a case of this kind, why not in every case?

Mr. McCARTHY. The wife is competent now, and my amendment is only an extension of the law.

Mr. WELDON. I would suggest that the amendment of the hon. gentleman should be made a proviso in section 2.

Mr. McCARTHY. If there is any difficulty about the wording of the clause, I will move it on the report.

Amendment agreed to.

Committee rose and reported Bill with amendments.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron) moved that the said amendments be now concurred in.

Mr. AMYOT moved:

That the said amendments be not adopted, but that the said Bill be referred back to a Committee of the Whole, with instructions to amend the same, so as to take away the right of husband and wife to be used as witnesses, the one for or against the other.

Mr. CAMERON (Huron). There is no clause providing that the wife can be a witness against her husband; she can be a witness, but not against him.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. AMYOT. When a witness is brought into a box you cannot tell beforehand what he is going to say. It often happens that a witness who is brought to help the prisoner turns out to be the strongest witness against him. There is great danger that a wife who comes into the box to help her husband may become the cause of his conviction, and there is great danger that by the interference of the wife or husband in the evidence you will create trouble in families and weaken the tie that exists between husband and wife. The permission given to a wife or husband to be a witness against the other is immoral; it is against the law that makes man and wife but one, and I hope the House will not permit such evidence to be admitted.

The House divided on amendment (Mr. Amyot) to recommend.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Amyot,	Dodd,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Bain (Soulanges),	Dupont,	McDougald (Pictou),
Bergin,	Ferguson (Welland),	Moffat,
Blondeau,	Grandbois,	Montplaisir,
Bourbeau,	Guillet,	Ouimet,
Cameron (Victoria),	Hackett,	Pope,
Carling,	Haggart,	Sroule,
Caron,	Jenkins,	Temple,
Chapleau,	Landry (Montmagny),	Tupper,
Curran,	Lesage,	Wallace (Albert),
Daly,	Macdonald (King's),	White (Hastings).—34.
Desjardins,		

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allen,	Harley,	Mulock,
Armstrong,	Hay,	O'Brien.
Baker (Missisquoi),	Hesson,	Paterson (Brant),
Baker (Victoria),	Hickey,	Platt,
Bowell,	Hilliard,	Ray,
Burnham,	Irvine,	Rinfret,
Burpee,	Jamieson,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Cameron (Huron),	Kaulbach,	Robertson (Shelburne),
Cameron (Middlesex),	King,	Rykert,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Kirk,	Scriver,
Casgrain,	Kranz,	Somerville (Brant),
Charlton,	Landerkin,	Somerville (Bruce),
Cochrane,	Langelier,	Springer,
Cockburn,	Langevin,	Taylor,
Colby,	Laurier,	Townshend,
Davies,	Livingstone,	Vail,
Fairbank,	Macmaster,	Wallace (York),
Farrow,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Watson,
Fisher,	McCarthy,	Weldon,
Fleming,	McCraney,	Wells,
Forbes,	McIsaac,	White (Cardwell),
Foster,	McMullen,	Wigle,
Geoffrion,	McNeill,	Wilson,
Gillmor,	Mills,	Woodworth,
Gordon,	Mitchell,	Yeo.—76.
Gunn,		

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to and amendment concurred in.

INCOMPLETE RETURNS.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I have been accused of putting a report before this House knowing that it was incomplete. If the hon. member for Guysboro' (Mr. Kirk) had taken the trouble to read the first page of the report, he would have seen that it is a complete return, as the return furnished is the only return that has been made of the Canada Temperance Act from the Province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BLAKE. As I repeated the hon. member for Guysboro's question, I know that his statement was that the hon. gentleman had not brought down a complete return, but he did not say that he had brought down an incomplete return knowingly.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not mean it as maliciously; that would be like the verdict rendered lately in Montreal.

Mr. KIRK. The Order of the House was for a return for the year 1884. This return is for the year 1881; therefore, it did not follow the Order at all, and there was no necessity to bring it down. The Secretary of State says that is all that is in the office. Well, the law requires that an annual return be made, and it is the duty of the Minister to see that these returns are sent to the Department.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. *Nemo dat non quem habet.* There is none and can be none in my Department. The Department of Inland Revenue has given us the only report made.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Return showing the number of free passes or reduced fare tickets granted to parties to travel on or over the Intercolonial Railway, from the 1st of January, 1884, to the 1st of February, 1885; the names of the parties to whom granted; the date of issue; the length of time to remain in force, and in case of a reduced fare, the reduction made.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing amount of money paid for injuries to parties in the Mounted Police since 1878; specifying the names of the parties injured, the nature of the injuries, the amount of money paid, and to whom paid.—(Mr. Somerville, Brant.)

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 12th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. ABBOTT moved :

That as the time for the reception of reports from the Committee on Private Bills expires to-day, the same be extended to Thursday, 2nd April next, in accordance with the recommendation of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

AMERICAN GOLD.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the attention of Government had been called to the fact that by substituting American gold for sovereigns in the gold held by them a material reduction in the average rate of exchange upon New York may be secured to the great advantage of the community at large? And whether it is the intention of the Government to arrange for holding sufficient quantities of American gold to secure this object henceforward?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We hold our reserve both in English sovereigns and in American gold, and it is optional with the Department to pay it out with one or with the other.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BLAKE asked, How soon the measure on the subject of Chinese immigration, which the Secretary of State declared in Victoria would be proposed this Session, will be introduced?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not know that any measure was promised on the subject, but I suppose the Government will take the matter in hand when they are ready to put it before the House.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CONTRACTORS' CLAIMS.

Mr. WELDON asked, Have any claims been preferred by the contractors, or any of them, of section sixteen (16)

of the Intercolonial Railway? Have the same been adjudicated upon by the Railway Commission? If so, has any award been made thereon; and has any money been paid to J. B. Gough, or any other person, on account thereof?

Mr. POPE. No claims have been presented to Department, and consequently no action has been taken on them and no money paid.

CANADA AND JAMAICA.

Mr. BURPEE moved for:

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Canada and the Government of the Island of Jamaica concerning the confederation of the same with Canada, or with Mr. Solomon or any other party on behalf of Jamaica, upon the subject. Also all correspondence with the Government of Great Britain upon the same subject.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I may inform the hon. gentleman, there is no correspondence.

Motion withdrawn.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley, for the House to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McLELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to trouble the House at any great length on this occasion, and I hope I shall not do so. But there seems to be a great desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to discuss the National Policy, and to emphasise and repeat for the hundredth time their admiration for a policy of free trade, and their belief that every man ought to be free, as the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) expressed it at Toronto, to purchase whatever he requires in whatever market he chooses. It seems no matter to those hon. gentlemen whether the mechanic, who makes the articles that we require for use, shall reside in our own country or in a foreign. We, on this side of the House, entertain different views from those. We have no desire to shorten discussion on this question; we desire that it shall be discussed in the fullest manner possible as far as it can be done consistently with the despatch of public business. All we object to is the tone and manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite have for five years discussed this question. When the tariff and the policy of the Government were first laid upon the Table, we remember how bitterly that policy and that tariff were assailed. We remember well that the manufacturers under that policy were styled public robbers, and we were told it was the intention of this Government to legalise the robbery of the people by the manufacturers. The hon. gentleman, the ex-Finance Minister, lavished all his wealth of bitter invective upon the manufacturers of this country, denouncing them and the purpose they had in view. He has to some extent since then moderated his tone, and we do not hear so much of robbery by the manufacturers now. But, Mr. Speaker, they have assumed a tone of sadness and depression; the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite seem to be acting in a spirit of rivalry as to who shall present the condition of this country in the most sad and doleful colors possible. There seems to be a rivalry among them; certainly not a holy rivalry, but more in the spirit of that which may be supposed to exist amongst undertakers as to who shall do their work in the most solemn and grief-stricken manner. They appear to have been studying the philosophy of sorrow and to have been acting with some slight amendment in the words of Thomson's "Philosophy of Sorrow":

"For party sake let us gather around
And invent sad and doleful stories about everything,
To see who among us shall do the worst
In tangling the skein of circumstances,
And in weaving a web of dreariest argument,
To make us comfortably miserable."

So, Mr. Speaker, they seem to be exerting themselves to be comfortably miserable. Whenever they can point to a

bankruptcy, whenever they can point to an industry that is broken down, to a workshop whose fires have gone out, and whose workmen are idle, they seem to be comfortably miserable and happy in publishing those facts abroad to the world. Sometimes they get miserably jolly—we had an instance of that the other night, when the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) presented to the House a picture of a city laid in ashes. He brought up to our minds the destruction of the City of St. John and the calamities connected with it. We had pictured before us all those thousands of men who had for years previously been providing homes for themselves, and families—all suddenly swept away, and nothing but blackened walls and smouldering ashes left to mark the spot where once their homes had stood. And while he was dwelling upon that picture the hon. gentleman's wit sparkled and shone as a fire, his oratory flamed up, and the hon. gentlemen beside him and behind him grew uproarious in their mirth, with this picture of desolation before us. Mr. Speaker, there are some things which come down to us in history that are hard to believe, but when the hon. gentleman and his friends grew so joyous and uproarious, in view of that picture, I felt, Sir, that the incident which the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) alluded to the other night was possible, and that it was even probable, that Nero fiddled while Rome was burning. But, Mr. Speaker, they must choose their own course, and we do not so greatly complain of the effects their speeches may have in this country; our only concern is as to the effects upon this country which their speeches and utterances may have abroad. But to refer for a few moments to the utterances of the hon. member for North Norfolk. The hon. gentleman summarised his indictment against the Government by declaring that we met Parliament with a large debt, with heavy expenses, with over production, the North-West blighted, the tide of immigration reduced to a dribble, and the North-West people told that they shall not use their own moneys to build their own railways. For a moment let us refer to this indictment. He says we have met Parliament with a large debt. It is true that our debt is respectably large. It is true too that, as has been shown by the hon. the Minister of Finance, it is by no means so large as the debts of many other colonies which have less resources and less abilities to meet those debts than the Dominion of Canada. But, so far at least as this Government is concerned, both during the time it has occupied the Government benches since 1878 and in the period up to 1873, no part of that public debt was created to meet the ordinary expenses of Government. We cannot say so much of the hon. gentlemen opposite, for a considerable portion, not a very large percentage, but a very large sum at least, was added to that debt by the hon. gentlemen opposite to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government of the country which could not be met out of the current revenue. On the contrary, the present Government can turn to this fact that, but for the surpluses which they have had previous to 1873 and since, the public debt of the country, with the works that have been constructed, would have been very much larger by some \$30,000,000 than it is at present. It was expected in the confederation of these Provinces that we should incur considerable debt. It was anticipated, in forming this Confederation, that in order to its success and to the prosperity, and to the stability of the Dominion, there should be large public works undertaken on capital account and carried to completion. It was specially provided that the Intercolonial Railway should be constructed in order to afford means of communication between the Lower Provinces and the Upper. It was provided that the canals should be enlarged and deepened; and subsequently, when the North-West was acquired and British Columbia was added to the other Provinces and made part of the Dominion of Canada, it was admitted by both parties that there

Mr. McLELAN.

should be a very large capital expended in the construction and completion of a highway from ocean to ocean. What would this Confederation have been worth if there had been no means of communication from one Province to the other? What would it have been worth if we in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had, every year, or whenever we wished to visit Ottawa or any portion of the Upper Province, to take passage to Maine or to Boston—in the winter season especially—or to New York, and then travel through American territory in order to reach the capital of the Dominion? I say it would hardly have been worth the paper on which the British North America Act was printed had there not been means of communication provided from one Province to the other. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made a comparison of the debt of the United States with the debt per head of the Dominion of Canada. I shall not deal specially with that branch of the subject, because I understand that a gentleman near me will take it up and go into it at large, but I may refer to the remark of the hon. gentleman and the reason he gave for the debt of the United States. He told us that twenty years ago there was an enormous debt rolled up in the United States to preserve the nation, to preserve the life of the nation. Why, we have incurred a debt to create a nation, we have rolled up this debt in order to create a nationality, to consolidate and bind together a Dominion which at some time shall be regarded as one of the proudest nations of the world. The hon. gentleman has said that in the United States that debt was created to preserve the national life. Ours has been caused in order to create a national life. I have said that the Confederation Act would not be worth the paper upon which it is written if there were no intercourse between the various Provinces from the east to the west. Sentiment is all very well, but you must bind the people together, you must create a self-interest, and, without the means of communication, there is no way in which the people of one Province can trade with the people of another and create an interest which will bind them together stronger than any paper Act of Confederation. The hon. gentleman from West Durham (Mr. Blake) went down to Nova Scotia and told us that the proper market for us was in the United States. If we had all followed his advice, if the Provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island had all their intercourse with the people of the United States, and none with the people of western Canada, and the people of western Canada had none with the people of the east, there would be wanting that strong commercial bond which binds people, and sometimes is stronger and more effective than any other that can be formed. The Intercolonial Railway was built and trade has been had between the eastern Provinces and the middle Provinces here, and, since that trade has been opened, and year by year is growing and enlarging, the feeling of sympathy between the eastern and the middle Provinces grows with it, and year by year becomes stronger and more binding; and soon, from a large portion of this expenditure which has been incurred, this debt with which we are charged, we shall have communication with the extreme west, we shall have the great Pacific Railway opened up, and communication from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and that communication will give the people of the extreme west and the extreme east an intercourse and a trade and a traffic which will grow up and strengthen and bind them together from the east to the west. Without incurring this debt and this expenditure, that communication could not have been made. We anticipated it years ago; both parties were prepared for it. It is true that the debt in 1885 is larger than we anticipated. We expected that in 1891 the whole expenditure necessary to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway would be laid upon our backs as a portion of the public debt, but it has been found possible, and good reasons have been

given, that it is in the public interest to complete the Canadian Pacific Railway at an earlier date, and it was decided in the interests of the public at large to make that expenditure in order to effect that completion, six years earlier than was originally contemplated, in 1891. But, Sir, if that debt is now larger than it was anticipated, if it has reached the sum we expected it to be in 1891, we believe that the results of the opening of that railway, the benefits of having communication between the extreme west and the east, will compensate for the outlay, and enable us fully to bear any burthen that may be imposed on us. The hon. gentleman said that the United States has rolled up an enormous debt in the war which was concluded in 1865; and he told us how that country had reduced their indebtedness and were year by year paying it off. And he says to the House that while we are increasing our indebtedness that fact is a matter for grave thought. Why, Mr. Speaker, I do look at that circumstance, and instead of its being matter for grave thought, I say it is matter for happy thought, that the United States have been able to reduce their large indebtedness by so many millions, in the twenty years which have followed the war. Why, Sir, what have they for that debt? What caused that debt? The hon. gentleman says it was to preserve the national life and all that was left of it was hundreds and thousands of men slain and an immense amount of property destroyed. Sir, all that was left to the United States for that great expenditure were the graves that covered the slain, and the tombstones that were erected to their memory—works that will never yield any return until the last trump is sounded and the graves give up their dead. How different it is with our expenditure and that for which our indebtedness has been created—not for any dead works, but for works that tend to the development and prosperity of this country, and that will, year by year, as the years roll on and as the country becomes more developed, show that they have been good investments and will be no burden to this great and prosperous country. If the United States, with their great diversity of soil and climate, if they, under their protective policy, were able, in twenty years, so largely to reduce their indebtedness, having no works that are productive caused by that special indebtedness, how much more hope have we that in our great Dominion, with its great diversity of soil and the inexhaustible resources we have in our mines, our fisheries and in agriculture, and our protective policy—how much greater hope have we that our debt shall be reduced in due time—in comparatively less time, and the burthen be entirely wiped out. But, Sir, if it were not wiped out I maintain that it is a necessary expenditure, and although these public works, as the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) said, were not wholly productive directly, yet indirectly they are of the greatest of benefit. They were necessary to our national existence, they are necessary to our national life, and they will form the greatest bond that will keep together this great Dominion from the east to the west. When this great highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific is opened, and when trade from the extreme east shall be had with the extreme west, and when it shall be borne over that railway, then we shall feel that we are one people indeed, and that we have one common interest. If I may be allowed to borrow an illustration, I would say that the trains which shall pass to and fro from the west to the east and from the east to the west, bearing the products of one Province to the others, shall be as the shuttle in the loom, weaving a web of common interest that shall bind these Provinces together in one great brotherhood. The hon. gentleman said that the expenses are heavy. Well, Sir, they are large, but the Finance Minister has shown that they are not heavy, that they do not bear unduly upon the people. The hon. gentleman

says that the Finance Minister had to shin around the streets in order to get money to meet his expenses. Sir, if the hon. gentleman had to secure money it was only for temporary purposes and to meet the obligations incurred in the construction of these great public works. Hon. gentlemen opposite, during the five years they were in power, had to shin round and borrow money in order to meet the current expenses of the country to the extent of seven or eight millions of dollars. I need not dwell further upon that point of the hon. gentleman's indictment. The hon. the Finance Minister, has given the figures to show how the expenditure, which the hon. gentleman calls heavy, has been met, and how lightly it bears upon the people of this country. The hon. gentleman says there is a plethora of production, and he regrets that there are so many manufacturers in this country. I think the hon. gentleman has himself to blame for that, to a large extent. We remember that three or four years ago, after the National Policy was introduced, hon. gentlemen on that side rose and announced to the world that, in the manufacture of cotton, in the refining of sugars, and in various other industries, the manufacturers were reaping enormous profits of twenty, forty or fifty per cent., and in some cases more. With such statements made to the country, is it any wonder that an undue stimulus was given to manufactures, and that a larger number of people went into the manufacture of cotton than, perhaps, the wants of the country just at that time called for? I repeat, hon. gentlemen have themselves to blame largely—if there be a plethora of production, if there be too many manufactures—for having increased the number of people engaged in them. Hon. gentlemen opposite would not have it said that no man in the Dominion believed them—that upon this great public question their word was not to be taken; Their word was taken in many cases; and it had its influence in bringing more manufactories into existence in these particular branches than were for the time desirable. But the Customs returns show that in those articles, the manufacture of which the National Policy is specially designed to encourage—cotton goods, and iron and steel manufactures—the importations have diminished. Take the six months from 1st of July, 1884, and compare them with the corresponding six months of 1883, and you find that there is a considerable decrease in the importation of these articles. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) tried to alarm us by the announcement that we have a shrinking revenue. The falling off in the revenue during the past six months has been occasioned by the diminution in the importation of cotton goods and of iron and steel manufactures; and why, Sir? Because the men who distribute these goods, the merchants throughout the country, find that they can be purchased on better terms at home than they can be imported. During the last six months there has been a decrease of \$805,153 in the revenue. There has been a decrease in the revenue from cotton goods of \$347,109, and from iron and steel manufactures, which are specially protected and encouraged by the National Policy, \$420,738, making together \$767,847; and in the revenue from spirits and wines, which are no doubt affected by the adoption of the Scott Act in the various counties, there has been a decrease of \$78,418; making a total decrease in the revenue from these three classes of articles of \$846,265, or \$41,112 more than the entire decrease in the whole Customs revenue for the six months. So that hon. gentlemen will see that instead of there being a general decline all through the importations, the decline has only been in such articles as we are specially fitted to manufacture, and which are specially encouraged by the National Policy. But the hon. gentleman says that the North-West has been blighted and the tide of immigration has been reduced to driblets. Why, Sir, if there be any

blight or any diminution in the tide of immigration, who is responsible for it but the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Opposition benches. The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) smiles, but I want to ask those hon. gentlemen what they did during the five years that the North-West was under their control, to increase the tide of immigration. I want to ask them if they had not control of the North-West for five long dreary years, and what they did to induce immigration to that country. The hon. member for South Huron said in Montreal that if it had not been for the mismanagement of these people, we should have 500,000 or 600,000 people in the North-West, and 20,000,000 bushels of grain would have been exported from the country this year. Why, after spending \$15,000,000 or \$20,000,000 in that country, hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power acknowledging that there were only 30,000 people in the North-West; and yet they get up now and tell us that but for mismanagement there would be a population there of 500,000 or 600,000. Under their policy what inducement was there for people to go into the North-West? What facilities did they provide for going into the country?

Mr. LANDERKIN. Railroads.

Mr. McLELAN. Railroads where?

Mr. LANDERKIN. From Emerson to Winnipeg.

Mr. McLELAN. You had not a single mile.

Mr. MACKENZIE. We had 50 miles.

Mr. McLELAN. There was not a single rail laid.

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was all laid.

Mr. McLELAN. It was graded for three or four years, and you had piles of rails rusting in the North-West, but not a single rail laid.

An hon. MEMBER. It was in operation.

Mr. McLELAN. I am informed by the Department of Railways that there was not a rail laid when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power, and during the autumn following every rail was laid and the cars were running into Winnipeg, providing for the first time railway connection with the rest of the Continent of America. Hon. gentlemen have boasted time and again that they built the railway. They started a railway at Selkirk to run 114 miles into the woods, and another from Port Arthur into the woods 114 miles, and then they went away 100 miles south of that and spent a quarter of a million dollars in constructing the Fort Frances locks. And yet they contend that with such a system they could have brought out from the North-West 20,000,000 bushels of grain. It would have been impossible, if they had completed the Fort Frances locks, and all the other means of communication they were arranging to have, to have brought out this year's surplus crop of the North-West in less than three or four years. But the hon. gentleman says the people of the North-West have been told that they shall not use their money to construct their own railways. Why, Sir, they forget the action they took. They forget that they either passed or submitted to Parliament a Bill, one of the provisions of which was that no railway should be constructed in the North-West nearer to the Pacific Railway than 40 miles.

Mr. MILLS. Parallel with it.

Mr. McLELAN. That you are not to tap the main line nor to construct any railway nearer to it than 40 miles.

Mr. MILLS. There is no such provision.

Mr. McLELAN. And so it hardly lies in the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite to charge us with having prevented the construction of railways in the North-West, or with having prevented the people of the North-West from using their own

Mr. McLELAN.

money in the construction of railways. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) says that under the National Policy we have not benefitted the farmer, yet in almost the same breath he says there has not been a day since the National Policy was adopted by Parliament when agricultural produce has not been quoted higher in the United States than it has been in the Dominion of Canada, and he also claims that it is the markets abroad that regulate the prices of agricultural produce. Well, if it be the markets abroad that regulate the price of agricultural products on this continent, the United States export largely their produce and we largely export ours. Why therefore should the markets abroad keep the prices at higher rates in the United States than in the Dominion? And why does the hon. gentleman desire so much that there should be reciprocity in agricultural products between the United States and Canada? If the hon. gentleman will go back to the celebrated speech that he delivered some years ago, he will find from his own utterances that the farmers are benefitted by a protective policy. He knows that it is a very small percentage of the agricultural products of the United States and the Dominion which is exported. He knows that nine-tenths of the products of the farm are consumed in the country, and that if we have a large population, not producers of agricultural products, if we have a large body of manufacturing people who are the consumers of agricultural products, we enhance the value of those products to a very appreciable extent; and that is the reason, if the hon. gentleman's statements be true, why agricultural products are quoted higher in the United States than in the Dominion—the reason being that in the United States there is a larger manufacturing population, a very much larger population of consumers for whom the farmers must cater, than proportionately exists in the Dominion. Then the hon. gentleman says we are doing nothing to get reciprocity. As I have said before, why does he desire reciprocity so much, if our markets are only affected by the foreign markets? The hon. gentleman went farther than he should have gone, in stating to the House that we are pledged not to accept a fair treaty. Why, we have for years announced our readiness to accept a reciprocity treaty negotiated on fair terms with the United States. But the hon. gentleman says we must give up something, and first of all he wants us to go back to a free trade tariff; he wants to have free flour, free grain, free coal, everything free, and then, he says, we will be in a position to negotiate a treaty by giving up something in return to the United States. There is but one desire in the Government and in Parliament, and that is, to have a fair commercial treaty with the United States, a treaty on fair and equal terms, in which the rights of the people of Canada will be maintained, and the people of the United States not have everything their own way. We desire to live. The hon. gentleman smiles. Well, we have had treaties with the United States, we have had general reciprocity with them, we have had treaties in connection with our fisheries, and we found that even these treaties required to be closely watched. We found that when our fish were allowed into the United States free, the packages or cans of the lobsters were taxed. Our desire is that there should be no misunderstandings, but that we should have a broad treaty negotiated, based upon equal rights. Our desire is to live in commercial concord and amity with the great people that dwell opposite to us; that the beaver and the eagle may dwell together in commercial concord and amity; that if the lion and the lamb should lie down together, that the little child shall be able to place his hand upon an untaxed lobster can. But the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) would have us first give up everything; he would have us first make free trade, and then he would have us negotiate a reciprocity treaty, and give up something more. What more could we give up? No, the

true policy is to go on as we are doing, and when the time comes, when the people of the United States will be in the humor, we will meet them face to face, discuss the whole question with them, and negotiate a treaty on fair and equitable terms to the people of Canada as well as to the people of the United States.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct his statement?

Mr. McLELAN. Well, he can do so after I get through, as I want to finish before recess.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have merely to say that every rail was laid before 1st July, 1878, and the road was finished to Selkirk, 23 miles beyond Winnipeg.

Mr. McLELAN. That is from Selkirk to Winnipeg.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That was completed, and from the boundary to Winnipeg every rail was laid. Here is the report.

Mr. McLELAN. I went specially to the Railway Department to enquire and was informed that every rail was laid from Selkirk to Winnipeg, but between Winnipeg and Emerson not a rail was laid.

Mr. MACKENZIE. That shows how well informed the present railway management must be.

Mr. McLELAN. If I am wrongly informed, the fault is with the Department and there is an oversight on their part.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The Minister ought to know.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will not claim that the railway was opened?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I will.

Mr. McLELAN. And running?

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

Mr. McLELAN. Why, it was not opened and running until the winter, if my memory serves me at all. However, it is better that we should not enter into a discussion now, before we have the papers from the Railway Department.

Mr. MACKENZIE. This is from the Railway Department.

Mr. McLELAN. It is not of very serious importance. The hon. gentleman had not opened it for traffic, he had not commenced the running of trains—I am satisfied on that at least—and there was no communication or traffic when the Government went out of power.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You said there was not a railway.

Mr. McLELAN. That is what I was informed. There was no traffic at all events.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, there was traffic.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) made the announcement to the world that we are growing poorer every day, and that people are leaving the Dominion. What an announcement to make in Parliament, and to make to the world, that this Dominion of Canada every day is growing poorer and poorer, and that the population is rushing out of it as fast as it possibly can! If the hon. gentleman believed that himself, if he believed that this country is going to rack and ruin, and that the people are leaving it, why does he not go out of it himself? If he believes that this country is going to rack and ruin, he has no right to stay in it. No man is justified in either going to a country or living in a country, unless he believes that country will afford to himself and his children the means of a living and of prosperity; and I say that the best denial of the hon. gentleman's own statement that the country is going to rack and ruin is that he remains here, and I believe that he is prospering, with the great mass of

the people that remain in the country. What indication does the hon. gentleman give? The Finance Minister referred to the returns of the savings bank and of various institutions, all proving that the great mass of the people are prospering, and that wealth is accumulating in the country. The hon. gentleman has tried to elaborate the argument that people are going out of the country in vast numbers. They have some figures to sustain their case that people have gone out. They have the census returns of the United States from 1870 to 1880, and from these census returns they show that there has been a large out-going of Canadians to the United States, some 400,000 people.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Add 2,000 more.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman would outdo Uncle Sam. He would outdo the Census Commissioners. On that side of the House, they are continually complaining that our census is a fraud. He seeks to make out that the census of the United States, that they admire so much, is a fraud and has not done justice to the United States. But, suppose that a large number of people have gone out between 1870 and 1880, do we not know and remember that the hon. gentlemen opposite were in the Government for five years of that period? Do we not know how they managed the affairs of the country? Do we not know the depression that existed from 1875 to 1878-79 and which only ended after the change of Government and after the introduction of the National Policy? And do they not see, in that depression and in that condition of the country during the five years that they held office, that there was just reason why there should be an outgo of the people of this country? But these gentlemen argue and they reiterate the fact that people have gone out since, forgetting that their own leader, the member for West Durham, last year showed to the House conclusively, endorsed the statement that almost all that outgo that is stated in the United States census was during the years 1876 and 1877. Let me refer to the hon. gentleman's speech to prove what I state, that they, in making this statement, are giving a flat contradiction to the position taken by the hon. the leader of the Opposition, who admitted here on the floor of Parliament that nearly all that outgo of people between 1870 and 1880 was during the time that they held office and in the years 1876 and 1877.

Mr. MILLS. Not at all, it is a mistake.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman says his leader makes mistakes.

Mr. MILLS. No, it is yours.

Mr. McLELAN. We know he makes mistakes, and from the time he took the leadership, seized the reins of the party, it has been one succession of mistakes down to the present. I know that in the particular party view the hon. gentleman takes, it was perhaps a mistake for him to make this admission, but here it is, he was making a long and elaborate speech upon the emigration—long and elaborate as his speeches always are, and able as they always are—but here is the mistake the hon. gentleman committed, according to the views of the hon. member for Bothwell. He says:

"It is proved by a very thorough examination that took place in the year 1882 under the instruction of the Legislature of Massachusetts into the question"—

That is the question of the immigration into the United States of French Canadians—

"that it has only been within the last ten or fifteen years that this immigration has assumed such large proportion in that part of the country. It is only within a much shorter period, five or six years before 1882, that it began to assume the character of a permanent settlement in the country to which these people went."

These are the words, this is the mistake, according to the hon. gentleman, which his leader made. The hon. gentle-

man was referring to an investigation made by the Massachusetts Legislature into this question of the immigration into their country of the French Canadians, and then he refers to a meeting of the French Canadians, themselves, and the resolutions which they passed at that time, and he goes on to read one of the resolutions which was passed by a gathering of the French Canadians of Lowell, as follows:—

"Whereas, since the French Canadians have come to this section, they have reached a population of 400,000 in New England, and whereas a large number have become proprietors, paying large taxes, and whereas, for the most part, the young men propose to make their homes here,—Resolved, that we protest against the portion of the report which says we are a horde of industrial invaders; whereas we have to live five years in this country before we can become citizens of this glorious Republic, and the French Canadians have been here in large numbers only for five or six years."

Take the first resolution, where they say they are 400,000 strong, and take the next, that they have been there only five or six years, and take the date, 1882, and you have the hon. member for West Durham proving that all this outgo was during the years 1876 and 1877. And yet the gentlemen opposite, forgetting what their leader has done, overlooking the mistake, as they call it, that he has made in making this admission, still harp upon this statement that there is a great outgo of the people from this country. My hon. friend from Cardwell (Mr. White) the other day gave us the proof that, even from the railway returns, there are more people coming into the country than going out of it. We refer to our census and we find we have a very large number of people here, once American citizens, residing in the Dominion of Canada and prospering; and that, compared to our population, there is a larger proportion of American born subjects residing in the Dominion of Canada than, compared to the population of the United States, is the percentage of Canadians residing in the United States. The hon. gentleman will persist, I suppose, in telling us they are going there; and why are they going there? What should there be in the United States to draw people away from Canada? I suppose the hon. gentleman will say there is more employment there, that wages are better, and that there are prairie lands to be settled. Well, Mr. Speaker, if the policy of the hon. gentleman were carried out and if we were reduced to a revenue tariff, if the doctrines laid down by the hon. member for West Durham were adopted by the Government that men should be free to purchase whatever article they require in whatever market they choose, and on the lowest terms, then there would be less employment for our own people in our own country, wages would be reduced, and there would be greater inducements for our people to leave this country and join the great multitude of the manufacturing classes employed in the United States. But the hon. gentleman referred to the balance of trade, and he says that it has been claimed by the Finance Minister that the nearer he can approach to equalizing it the better for us. I endorse that doctrine. The hon. gentleman referred us to the case of England, and he told us there was an enormous balance of trade against England in the eight or ten years past. And he told the House how that balance of trade was made up? By the earnings of their ships abroad, by the interest on the investments that they had in all parts of the world. But he did not go back and tell us that England had, under a protective policy, grown enormously wealthy and earned the money which she had to loan all over the world; that she was receiving the interest upon investments which she had abroad, and out of that she met the adverse balance of trade. Nor did he attempt to show how much better off England would be if she had not to expend that 1,290 million pounds sterling which he mentioned in purchasing foreign goods. He did not tell us how much better off England would be if that enormous balance of trade was not against her, which she now has to meet out

Mr. McLELAN.

of the earnings of her ships, and out of the interest of her investments abroad. He did not tell us how much employment that money, if spent at home, would give to the people of England, Ireland and Scotland. He did not tell us, either, that because of this large adverse balance of trade, and this enormous amount of money sent away to foreign countries, how much misery and suffering there is among the unemployed people of Great Britain. Why, Mr. Speaker, they talk about the burdens that are laid upon the Dominion of Canada, and the taxes that are gathered by my hon. friend the Finance Minister. Sir, if my hon. friend only had the poor rates of Great Britain at his command, if he had the amount annually collected to maintain the paupers of that country, he would be able to run the Federal Government and every Local Government in the Dominion of Canada, and still have a larger surplus than he has ever had yet. And yet the hon. gentleman opposite want us to adopt a policy that would take away employment from our people.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. McLELAN. I will just ask him. Suppose a portion of that 1,290 millions of pounds sterling went to Ireland to start manufactures and give employment to the people there, would it not conduce to the prosperity and happiness of that country? One of the great grievances complained of in Ireland is that there is a constant drain upon that people and upon that country by absent landlords; it is said that absentee landlordism is a curse to Ireland. If that is admitted, and it seems to be generally admitted the world over, where is the difference between absent landlords and absent mechanics? The hon. gentleman would have our mechanics go to the United States, to Great Britain or any other country, and in that portion of the country to withdraw from us the money that they earn from day to day to maintain and support themselves and families. The laboring classes of Canada would soon recognise a grievance like that, and would not be slow to complain of it, just as the people of Ireland are not slow to complain of the grievance of their being subjected to a constant drain to maintain absent landlords. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman next referred to assisted immigration, which he condemns. I have a word to say upon that. I think I made the statement here last year, in the absence of the hon. Minister of Agriculture—and if I did not make that statement the public records of the Province of Ontario will show the fact—that the assisted immigration which was so much complained of was induced by the Government of the Province of Ontario; that an arrangement was made by the commissioners from Ireland with the Government of Ontario to receive such immigrants as they should send out, and give them employment. Under that arrangement they came to the Minister of Agriculture and said: The Government of Ontario will receive all the people we send out, will you give some assistance in order to bring these people where the Ontario Government can care for them. That was done, and that policy was thus inaugurated, or very much enlarged. Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen opposite pretend to be the friends of the workingman and have his interests very deeply at heart. I ask them how they propose to benefit the workingman by the adoption of a policy of having all the various articles that we require for domestic and public purposes, manufactured in a foreign country? How are they to benefit the laboring classes in this Dominion if they are to break down the barriers and allow an influx of foreign goods. The hon. gentleman knows that it is just at a time when there is a plethora of production the world over, as the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) calls it, that a protective policy is specially advantageous to us. It is then, if ever, advantageous, because that is the time when the productions of foreign manufacturers and mechanics will be sent in to

overwhelm the markets of the countries that have free trade and no protection. And, therefore, I say that when hon. gentlemen opposite take to heart the workingman and want to improve his position so much, it is not by sending abroad for labor and giving encouragement to foreign mechanics that they will better his position very much, but rather by having mechanics in the country, employing them here and maintaining them by the produce raised by our farming population. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) reminded me the other day of an incident which shows clearly, to my mind, how largely the whole community, and more especially the agricultural class, can be benefitted by the employment of mechanics. Why, if you take all the mechanics out of Montreal and Toronto and send them to the United States, the markets of those cities will not be one-half what they are at present. The incident of which the hon. member reminds me was this: When I was in Scotland, a gentleman took me to see various towns of the country. We came to a town which seemed to be all prosperity. I walked through the streets and looked at the shop windows, and saw there every article of luxury and comfort possible for the hands of man to manufacture and display for sale. I saw large public halls, schools, churches, and I asked my friend, what is the population of this town? He said: about 60,000. I went through the markets and saw them crowded with agricultural produce for the maintenance of these 60,000 inhabitants. I turned to my friend and said, What is the trade of this town? How is it sustained? He said, It is just manufacturing thread; the whole prosperity of the town and its inhabitants depends upon the manufacture of little spools of thread that are sent all over the world. In all my travels through that town I did not see a single spool of thread, but everything for the comfort and luxury of the 60,000 inhabitants, all maintained by that little manufacture of which the hon. member reminded me the other day. Is it possible that such a town can be in existence and not benefit the agricultural portion of the community? If you establish in the Dominion one industry or a dozen industries that will support a population of 60,000 people, it is an impossibility that such shall not largely benefit the agricultural as well as all other classes of the population. But hon. gentlemen opposite say that laborers should have protection as well as other classes. We feel we have given laborers protection, and that protection is in giving them employment. It may be that there are a few industries which are depressed; it may be that there are a few people who are not so fully employed as they once were; but compare their position with that during the years 1876-77-78. Those people then were either not in the country or were idle, begging from door to door. But the figures given by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), the other night, are conclusive upon this point. He gave a table of rates of wages, and said that the rate of wages paid to a laboring man, in 1877, was 80 cents a day. It is from \$1.25 to \$1.50 now, and, I say, in that increase of wages we have given protection to the laboring classes. It does not lie in the mouth of hon. gentlemen opposite to talk of not protecting the laboring class. That is our aim and our desire, and we have the interest of the workingman deeply at heart, and we are watching carefully in what way we can improve his condition. But hon. gentlemen opposite in 1876-77 and 78 were not so careful. They did not manifest such interest in the laborers as they do now. Sir, I have been for twenty-seven years in Parliament, and during that time I have heard many speeches that were wise and many that were otherwise; but of all the speeches I have heard none do I remember so distinctly and clearly as a speech made by a member of the late Government in the other House, the leader of the Government in the other House. Speaking of public works and what had been done in the country,

that hon. gentleman boasted that they had saved \$3,000,000 at least by the lowness of wages paid to the laboring people; that they had saved \$3,000,000 on canals and railways, \$3,000,000 ground out of the muscle and blood of the laboring class of the community. That speech fell upon my ears harshly, it was "graven" on my memory as if "with a pen of iron and lead in the rock forever," and I could not help taking advantage of the occasion to condemn the hon. gentleman for the insulting manner in which he had boasted that the Government had saved \$3,000,000 by the lowness of wages, when the people were begging from door to door, and even from Parliament. Yet, now when wages have advanced and employment is given to the people, hon. gentlemen opposite come forward and say we are neglecting the working man. Sir, the Government to which I have the honor to belong has the interests of the workingman at heart, although we may not be able to do all we desire to improve his condition. God forbid, that I should ever be a member of a Government which would boast of saving \$3,000,000, wrung out of the blood and muscle of the laboring people, and out of their starving wives and children. There is another point to which I desire to refer. I suppose the hon. gentleman who will next address the House will tell us what enormous taxation we have placed on the poor man; he will pretend that while we have increased his wages—and they will not presume to deny that the wages of the working class have been increased since 1877-78—we are taking more than that out of them in taxation, and that the grievous taxation we are imposing on the poor man is driving him out of the country and making his condition worse than what it was in 1877-78 on the 80 cents a day rate of wages. I should have referred to this matter when I was dealing with the North-West; I should have shown the hon. gentleman that in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West the percentage of taxation which they imposed on the people was higher than the taxation under the present tariff. I have said before, and I repeat, that in a purely agricultural country the present tariff does not impose so heavy a degree of taxation as the tariff of the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright). When we passed over the North-West to them the rate of taxation was about 5½ per cent.; when they gave it back in 1878 the rate of taxation upon all goods entering into the Province of Manitoba and the North-West was 19 per cent., and during the past year under this tariff, which they say is driving the people out of this country, the percentage has only been 17¼, so that there has actually been a less percentage of taxation in Manitoba and the North-West under the present tariff than was under the old tariff of the hon. the ex-Finance Minister. Before passing from that subject I want to refer to one statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He said, You had prosperous times, you had a surplus, you had plenty of money, and if you had only left the tariff alone you would have had just as good times, and you would have had just as much prosperity, and the taxation then would have been comparatively as much. What we maintain is that under this tariff, under this modification, with the duties on tea and coffee and many other articles reduced, with a large list of free goods, poor men and men in middle life can purchase their goods as low, and live as cheaply as, and more cheaply than, they could when the old tariff was in existence, and the taxation distributed as it was under that tariff. Now, let me remind the hon. gentleman of one or two points in illustration of this fact. What we claim is that a large portion of the money collected under this tariff, now that manufactures have got started, is collected on the luxuries of life and from that class of people who are best able to pay. I take spirits and wines, and I suppose hon. gentlemen think these are luxuries; I take silks and satins, and I dare say hon. gentlemen will admit that these are luxuries. I ascertain the amount of duty collected by hon. gentlemen

opposite during the five years they were in office upon silks and satins, and I take the five years my hon. friend the Finance Minister has been collecting the duty, and I find that in these latter five years we have collected \$2,555,977 more on silks and satins than the hon. gentlemen did under his tariff. That is one illustration of the fact that this tariff is designed to press most heavily upon the class who are best able to pay. Let me say this, that while the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) claims that we are growing poorer every day, is not the fact that people are importing and wearing more silks and satins a proof that they are growing richer and more luxurious in their tastes? I take those two things, wines and spirits on the one hand, and silks and satins on the other, and I find that my hon. friend the Finance Minister in those five years has collected \$3,848,860 more than the hon. gentlemen opposite collected during the five years he was in office. While they are talking about our distressing the poor man and grinding him down, and taking a surplus of money, we show that a large proportion comes from the class who are best able to bear it. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) has referred to the condition of the United States manufacturers under a revenue tariff and under a protective tariff. But the hon. gentleman deals entirely with percentages. He says that under the revenue tariff, from 1850 to 1860, there was a large percentage of increase, and then he goes on to the protective tariff period and he says there has been an increase but there is not so much percentage. Now, the House will perceive the fallacy of this statement. Let me illustrate it. If you start with a basis of 100,000, and you have 100 per cent. increase in a year, you have 200,000 but in the next year if you have 100,000 increase you have only 50 per cent., and so on; and as the hon. gentleman came down from 1850 to 1880, the percentage diminished, although the volume of increase there had been very much larger than in the other periods referred to.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Four times larger.

Mr. CHARLTON. No.

Mr. McLELAN. I give this as an illustration of how the hon. gentleman conducts his arguments in order to deceive the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. McLELAN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman does not do it to deceive, but it does deceive the country in the first flush, but not those who have time to examine the case and understand it, and understand the motives and facts he may present. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for the patience with which they have heard me. There are some other points to be refuted in the hon. gentleman's long and elaborate speech, but I know that there are several other gentlemen who are prepared to deal with them, and with the arguments and fallacies which the hon. gentleman has addressed to the House.

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

After Recess.

Mr. MILLS. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not at all pleased with this side of the House. He says we speak in lugubrious tones—that one would think we were engaged in the business of undertakers. But it seemed to me from the tones of the hon. gentleman himself that he was much more likely to engage in the business to which he referred than any hon. gentleman on this side of the House. He spoke very much more like one having upon him the weeds of mourning than the garments of rejoicing. The hon. gentleman's reference to the business of under-

Mr. McLELAN,

taking reminds me of a story that was told of a very ardent supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite residing in this city, who after 1873 declared that he had not had a customer for three months; so that it would seem that if any particular business was injured by a change of Administration at that time it was the very business to which the hon. gentleman who has just spoken referred. The hon. Minister told us that the United States debt was incurred in consequence of a great war, but that by the policy of protection they had been enabled to pay off a great portion of that debt, and that in fact they had nothing to show for the immense expense which had resulted from that war other than tombstones and the inscriptions upon them. He quite forgot that six millions of the population of that country were turned from slaves to free men; and unless the hon. gentleman supposes that freedom adds nothing to the intellectual power and force of a people, he can hardly suppose that so extraordinary a revolution as that could be of no possible consequence. The hon. gentleman quite forgets, too, that the circumstances of population have something to do with progress. The civil war of the United States was a great event. It stirred the feelings of the nation to their profoundest depths. There was in many parts of the country a great demand, a real necessity, for labor. The inventive faculties of the people were taxed to their utmost, and it is a remarkable fact that most of the progress made in the application of machinery to agricultural pursuits was in a large degree the outcome of that particular period. I might mention a fact which will perhaps show more than anything else the absurdity of the fiscal policy which the Government are at present upholding, and which the hon. gentleman advocated—I think I mentioned it once before in this House—a fact stated in the *Scientific American* some three or four years ago, that in the business of boots and shoes a single invention that took place in 1872 or 1873 had added 55 per cent. to the laboring power of those engaged in that particular business. In other words, the production of a given number of hands was 55 per cent. greater after the invention than it was before; and it is perfectly obvious that a tax, unless it exceeded 55 per cent., could not serve as a barrier to the importation of that particular commodity. Then the hon. gentleman told the House what extraordinary progress the country had made under the present Administration, and what very little progress it had made under their predecessors. He said there were only 30,000 people in the North-West Territories and Manitoba when this Government came into office in 1878. The Government of Mr. Mackenzie had been in power for five years, and during that time there had been only 30,000 added to the population of that country. Well, Sir, the hon. First Minister has been in power for many years, and there is no greater population in the vicinity of Hudson Bay or the Labrador coast than there was when the hon. gentleman took his seat in Parliament for the first time. Now, I do not think very much can be established in that way. The hon. gentleman did say that up to the time that the Government of Mr. Mackenzie retired from office, there was no railway communication established with the North-West Territories. The railway from Pembina to Selkirk, a distance of 84 miles, was completed, a few weeks before the defeat of the Administration, except ballasting, which I think was completed some time in the month of December, 1878, but as no American railway was at that time built up to the border, railway communication was not established, and until facilities were afforded to enable population to get into the country with some degree of ease, we could not expect that there would be any very large number of people who would go to settle there. The Government of hon. gentleman opposite obtained possession of the country in 1869. In that year they provided by a Bill for the establishment of government in the territory; in

1871 they admitted Manitoba into the Union; nearly three years afterwards they retired from office; and what population was added to Manitoba during those two years and nine months? Very few people went there, because there were no facilities for going into the country; and the hon. gentleman might with just as much propriety refer to the fact that these hon. gentleman had been a long time in power, that they had been in possession of the country for at least three years, and that they had established a province there nearly three years before they retired from office, and yet before their retirement there were not 5,000 people in the country in addition to the aborigines. Well, Sir, nothing can be established in that way; there is no propriety in such a line of argument; and when the hon. gentleman stated that but 30,000 people had gone into the country, he proved nothing against the policy or the conduct of the late Administration. Then, the hon. gentleman said that my hon. friend the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), who was Premier at that time and was in charge of the Department of Public Works, had commenced the construction of a railway from Red River to Lake Superior, and that the two ends were built while there was a large section of the centre portion of the railway for which the contract was not let. Well, Sir, that is true, and I think it was proper, it was a wise and prudent course to pursue in the public interest. The hon. gentleman complains that we had not begun with the construction of this road at an inaccessible point—in the centre. Where was the propriety of letting contracts for the construction of that portion of a road which was inaccessible, and which could not be reached until the two ends were completed? It was by the construction of the two extremities that it was made possible to construct the centre portion, and it is perfectly obvious that the terms on which the Government could make a contract for the construction of that centre portion would be much more favorable after the two ends were completed than before. The hon. gentleman knows that since he has come into office the Government paid as much as 15 cts. a pound for sending Indian supplies into that country. Now, the hon. gentleman said that we also proposed to create railway monopolies in that country—that we proposed a system of colonisation railways, and provided that no railways should be constructed within 40 miles of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Now, that statement is not correct. It is only necessary to examine the Bill that was introduced on that subject to see that it is not an accurate statement. The fact is that we proposed that no line running parallel with the Canadian Pacific Railway should be constructed within 40 miles of that road; but any number of tributary lines radiating out from that line might be built. The proposal we made was a wise proposal; it was a proposal in the public interest, and one which, if those hon. gentlemen had carried it out, would have supplied the whole North-West with a network of railways without any charge on the public treasury, and with immense advantage to the settlement of that country. Then the hon. gentleman says that he is in favor of a reciprocity treaty, but he wants reciprocity upon fair terms: he wishes to have something to offer the people of the United States when the time comes for the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty. Well, the hon. gentleman has his opinions as to the best means of securing reciprocity, but I can tell him that when the Government adopted a high protective tariff, when they abandoned the policy of a revenue tariff, they did that which was the very worst thing that could be done in the interest of the people of this country. It is not by imitating the people of the United States, it is not by adopting the policy they have adopted, and which has proved detrimental to their interests, that we will succeed in convincing them that they are wrong. If the hon. gentleman be right in his views, it is the best

thing in the world for us not to have a reciprocity treaty at all; if he be right, a reciprocity treaty would be a misfortune to us and to the United States as well. It is, according to him, by a policy of exclusion that the two countries are to prosper. Was the hon. gentleman to go to the United States and propose to negotiate a treaty, what would the Americans say to him? Why they would say: There are many people in this country who hold that the less free trade we have with others the better; who claim that it is important to keep the United States for the people of the United States; you have adopted the doctrine of Canada for the Canadians; why, then, do you come here and ask to have the barriers thrown down between the United States and Canada, if by removing them each country will be injured? What reason can hon. gentlemen opposite assign for establishing free trade between the United States and this country that will not apply to every other country as well as to Canada? There may be a difference in degree, but there can be no difference in kind, and hon. gentlemen opposite, in adopting the policy they have adopted, have delayed, instead of hastening, the period when a treaty of reciprocity might be negotiated with some hope of success. Let me take an instance in point. The colony of Victoria, in Australia, adopted in 1883 a protective policy; and the colony of New South Wales continued the policy of free trade. The two colonies lie side by side, precisely as do Canada and the United States. There were a few in the colony of New South Wales who advocated the doctrine of hon. gentlemen opposite, the doctrine of retaliation; who said: "If the people of Victoria will not admit our products into their country on fair terms, we should not admit their products into ours on fair terms." But the majority of the people of New South Wales took a different view, they believed in the policy of a revenue tariff, they believed that the system of free trade was better than the system of protection; they acted on that belief and have adhered to free trade ever since. And what has been the result of each system during the 11 years in which both have been in operation side by side? To-day the Colony of New South Wales has an extensive commerce, to-day it is the maritime colony of that portion of the British Empire. The shipping interests of New South Wales have prospered, the shipping interests of Victoria have languished; the shipping interests of New South Wales have increased, the shipping interests of Victoria have diminished. In 1873, the imports and exports of the two were very nearly equal; to-day the imports and exports of New South Wales are millions in excess of those of Victoria; and, in fact, of the two provinces situated towards each other relatively as are Canada and the United States, the one adhering to a policy of high duties and the other to the policy of a revenue tariff, the colony that adopted the revenue tariff has far outstripped in commercial prosperity the colony that followed the opposite doctrine. Now I say that New South Wales has at this moment an opportunity of securing free trade or reciprocal trade relations, based upon the principle of free trade, with Victoria, very much better than she would have had if she had imitated Victoria and adopted her fiscal policy. And I say too that we would be in a position to secure more favorable trade relations with the United States had we adhered to the policy which we had pursued for many years before, than by following the policy we have since adopted. The hon. gentleman told us also that the Government have not imposed taxation in the interests of the rich and against the poor, that they have not favored the manufacturer at the expense of the ordinary laborer; in fact he says, we have collected three million dollars more duty upon silks during the past five years than was collected by the Government that preceded us. Well, what of that? I remember when the First Minister, addressing an audience

in Toronto some time in 1878, told them he was going to admit silks free of duty; he told them it was very important that they should be admitted free of duty, that the poor people ought to have their silks cheap, and that if he succeeded in obtaining office he would see that that was done. I have before me a statement of another tax that these hon. gentlemen have imposed and to which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not alluded—the tax on bread stuffs and coal. Now bread stuffs and coal were admitted free under the previous Administration. I suppose that hon. gentlemen opposite will say that this duty imposed no burden on the population, that in fact they are duties which are paid by the producer; that the people of the Maritime Provinces do not really pay any duty upon bread-stuffs, but that these are paid by the people of the United States; and that the people of Ontario do not pay any duty upon coal, but that this duty is paid by the people across the line. I do not think that there are many who subscribe to that view. If that view be correct, I am unable to understand why the hon. gentleman who has charge of the fiscal policy of this Administration has permitted the rascally Chinese to escape a tax on tea. Now I find that there have been duties collected during the last five years on breadstuffs and coal amounting to \$5,791,152. The tax on coal during the past year amounted to \$1,113,611. This tax has more than doubled during the past five years, not because coal is more largely consumed by manufacturers, although, no doubt, there has been an increase in that particular, and by railways, but because coal is largely entering into consumption amongst the population. The people are using it in their houses instead of wood; many people who during former periods used no coal at all are now consuming it, and a very large quantity of coal is being consumed for domestic purposes by our population. It is worth while saying something with regard to the history of this policy. The hon. gentlemen began to preach the doctrine of protection in 1877 and 1878, and after they came into power in 1879 this protective policy was adopted, but all the Conservative party was not committed to the doctrine of protection in this House. The hon. the First Minister sat for many years on the fence. He said it was not a protective policy he was imposing, that he was not proposing to increase the tariff, but only to equalise the taxation. He also said that it was for the purpose of retaliation. The people of the United States had kept out the products of Canada from their markets, and we ought to retaliate and keep their products out of our market. In fact, it is only necessary to read the resolution to see that the policy of high tariffs when first proposed by the hon. gentleman was not proposed as a protective policy at all, but a means of coercing the United States to adopt towards this country a more liberal policy. In fact he admitted that protection was a bad thing, that it was not in the public interest, but he said it was better than a system of one-sided free trade, and it was important to adopt a policy of protection until the Americans were forced to give us more favorable trade relations than we had, since the repeal of the reciprocity treaty, been enabled to secure from them. The hon. gentleman proposed this resolution in 1878:

“That this House is of opinion that the welfare of Canada requires the adoption of a National Policy which, by a judicious readjustment of the tariff, will benefit the agricultural, the mining, the manufacturing and other interests of the Dominion; that such a policy will retain in Canada thousands of our countrymen obliged to expatriate themselves in search of employment denied them at home, will restore prosperity to our struggling industries, now so sadly depressed.—”

Mr. RYKERT. True—every word of it.

Mr. MILLS. I shall have an opportunity of saying something about that—

“will prevent Canada being made a sacrifice market, will encourage and develop an active interprovincial trade, and moving, as it ought to

Mr. MILLS.

do, in the direction of a reciprocity of tariffs with our neighbors, so far as the varied interests of Canada may demand, will gradually tend to procure for this country eventually a reciprocity of trade.”

Mr. RYKERT. Hear, hear—every word true.

Mr. MILLS. One hon. gentleman says every word of this is true. Was it true that thousands of our people had gone out of the country for want of employment? Was it true that our manufacturing industries were badly depressed? Was it true that by adopting this policy we are likely to secure eventually a reciprocity of trade with the United States? This resolution is worth some little consideration from the House, for, although many years have passed, it is the starting point of the present fiscal policy of the Administration. There are here three propositions, no two of which can stand together. If it be true that interprovincial trade is necessary, it is perfectly obvious that reciprocity would, in a large degree, put an end to that interprovincial trade. The hon. gentleman knows that he cannot have interprovincial trade to any large extent and reciprocity with the United States. The people of Nova Scotia do not want Ontario as a coal market; they would prefer the New England States; and, if we were to get reciprocity with the United States there is no doubt whatever that Nova Scotia coal would cease to find its way up the St. Lawrence. It would find its way to the New England States, and the breadstuffs of Ontario would not to the same extent be carried to the Maritime Provinces. The hon. gentleman proclaims that this interprovincial trade is a necessary bond of union, that without it we have only a union on paper, that without this interprovincial trade our union was not likely to endure, that by trading with the people of the Maritime Provinces we were likely to consolidate the union between those Provinces and Ontario and the Provinces of the west. When I look at the reports of the condition of affairs and of public feeling in the city of Halifax and the city of St. John, after a trial of this policy since 1879. It does not appear that it has done very much in either of those places to consolidate union. It does not seem that the people of Halifax are more devoted to the union to-day than they were when the union was established, and it is quite obvious that the city represented by the Finance Minister himself is, at this moment, far more disaffected towards union than at the time the union was carried. The hon. gentleman says that this reciprocity of tariffs is ultimately to secure reciprocal free trade. He admits then that reciprocal free trade is a better thing than protection. He admits that the interests of Canada would be promoted by reciprocal free trade with the United States. The reason he gives for a continuance in the policy of protection is that it is the best thing we can do until reciprocal free trade with the United States is established. If that be so, then it follows that all we have heard about struggling industries, all we have about Canada being a slaughter market, all we have been told about the necessity of protecting the smaller manufactures of Canada against the hostile policy of the larger establishments on the other side, is unfounded. I am inclined to think that in that view hon. gentlemen are right. I see cotton mills springing up at St. Louis and rolling mills at Chicago, and I know they are not protected against the hostile policy of the cotton mills of Lowell or the rolling mills of Pittsburg. There is no tariff to protect these manufactures in a new state. How then do they come into existence, if the arguments which hon. gentlemen put forward are well founded? It is perfectly clear that an establishment in Canada can live quite as well as an establishment in Kansas against an American establishment of the same kind; but, if that be so, if reciprocal free trade with the United States is an advantage, then all we have heard about the dangers of competition from the larger establishments is quite unfounded. These gentlemen have told us that the trade was very much depressed in 1878, that what

the hon. First Minister said about thousands leaving Canada then was quite true. They tell us, and he told us in a speech in Toronto at the time, that 500,000 people had been driven out of Canada by the policy of the Mackenzie Administration. He said it was a crying shame that so large a number of our population should be obliged to go away for want of employment. Well, I look at the Trade and Navigation returns, and I do not find that they sustain the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite. I find that in 1873 we imported into Canada 3,514,387 lbs. of raw cotton for the purpose of being manufactured, and that in 1878 the cotton mills had increased to such an extent that we manufactured 7,243,418 pounds of raw cotton, that in fact the quantity of raw cotton had more than doubled during those five years. The cotton mills increased their capacity. If I look at the woollen mills, the boot and shoe business, no matter to what particular industry I turn my attention, as disclosed in the trade and navigation returns and the census. I find that we have made a constant progress in these particulars. Now, Sir, those gentlemen told us at that time stories about soup kitchens. They said the soup kitchen was the only establishment that prospered during the Mackenzie regime. I remember that the hon. member for Kent, and I think the hon. Minister of Militia, went to the mills at the Chaudiere and brought about a hundred men who were employed in those mills, to the House here, demanding employment from the Minister of Public Works, the Premier Minister of the day—and the hon. gentleman referred to this. Here were men who were crying for work, men who were not seeking favors at the hands of the Administration, but were only seeking an opportunity for toil: and he said that if you were to go to the cities of Pittsburgh, Baltimore, and New York, wherever you might go where there were manufacturing establishments, there you would find Canadians employed. Now, Sir, at that time we heard nothing about a want of patriotism in those who decried the country and spoke against the exodus of the population. Now we are told that it is little short of treason to say that any portion of our population are not employed; now it is little short of treason to say that large numbers are being expatriated to the States; now it is quite improper to make any representation of this sort. We are told that the agents of American railways abroad are publishing those statements that we make as to the condition of the country, and using them to prevent people coming here, with a view of attracting European immigration to the United States. Well, Sir, how was it that those gentlemen did not say the same in 1878? How was that when the First Minister proclaimed from the hustings—I think at the Amphitheatre in Toronto—that 500,000 Canadians had gone to the States, there was nothing improper in that statement? How was it that when the First Minister declared there were thousands of people anxious to obtain employment and were obliged to emigrate because they could not obtain employment, that there was nothing unpatriotic in that? Were not these statements sent abroad? Were they not employed by emigration agents of the United States?

Mr. RYKER. They were true then.

Mr. MILLS. They were not true, and I have before me facts which will show they were not true. I have before me facts which will show that the emigration from Canada during the Administration of the hon. gentleman down to 1873, averaged nearly 44,000 a year, that during the Mackenzie Administration it was 22,000 a year, and that during the present Administration it has been 88,500 a year. And yet when these facts are accessible to all and are as well established as any other matter of fact can be, hon. gentlemen continue to repeat that the people of Canada were expatriated at a time when the people left the country at the rate of 22,000 a year, and that they are not expatriated during the Administration of the present Government

although 88,500 have left the country each year for the past five years. Let me give to the hon. gentleman a few facts from the *Hamilton Spectator* of 1877. That was a year of as great depression as any year during the regime of the Mackenzie Administration. The *Hamilton Spectator* is the organ of the Tory party. It is a paper friendly to the Administration; it advocates the doctrine of protection, and it describes the condition of the manufactures in Hamilton at that time. It says: "The Empire foundry of Copp & Co. had been enormously increased in capacity, and its business has increased." It mentions the facts that the Wanzer Sewing Machine Co. had greatly extended their business, and were employing a much larger number of hands than before. It mentions that the Gurney Co. had also greatly increased the capacity of their factory, and were giving employment to a greater number of men than before. It also describes the manufacturing establishments of Sawyer & Co. and of Burrows, Stewart & Milne. It describes several other establishments in Hamilton that had enlarged their capacity, and employed an increased number of hands. And, sir, it is well known that the progress of manufactures in Hamilton was greater between 1873 and 1878, notwithstanding there was a depression existing, than it has been between 1879 and the present hour. Now, Sir, these hon. gentlemen seem to think that they are the only parties who are privileged to discuss the state of the nation. Tom Moore describes a pagan country in which he says that

"None but priests are privileged to trade
In the best marble of which gods are made."

So it is with these hon. gentlemen. While they think they are entitled to discuss the state of the country and its industrial condition, it is little less than treason for any hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to point out the actual condition of things while the present Government holds power. It is quite proper to exaggerate the distress, to misrepresent the industrial position of the country when they are on this side of the House, but it is improper to state the real condition of the country when they are upon that side of the House. Now, Sir, there has been a very large emigration from Canada, and I wish to give a statement with regard to the exodus. I shall ascertain by different methods the extent of that exodus, which, I think, will show that the representations made from this side of the House are not exaggerations, but that they are borne out by the facts. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) charges my hon. friend from South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) with quoting school statistics to show the exodus from Ontario, which, he says, are notoriously inaccurate. Now, I do not hesitate to say that we have no returns more to be relied on than the report of school attendance which the hon. member for Huron quoted. How did the hon. member for Cardwell substantiate his declaration that these statistics were not to be relied on? Did he show that they were inaccurate; that they were, in any way, self-contradictory? Not at all: he did not even attack them. He attacked a wholly different return, and one which no one claims to be reliable. The member for Cardwell referred, not to the school attendance, but to the population between five and sixteen years of age, whether at school or not. The statistics of school population is often estimated, and is known not to be perfectly accurate. But about the school attendance there can be no mistake. The teacher keeps a daily register. The name and age of every pupil is entered upon the register; and a copy of these names and ages is transmitted, half yearly, to the school inspector. It is a part of his duty to examine the registers when he visits the schools and to see that the numbers have been properly reported. The school registers of 1873 showed an attendance of 471,918; of 1878 an attendance of 499,589, and in 1884 of 476,212, that is, an increase in the school attendance of 27,500 from 1873 to 1878,

and a decrease of 23,300 from 1878 to 1884. There can be no doubt that these statistics show a diminution of the population during the last five years within the school area of the Province. Some of the inhabitants may have removed to Algoma and Muskoka, some to Manitoba and the North-West; but by far the greater number have gone to the United States, and I am confident that I am quite within the mark when I say that there are to-day 200,000 Canadians in the State of Michigan alone. There is no denying the fact that, according to the United States census, in 1880, one-sixth of the native population of Canada was resident in the United States. This is a very serious matter, and when we examine these statistics we will find that since 1880 the emigration from Canada to the United States has been unprecedentedly large, larger than at any previous period of our history. The number of Canadians in the United States in 1870 was 490,000, and in 1880 712,000. The leader of the Opposition showed last year that the death rate was 21.27 per cent. for the decade, which would show 123,000 deaths during the decade; so that the actual emigration from Canada between 1870 and 1880 was 343,000, or 34,300 a year, which would be a little larger number than that shown by the Bureau of Statistics. The number of immigrants to Canada between 1871 and 1881 was 333,700, and the Minister of Agriculture had claimed these as Canadian settlers. But when we look at the census of 1871 we find the foreign-born population of Canada was 489,500; and in 1881 the number was 487,600, or 1,900 less than it had been ten years before. We were told that, according to the returns made by the Minister of Agriculture from time to time to this House, there were, during that same period, 333,700 immigrants settled in Canada. But that is quite impossible, because if we make allowance for the usual number of deaths, it is too plain to admit of denial that only about 100,000 people came from abroad and settled in the Provinces of Canada during the ten years between 1871 and 1881. If we take the natural increase of population and the same percentage of increase as is shown by the census of the United States, there ought to have been an increase of 783,380. There was, according to the census, 558,300, or 225,500 less than there should have been. If we add to this the decrease from death, which vacuum must have been supplied from abroad, we have 343,000 as the emigration from Canada to the United States during the period between 1871 and 1881, and we have, according to the census of the United States, 343,000 as the number which emigrated to the United States between 1870 and 1880. These figures are sufficiently near to show that this is a fairly accurate representation of the exodus from Canada to the United States. If we take the returns of the Bureau of Statistics, we get very nearly the same numbers that we get from the census of the United States and from the census of Canada. According to the census of the United States, as I have pointed out, the number of emigrants from Canada to the United States, between 1870 and 1880, was 343,000, and between 1871 and 1881, according to the census of Canada, 348,000. The number was about 340,000, according to the census returns of the Bureau of Statistics. So we have three independent sources of information, all giving very nearly the same number as those who expatriated themselves from Canada and took up their abode in the United States during those ten years. I find the Bureau of Statistics gives the number of those who settled in the States from Canada, as follows: 1880, 89,416; 1881, 125,000; 1882, 98,109; 1883, 69,354; 1884, 60,406. So that we have during those five years a population leaving Canada larger in number than the population of any one of the Maritime Provinces. If we were to lose the entire population of Nova Scotia we would be appalled at the tremendous loss that the country would sustain, yet during the five years those hon. gentlemen have been in office, since 1880, the population which this country has lost by emigration

Mr. MILLS.

to the United States is far in excess of the population of any one of the Maritime Provinces. I find that during the five years of the Mackenzie Administration the emigration from Canada to the United States was about 123,000, and yet by the returns of the Bureau of Statistics of 1881, no less than 125,000 people left this Dominion for the States. In other words, a larger number of people left Canada in 1881 than left this country between 1874 and 1879. The hon. gentlemen proposed to keep the people in Canada, to adopt a policy that would put an end to the exodus. They proposed to put an end to the emigration of 22,000 Canadians yearly to the United States. They came into office. They have had seven years in which to try their experiment. What is the result? That there are 83,500 people leaving Canada every year. If any one in any ordinary pursuit were to promise to do certain things and failed as egregiously as hon. gentlemen opposite have done, he would not have been retained in his position for an hour; and yet those hon. gentlemen have not in a single particular fulfilled the pledges they made to the country. They were to be the great State physicians; they were to perform extraordinary feats; they were to give employment to our entire population; foreign markets for our goods would be unnecessary; every village was to be converted into a town, every town into a city, and all the cities were to become great markets, such as New York and London are at the present time. Those were the representations that hon. gentlemen made. They said we must have a home market—Canada for the Canadians—and we will not only secure a large immigration of people to this country, but also a large amount of capital, which would serve to build mills and give employment to our people. Where are those great mills? Where are those millions of capital that were to be invested? Where are those hundreds of thousands of artisans of Europe who were living in comparative penury there, but who were to be employed in this country? At the present time we have a larger export trade than we had before, but not one of those things which the hon. gentleman promised has been fulfilled. I look, Sir, at this tariff which the hon. gentleman has tinkered year by year for the last five years, which he informs us that he has made better every year, and I observe that he does not exactly adhere to the orthodox doctrines laid down by the First Minister. The First Minister told us that the producer always paid the taxation. He told us a story about two barley farms, and he told it so often and so well that all his supporters learned it and we heard it everywhere. He assured us that if he was in power the farmers would receive the advantages of just as good prices for the products of their industry as were received in the United States. The Finance Minister does not adhere to these doctrines. He admits wool into the country free of duty, but if the duty is paid by the persons who produce the wool why should he admit it free? Then the hon. gentleman promised to allow drawbacks on wheat and other breadstuffs which are imported into Canada, and are to be manufactured and reshipped again; but if these taxes are paid by the producer, why does he allow the miller to put his hand in the public Treasury and receive so much for every bushel of wheat which is imported into the country. We find, therefore, that the hon. gentleman is proclaiming one doctrine when he is seeking protective duties, and is professing wholly different doctrines when he is professing to help the manufacturers. He admits wool free from duty, raw cotton and many other articles used by the manufacturers of the country, on the theory that the duties he imposes will be paid by the person who imports the article. Sir, last year we called the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to the impropriety of importing a large number of artisan immigrants. We pointed out that these people could not find employment; that they were idle in our cities; that they became a

burden to the rest of our population, and were seriously interfering with those artisans who were already in the country, and who found it sufficiently difficult to get employment. The hon. gentlemen denied this. It did not comport with the theory they advocated in this House to admit that we had more of this class of people in this country than could now be profitably employed. Now, Sir, when my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) proposed a motion against assisted passages for this particular class of people, hon. gentlemen opposite resisted it, and they voted it down. But this year they proclaimed to the House that they had adopted the very policy which they thought it was not in the public interest to favor. In fact, they have been forced to do so. They have had loud remonstrances from the unemployed artisans in the cities of the country, and they knew they could not disregard those remonstrances and complaints; they knew that if they did not discourage further immigration of this particular class they would not be very likely to secure the support of those people. Now, Sir, I recently observed a statement in a New York paper about two Danes who applied there to some charitable institution for relief. They said they had been brought out to Canada as assisted passengers; that they had been taken to Toronto; that they could not get employment, although they had sought for employment for some time, and not being able to find any, they had left the country and had gone to New York. They also gave this further piece of information. They said they had served for some years in a Danish penitentiary, that they had served out their time and had been discharged, and they had been told that they had better go to Canada, because people going to Canada were assisted in their passage. How many of this class came here I do not know; I hope the large majority of those who are brought here are of a very different class; but we do know that people have been taken out of the poor houses; that waifs have been taken off the streets of London and brought to this country, and that the only advantage that the country has in the matter is from the fact that we know that they very speedily find their way across the border. If they prove to be not a very desirable class of people, we have at all events this consolation, that we do not retain them very long in the country. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) informed us that the Government were very economical; that there had been no unnecessary waste of public money; that the affairs of the country were now as economically administered as they had been formerly. Well, Sir, I find, at all events, from the statement of the Minister of Finance, that there is nearly \$33,000,000 of expenditure during the current year, and that this is very nearly \$10,000,000 more than it was when these hon. gentlemen took office. I find, Sir, by the Estimates which are brought down, that we have an enormously greater expenditure now than we had five years ago. In 1878 the expenditure on Indian affairs was \$421,531; in 1882, \$1,183,000; and in 1883, \$1,116,000, or an increase of nearly threefold. I say there is nothing to justify this increase—nothing to warrant so large an expenditure on the management of our Indians. In 1878 we were put to a large cost in negotiating the treaties, and in carrying supplies to various points during the period we were paying the Indians for their annuities. They were not settled on their reservations, and they had to be kept together for several days before payment was made, and a large incidental expenditure was incurred during the making of these payments. Everyone expected that when the Indians were settled on their reservations this expenditure would come to an end. Hon. gentlemen opposite complained that there was any expenditure at all in this particular, and still this expenditure has not only been continued but been increased; and there is a much larger sum paid to-day and, in my opinion, unnecessarily, than in 1878. In fact, the

policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has served to pauperise the Indian. These people, if they were put under careful management, under the supervision of competent agents, might have been made self-sustaining, but hon. gentlemen opposite have been more anxious to provide places for their friends than to provide competent men to take charge of the various Indian bands, and the result is, that the Indians are less industrious and do less for themselves than formerly. They have not come to depend on, they will not work, and the result is, that they are, year by year, becoming a more heavy charge on the public Treasury. Then, Sir, I observe that there is an immense increase in the expenditure of almost every Department. In 1878 the expenditure for clerks and officials in the Department of the Interior was \$42,760; in 1883 it was \$175,422, an increase of upwards of \$133,000. There is nothing to warrant this increased expenditure, and the Government, themselves, felt that it could not be justified; for we find that \$30,000 of the expenditure for the officials of the Department here in Ottawa is charged to capital account. Then, in the Department of Public Works, in 1878, there was an expenditure of \$48,884, and in 1883 an expenditure of \$87,790—and when I say the Department of Public Works, I am including the Department of Railways and Canals, because this Department was part of the Department of Public Works in 1878. Now, Sir, some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have said, in reference to the Washington treaty, that we were opposed to it at the time it was negotiated, but that now we are in favor of it; that then we condemned the First Minister for the course which he took; and that now we exhibit an undue anxiety for its perpetuation. This, Sir, is a misrepresentation of the facts. Of what we then did not approve, we still oppose. We did not approve of the policy of giving the go-by to the subject of the Fenian raids. We thought that to allow a part of the citizens of the United States to arm and drill and collect funds for the purpose of invading this country, was a flagrant violation of international duty. We think so still. We thought that to allow those men to invade this country was a still more flagrant violation of that duty. We thought that this, no less than the Alabama claims, ought to have been dealt with. We thought the United States could not reasonably resist our claims in face of the demand they were urging upon Great Britain for allowing vessels to be fitted out in England to prey on the commerce of the United States. Ministers at the time concurred in this opinion. Their minutes of Council conclusively established this fact. But at this point they played a shabby part. They asked for and obtained an Imperial guarantee for a loan of £2,500,000, towards the construction of a transcontinental railway, as a condition of acquiescence in what had been done. Of this we did not approve. If it were necessary to abandon our claim in the interest of the Empire, it ought to have been done with becoming public spirit, and not for a bribe. We were opposed to the provisions relating to the St. Lawrence and the canals. We conceded the navigation of the river for all time, and we secured the right to navigate Lake Michigan for ten years. We did not obtain the right to navigate the Columbia. A right which we had to the navigation of the rivers of Alaska was limited to three rivers. We were opposed to a monetary compensation for the use of our fisheries, believing that certain trade relations ought to have been made with the United States; and we were in favor of the settlement of the headland question. So far as I know, the views of this side of the House on all these matters remain unchanged. What we opposed then we do not approve of now, and what has since transpired has not served to show that our views were unsound. Now, Sir, the hon. Minister of Finance has laid on the Table a report on the progress of manufacturing industries in Canada since 1878, which, by the way, I believe

has not yet been distributed, and has not yet been placed in the hands of the members. In that report there is a great show of material and industrial progress, and I observe, after looking at it while it was on the table of the House, that it reports ten new industries in the city of London. The names of these industries and the time they are stated in the report to have been published are as follows:—

New Factories.	Purpose.	When Established.
1 Essex, Dunn & Co.....	Brass works.....	1880
2 J. Gouinlock & Co.....	Hats and caps.....	1883
3 Dom. Baby Carriage Co.....	Baby carriages.....	1881
4 J. M. Dufton.....	Woollen factory.....	1881
5 J. Fox.....	Scales.....	1882
6 Joseph Groves.....	Safes and locks.....	1884
7 London Machine Tool Co.....	Machinery.....	1882
8 John Elliott & Sons.....	Ploughs.....	1882
9 Wortman & Ward.....	Iron pumps, etc.....	1882
10 Oil Cloth Co.....		1884

Now, I have made inquiries with reference to the above, and I will read the information I have obtained:

"1. Essex, Dunn & Co. were the purchasers of the Essex, Murray & Jolliffe business, and Essex, Murray & Jolliffe bought out, I think, the London Steam Supply Co., who bought out the Stevens, Turner & Burns Co. Stevens, Turner & Burns were in business, and because the contractors for the London water works, and there had been a plumbers' shop in the premises for many years before.

"2. J. Gouinlock, hats and caps. J. Gouinlock was in partnership with John Marshall—Marshall & Gouinlock. They dissolved and divided into two businesses. Marshall is alone with his share; J. Gouinlock took a young man, Hastings, in with him.

"3. Dominion Baby Carriage Co. bought out Hourd's insolvent Baby Carriage Co. Hourd & Co. conducted the business now conducted by that company in existence ten or twelve years.

"4. J. M. Dufton is a removal from Byron, about five miles down the river, near the waterworks—twenty years in business.

"5. J. Fox, scales, is on York street. House and factory combined; father and son constitute the staff.

"6. Joseph Groves, safes and locks. He failed, and the *Advertiser* and *Fairgrieve* took a safe in partnership for their accounts.

"7. London Machine Tool Company. This is Wm. Yates. When Mahon's bank failed, Yates failed or compromised. The company was then formed and is the Yates Company.

"8. John Elliott & Sons, ploughs. The business they bought is the old George Jackson business. Jackson failed, Elliott & Co. bought the plough works. Of course you are aware that John Elliott made his wealth long before the National Policy was thought of.

"9. Wortman & Ward. I don't know whether this is running now or not. It is the place on York street, a little west of William street.

"10. I made diligent enquiries in every part of the city, and have not been able to find the Oilcloth Co. In fact, I have not been able to meet any person who knows anything about it."

These are all the industries mentioned in the city of London as the outcome of this National Policy.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. What did that report cost—\$6,000?

Mr. MILLS. Then I find that he has reported four establishments in the town of Chatham, and it was reported that since then two new ones have been established, making six altogether. I sent this statement to a gentleman in Chatham, and he reported that there were fifty-three there in 1878 instead of four, that some of those mentioned are closed, and certainly we know that the waggon factory, in which a large number of the hands mentioned as being employed are engaged, has not been doing a prosperous business for the last two years. I do not wish to enter into a discussion of the condition of private firms, but certainly the report which the hon. gentleman has laid on the Table is one that presents very strong temptations to enter into a discussion of those establishments. A more untrustworthy document was never submitted to a Legislature; in no particular can it be relied on. It does not give the condition of the manufacturing industries, either in 1878 or at the present time; it is thoroughly misleading, utterly untrustworthy. It may have served the purposes of the Finance Minister of making a show of prosperity, but a large number of those establishments mentioned in various places are in a far less prosperous condition to-day than that in which they were in 1878, and many of those reported as

Mr. MILLS.

being in operation are insolvent institutions. Now, I have in my hand a report of the condition of the manufacturing establishments in Hamilton. I learn from it that many of them are far less prosperous now than they were in 1878. Take the Wanzer Sewing Machine Company. I have a report in which it is said that they to-day employ one-third the number of hands that they employed in 1877, and so with many other establishments; and the writer says that if the Government are anxious to know the views of the people of Hamilton on the National Policy, they have only to appoint the one member collector and the other a judge, and they will have an opportunity of discovering what the opinion of the people of Hamilton is at the present time. I am inclined to think that the wholly untrustworthy character of these reports will fully account for its not being in the hands of members at the present time. It will not bear inspection; it will not bear scrutiny, and I have no doubt that the Finance Minister has pursued a very prudent course in withholding it from the supervision of hon. members.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not withhold it in any shape or form. It was submitted the very day it was prepared, and so far as the Government are concerned, they have not interfered in any way, except to have it printed as soon as possible.

Mr. MILLS. Well, it was in the power of the Government to have this report printed and laid on the Table when the House met; and, what is more, it does seem to me that it is scarcely fair in the Minister to refer to this report and herald its contents while, at the same time, the House had not an opportunity of examining it fully and considering it. There is no doubt of the fact that the report is not in our hands; there is no doubt of the fact that it is utterly worthless; there is no doubt of the fact that its untrustworthy character could be established, not only in the city of London and the town of Chatham, but in every town and city of Canada to which reference has been made, and the Finance Minister ought not to have discussed its contents until the House had an opportunity of examining the report. Let me look at some of the industries mentioned. High taxes have been imposed, and for what? Why, hon. gentlemen opposite say, for the purpose of keeping away foreign products, and making Canada a close preserve for the manufacturers of Canada. We want to have Canada for the Canadians; but has that been the result of the policy? Take the case of importations. The following table shows the importations in 1879 and 1883 of a number of leading articles:

	1879.	1883.
Carriages.....	106,946	202,606
Clocks.....	61,405	136,345
Brooms.....	41,345	112,359
Boots and shoes.....	200,150	216,205
Blankets.....	201,070	265,956
Furniture.....	247,970	264,361
Pianos.....	289,631	371,323
Stoves.....	34,212	49,043
Sewing machines.....	126,262	323,197
Hats and caps.....	938,583	1,364,558
Files and rasps.....	49,664	106,341
Whips, etc.....	3,383	56,237

So that, as regards a large number of manufacturing industries, the importations have increased, under the operation of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman, after doubling the taxation of the country, assured us that Canada was still the most lightly taxed country in the world, or very nearly so, and he referred to the amount of revenue and expenditure in the Australian colonies, and showed how very heavily they were taxed as compared with Canada. That was, in my opinion, a most disingenuous comparison. The hon. gentleman knows that no comparison can be instituted between Canada and the Australian colonies in the way he suggested. He knows that there the railways and the telegraphs are public prop-

erty; he knows that the cost of running those railways is charged as ordinary expenditure, and that every dollar paid for freight and passenger tickets on a road is marked as revenue. He also knows that in those colonies they have no such thing as capital account, that the whole expenditure of the Government for the year is charged as ordinary expenditure. He knows that he himself has expended during the past year \$67,000,000 instead of \$31,000,000; that, by keeping a capital account, he has charged \$37,000,000 of expenditure during the past year to that account which, in the Australian colonies, would be charged as ordinary expenditure. In order to institute a comparison it is necessary not only to see what has been expended on capital account and what has been charged as ordinary expenditure, but also what has been expended in operating every railway and telegraph in the country; and to charge that as Government expenditure. It would be necessary to ascertain the exact expenditure of every Province of the Dominion for municipal and local purposes as well as for ordinary provincial purposes, and to charge that as the ordinary expenses of the Dominion. I will hastily run over some of the receipts and expenditures of these Australian colonies. I find that in New Zealand they have a population of 540,000; that their revenue is £3,700,000 and their expenditure £3,800,000; that they own 1,370 miles of railway, and that £888,000 of the expenditure is expended in operating this railway. Their expenditure on telegraphs is over £40,000, and their earnings from railways, which appear as part of the revenue, is £1,260,000, and their income from telegraphs nearly £93,000; that from registration fees they have an income of £37,000, from land sales £320,000, and their postal revenue is £177,000; that their Customs duties amount to £1,396,000, and their Excise to £57,000. In fact, a large portion of their expenditures are not expenditures upon works that would here be regarded as ordinary Government expenditure, and that a large part of their income is derived from other sources than that of taxation. Let me take some of the expenses of that colony which are not expenditures with us at all, but are expended by the Provinces. Education, £313,000; railway surveys, £13,000; ordinary roads, £202,000; gold field roads, £26,000; water works, £16,000; gaols and other public buildings, £165,000. Here is a total of local expenditures of nearly £800,000, besides the large expenditure of nearly £900,000 on railways. Now it is clear that, if we deduct those expenditures from the ordinary expenditures of Government, the expenditure of Government in New Zealand is reduced to very nearly the same proportions as in Canada. The hon. gentleman gave us a statement of the revenue and expenditure in the colony of Victoria. I find that Victoria has a population of 915,000, a revenue of £5,600,000, an expenditure of £5,600,000, imports of £18,700,000, exports of £16,100,000; that it has 1,400 miles of railway built, and 7,000 miles of telegraph in operation. It expends on railways £1,098,000 a year, and has a revenue from railways of £1,781,000. In fact, its railway pays expenses and affords a revenue of £600,000 in addition. It has from post offices and telegraphs a revenue of £311,000; a territorial revenue from land sales of £700,000; its Customs duties are £1,871,000, and its Excise £552,000. The Customs duties are almost exactly 10 per cent. on the importations, so that, although Victoria is a protective colony, its taxation from Customs duties is very much less than the taxation of Canada.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says "oh."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The gross amount is far ahead.

Mr. MILLS. The imports amount to £18,748,000, and the Customs duties to £1,871,000, or 10 per cent. as nearly

as may be. Now, look at the expenditures of Victoria. It expends annually on railways £1,209,000; £55,000 on agriculture; telegraphs, £39,000; charitable institutions, £110,000; municipal subsidies, £310,000; education, £578,000; gaols, £57,000; reformatory schools, £52,000, insane hospitals, £99,000, and irrigation, £27,000. Here is an expenditure of more than half the total expenditure of Victoria for operating railways and for expenditures that are here assumed by the Provinces, and yet the hon. gentleman, in the statement he made to the House, included the railway expenditures, the telegraph expenditures, the expenditures that here would be charged to capital account, and the expenditures that here would fall to the lot of the Provinces, and he compares the gross revenue of that Province with the Customs duties and the ordinary taxation of this Dominion. Then, if we take New South Wales, we find it has a population of 840,000; imports, £21,000,000; exports, £16,750,000; that it has 1,400 miles of railway completed and 504 miles partly completed, and 16,000 miles of telegraph, that cost £524,000. It has a revenue of £7,900,000 sterling. It has an expenditure of £6,350,000. Now, when I look at its taxation, I find the Customs duties are £1,632,000, and the Excise duties £5,000. In fact, New South Wales has a tax on its imports of 8 per cent. Now, the hon. gentleman informed the House that these people were more highly taxed than we are, yet we find that the larger portion of their revenues is not a tax at all. They have a revenue from land of £1,480,000; from land sales and occupation rents of £723,350; income from railways, telegraphs and other sources of service, £2,720,000. Now, I find that, when I look at their expenses, they expend on public instruction, £530,000; for operating railways, £750,000; for operating telegraphs, £130,000, yearly. Yet the hon. gentleman institutes a comparison between the expenses of those Provinces, which have these extraordinary sources of income, and the Dominion of Canada. I might go over Queensland. I find that the taxation on its imports is 10 per cent., and there is just the same concealment of facts. Did the hon. gentleman tell the House that a large portion of this expenditure was expenditure that falls to the Provinces?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I practically did.

Mr. MILLS. Did the hon. gentleman say that a large portion of their expenditure was for railways, such as the Grand Trunk Railway, the Great Western, the Canada Southern and other roads of that sort?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman knows that if he were to charge the expenditure on the Grand Trunk Railway to the ordinary expenditure of the country, he would add \$16,000,000 on that one item alone. If he were to add all the railway and telegraph expenditures of the Dominion to that of the Government, and add the Local Legislatures also, then he might institute a comparison. The hon. gentleman's comparison was not a candid comparison; it was one calculated to mislead the House and the country. Sir, it has had that effect already, for we find the press which supports the hon. gentleman is already declaring that Canada is one of the most lightly taxed countries in the world.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear. That is true.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman says "hear hear," and yet the facts from every one of those Provinces, with the single exceptions of Tasmania and New Zealand, are against his statement. If the hon. gentleman deducts the expenditure on railways and telegraphs, which more than pay expenses; if he deducts the income from the ordinary charges of the Government; if he deducts the charges for education, public works, gaols and things of this sort, that

here fall to the Provinces, he will find that there is a very much smaller expenditure both in Victoria, in New South Wales, in Queensland, and in South Australia, than we have here in Canada. The hon. gentleman also instituted a comparison between Norway and Sweden and Canada. If the hon. gentleman should deduct the expenditure in those countries for the diplomatic service, for the navies and the armies, he will then have a very much larger expenditure—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Are they not taxes on that country?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly they are taxes, and I am not disputing the fact that they are taxes. But I am pointing out the fact that, so far as these countries are concerned, the hon. gentleman has instituted an unfair comparison. They are not situated as we are; they are not seeking for immigration.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I was answering the charge made by a gentleman opposite.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman was doing a good deal more than that. He was conveying an impression that was not consistent with the facts. The impression which the hon. gentleman's speech was calculated to make, and which it did make, is at variance with the facts.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not at all. I will prove the contrary.

Mr. MILLS. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman says that this policy of his has not affected the carrying trade from the western States through Canada to Europe. I contest that statement; I say that it has. I say the Trade and Navigation returns show that the trade of Canada in that particular has been seriously affected by the policy the hon. gentleman has pursued. I take the wheat, corn and oats that have been imported into Canada and in part exported to Europe, and I find that in 1876 there were 10,000,000 bushels carried; in 1877, 14,800,000; in 1878, 15,331,919; in 1882, 6,900,000. Now, if the carrying trade had increased in the same proportion as the total American trade in broadstuffs, it would have been 16,000,000. In 1883 it was 7,600,000 instead of 17,300,000, and in 1884 it was 9,630,000 instead of 15,000,000. So the hon. gentleman will see that the carrying of grain through the canals and waterways of Canada from the west to Europe, has been very seriously affected by his tariff policy, that it was not at all as large as it was formerly, and that it is much less than it ought to have been if the same percentage had been preserved. Now, Sir, the hon. gentleman has stated that the industries had been diversified. The hon. member for Cardwell and other hon. gentlemen on that side have spoken of the necessity of diversifying our industries—that we ought not to be hewers of wood and drawers of water, and that we ought to engage in manufacturing pursuits, and furnish other employment to our population than that of cultivating farms and clearing forests. The hon. gentleman quite forgets the condition of things that existed in this country even as early as 1871. Now, I find, by the census of 1871, that we manufactured, of the woollen goods consumed in Canada, 84 per cent.; of Canadian cotton goods, 28 per cent.; of boots and shoes, 99.1 per cent.; of rubber goods, 81 per cent.; of harnesses and saddles, 99 per cent.; of carriages, 98.91 per cent.; of furniture, 97 per cent.; of agricultural implements, 95.1 per cent.; of hardware and nails, 99.5 per cent. Now, in all these respects, with the single exception of the cotton manufactures, we are to-day manufacturing no greater percentage of the goods consumed in the country than we were manufacturing at that particular time. It is not a fact, as stated by the report which the hon. gentleman laid on the

Mr. MILLS.

Table, that we are manufacturing to-day \$5,200,000 worth more goods in the country than we were manufacturing in 1876. The hon. gentleman increased that amount by 50 per cent.; he made it \$79,561,125. I deny, Sir, that there is any such increase in the product and manufactured goods in this country. Let us look at the facts: In 1870 we imported \$70,415,000 worth of goods; in 1873-74, when our importations were very large, we imported \$128,213,000 worth of goods. There was a variation between the lowest point of importation and the highest point of \$57,750,000. In 1878 there were \$91,000,000 worth of goods imported; in 1882 there were \$132,000,000 worth imported. There was a variation between the two periods of \$41,000,000. Now, if there had been a corresponding increase of importation since 1878 there ought to have been \$157,000,000 worth of importations, making allowance for the growth of wealth and population in the country, instead of \$132,000,000. Now, that would indicate a displacement, not of \$79,000,000, as the hon. gentleman says, but of \$25,000,000 worth of goods. So that would indicate the increase was not very greatly in excess of the natural increase, allowing the same percentage of growth that prevailed between 1871 and 1878. Now, according to the hon. gentleman's mode of calculation, that would represent an increase of industrial population, not of 51,800, as the hon. gentleman reports to the House, but of 15,125. But this increase of 15,125 and the persons dependent upon it was secured by the expulsion from the country of upwards of 200,000 of our population in excess of what the ordinary exodus from the country had been. The hon. Finance Minister admitted that he had taxed the country largely in excess of the actual requirements of the State; but he said this, that it should not be counted as taxation on the people because it was unnecessary taxation. The Government did not require it for public purposes, and it should, therefore, be left out of account altogether. The argument of the hon. gentleman reminded me of an anecdote told of Curran, when engaged in a duel with a rival at the bar, who was very much larger than himself, and who complained that because of his large size he was more likely to be hit. Said Curran "I will chalk out my size upon you, and all shots that hit outside the chalk mark I will not count." The Finance Minister adopted very much the same policy. He collects an amount of taxes largely in excess of the requirements of the State, and says that because he did not require it, we should not count that as taxation at all. It is outside the chalk mark. The present condition of the country shows very clearly what the hon. gentleman has accomplished by his tariff. He has neither attracted thousands of emigrants from abroad nor millions of money. But he has misdirected a large amount of capital already in the country. He has withdrawn capital from one industry to be invested in another, and there are to-day millions of dollars invested in manufacturing establishments that are standing idle; and if those who have spent their money could get it again, they would not invest it in the enterprises in which it is now locked up. The hon. gentleman knows that the cotton mills of Canada to-day could produce, by working three days and a-half, as much cotton as Canada could consume, and during two days and a-half the mills must stand idle or a foreign trade must be had. It is plain, therefore, that one-third of the entire capital invested in cotton mills is wasted; that it is invested in a business which cannot pay, in a manner in which it cannot be profitably employed. If it had not been for the tariff this capital might have been profitably turned to some other business. But in consequence of the high profits which the hon. Finance Minister was able to secure for the investors during a very short time, a large amount of capital has been invested; and there are to-day in Hamilton, I am informed, establishments now standing idle which are in the market for

sale and for which no purchaser can be found. The hon. gentleman, then, has disarranged industries. He has rendered employment in those various industries uncertain; he has introduced into the cities a large population whose means of subsistence is extremely precarious, and who may, for a considerable portion of the year, be obliged to depend on another portion of the population for means of subsistence. This is what the hon. gentleman has accomplished; and he has accomplished nothing more. We never said that a 17½ per cent. tariff was just enough and that no more ought to be imposed. All we ever contended for was this: That the rate of taxation should be such as to meet the requirements of the State; that it should be imposed in such a way as to interfere with commerce and industry as little as possible; that it should be fairly distributed over the different Provinces, in the proportion of their ability to pay it, and among the population of the country on precisely the same principle. I am perfectly aware that we cannot get back to precisely the position we occupied in 1878. Our liabilities have been enormously increased; a high rate of taxation is necessary to meet our obligations; but this we do know, that the taxation during the past five or six years has been far beyond the requirements of the State. The Finance Minister knows right well, according to his own statement, that he has taken from the people of this country \$20,000,000 which he did not require. He has assumed that this money, in the pockets of those to whom it rightly belonged, would not be so wisely and well employed as if it were in the possession of the Government. We know how the hon. gentleman expended the public money. We know what income the country is deriving from that expenditure; we know right well that if the people of the country could not have made a better use of those \$20,000,000 than the Government have done during the past six years, then there is very little hope of the prosperity of the country in time to come. Hon. gentlemen opposite have accomplished none of the things they promised. They said they would prevent the exodus from continuing. We have seen it increase fourfold.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman laughs, but I say it is so. The hon. gentleman himself had no warrant for the statement he made in 1878. Not only has the expenditure of the country been enormously increased, but the progress of the country has been seriously retarded. The country is less prosperous than it otherwise would have been. The hon. gentleman promised he would introduce millions of money into this country. Those millions had not been forthcoming. The hon. gentleman said there was no limit to the number of skilled laborers that might find employment here; that the capital of the world was to flow into Canada, and the laborers of the world were to come here, in order that that capital might find profitable employment. Farmers were to find a home market for what they produced. There has not been established a home market. They export more largely than they did before. They get lower prices. The hon. gentleman promised there would always be good wages for the laborers. But the hon. gentleman dared not meet the laborers in Montreal. The First Minister in 1878, met those men; but in Montreal, when they were anxious for employment and wanted to know what the hon. gentleman was going to do, he could not see them; he was not quite prepared to answer that difficult question. How is the hon. gentleman going to give employment to the hundred thousands of our population out of employment now? The hon. gentleman knows right well that at no distant day those people will not trouble him; 300,000 have crossed the border already; 200,000 are in the State of Michigan. We read accounts during the past summer of people in the cities of southern Europe fleeing on account of the pestilence; and our popu-

lation is fleeing in much the same way from the country since it has fallen into the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. There is a pestilence in the country; the disease is on the Treasury benches, and it is most desirable that the country should get rid of it. I have not the least doubt that when the time comes, when the consequences of the hon. gentlemen's policy becomes fully known, when the depression has reached its lowest point, the public will realise fully the blessings that the hon. gentlemen have been able to confer on them. They are like the blessings conferred in the story told by the Duchess of Orleans upon her favorite child—they mingle a curse with all their blessings. The population of our towns and cities has been reduced, factories are closed, and many of them have gone into insolvency, and a large number of the cotton mills have never been opened, and the hon. gentlemen have increased the cost of government by \$10,000,000. These are the things which those hon. gentlemen have accomplished since they have taken possession of the Treasury benches.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not rise for the purpose of making a speech. The hon. gentleman has repeated what I had heard before; he says I was afraid to meet the workmen of Montreal. Now, no workman ever asked to see me, ever came to see me, ever sent a letter asking to see me, nor did they go to see my secretary. It is an utter falsehood. The day I left—an hour before I left Montreal, I found some resolutions enclosed in some blank envelopes, just before I took my passage back to Ottawa.

Mr. CURRAN. The debate has been going on for some days past and has extended to such a length that, for my part, I shall endeavor to confine my remarks to a very few points. I think what has transpired since the opening of the discussion, especially by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), that the Minister of Finance has reason to feel exceedingly proud of the position he occupies at the present moment. We were told by that hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) that it had been understood and arranged that each in succession of the gentlemen on the other side of the House would choose a certain section from the Finance Minister's most admirable speech, which they intended to dissect, thereby admitting that it required the whole phalanx of the party to meet the statements he had made. I cannot, however, congratulate hon. gentlemen themselves upon manner in which they have subdivided the work, because, like the last speaker on their side—who, no doubt, enjoys a very high reputation among his friends, and perhaps deservedly so—they do not appear to have been able to confine themselves to any one branch. Like him they have spoken *de omnibus rebus*; we have heard of everything concerning, and what does not concern, the debate just now going on, from the Reciprocity Treaty down to the Washington Treaty, and the statements which are said to appear in the report of the commissioners upon the manufacturing industries of the country. There are matters said to appear there which do not appear there, and it is stated that allegations are made in that report when no such allegations appear in it. We have, moreover, the concluding part of the speech of the hon. gentleman, which I will undertake to show, before I get through, is wholly unfounded, as has been truthfully stated by the right hon. the Prime Minister of the Dominion, with regard to the—I may say—infamous falsehoods telegraphed over the length and breadth of the Dominion, with regard to public meetings, said to have been held in the city of Montreal, by the workmen. I say there was no meeting held within the limits of the city of Montreal by any workmen, or by any body whatsoever, having any claim or right to represent them; just as there never was, at the dinner or the magnificent demonstration given in that city, a single man who either approached the president who occupied the chair, or any of

the city members, or any officers of the Junior Conservative Club—not one man who showed himself on the night of that magnificent banquet on behalf of any organisation of workingmen. And yet these people, after being convicted, as they have been by the press of the country, endeavor to repeat and reiterate what they know is not true; they have the audacity to come on the floor of this House and endeavor once more to disseminate these falsehoods throughout this country. And there is something more upon which the hon. Finance Minister has reason to feel proud and to congratulate himself. We have heard, not only in the beginning of this debate, but from the last speaker, of the enviable position held by New South Wales as compared with the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, it is not often that while a debate is going on, while a subject is still under consideration, a gentleman occupying the position of the Finance Minister finds himself sustained by the leading organ of the party opposed to him; nevertheless, gentlemen opposite are actually convicted out of the very publication that appears in that organ. I shall now read an extract which confirms in every particular the statement made by the Finance Minister a few evenings ago, taken from the *Toronto Globe* of to-day. Speaking of the floating of the loan, that paper says:

"We stated, soon after the Canadian Finance Minister put the last loan on the market, that the greater part of it was taken up by the financial agents and persons acting for them or with them."

That has been shown not to be true. The article goes on:

"It is scarcely pretended now that the public subscriptions amounted to more than two million pounds of the five millions offered."

The Finance Minister has shown, and the Public Accounts show, that £800,000 were held by these agents, and not one cent more. It goes on:

"A quarrel between the Government of New South Wales and the Bank of New South Wales, in London, respecting the issue of new loans, caused the bank to reveal how such matters are manipulated. The last New South Wales loan seemed to have been very successfully negotiated. The price obtained for the 3½ per cent. debentures was much higher than that obtained for the Canadian securities of the same denomination a few months before. In one of the letters written by the bank directors to the Government, they say:

"More than one of the recent loans of the colony, as you are aware, must have been publicly declared as marked failures, had we not, at your request, and to the extent of millions of money, directly and indirectly, upheld the credit of your securities." And in another letter the bank directors assert that they were instrumental in 'absolutely saving two of your (the Government's) loans from absolute failure.'"

Here is the confirmation almost *verbatim* of the statement made by the Finance Minister a few evenings ago, in reply to the strictures of the other side, wherein he said that a syndicate of bankers had bolstered and protected and thrown their mantle over New South Wales, and it was on that account that New South Wales had ranked so high as compared with Canada. But here we have, published in the organ of the Opposition, the confirmation of the words of the Minister of Finance, and we have the utter condemnation of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. Now, Sir, it is not my intention, at this hour of the night, to follow the hon. gentleman through his remarks regarding the question of reciprocity. I do not think, if the public do any of us the honor of perusing the speeches we are making in this debate, that what he has stated with reference to the policy of this Government on the question of reciprocity, and more particularly what he has urged with regard to protection in this country being a barrier to reciprocity, will receive the acceptance of one sensible man in the length and breadth of the Dominion. There is no Canadian, at all events, who has a manly heart in his breast, there is no man who feels the dignity of his position as a citizen of this Dominion, who will concur in the suggestion that we should show ourselves the humble, obsequious beseechers of the Government on the other side of the line; that we should exhibit four thorough self-abasement; that we must not for one moment think of protecting ourselves or of erecting any kind of barrier; that

Mr. CURRAN.

we should not dream of giving them the slightest offence; because, if we are sufficiently humble, if we are sufficiently servile, if we sufficiently forget our manhood, some fine day, perhaps, they may extend to us a benevolent and a merciful hand. Now, we have had also a reference by the hon. gentleman to the question of the Washington Treaty. I must say, for my part, that I am not sufficiently bright, intellectually, to see exactly how the hon. gentleman has wedged that question into this discussion; and not being able to discover the precise connecting link, I shall leave that subject, with several others of a similar nature, altogether untouched on this occasion. There was one subject, however, upon which the hon. gentleman was particularly unhappy. He tried to be very funny. He tells us he sent out a man to scour the country and to find out the value of the report which had been laid on the Table by the Government, with regard to the manufacturing industries of the country. It would seem to me, from the results obtained by that gentleman, whoever he may be, that he was more bent on finding the best means of turning a pun or making a joke than on learning the truth regarding the accuracy of this report. I hold in my hand at this moment this report with regard to the city of London, which my hon. friend opposite solemnly asserted was worthless, because therein it was alleged, amongst other things, that there was an oil-cloth factory in that city; and, said he, I find, after rambling about, that I could not stumble on any such institution. Well, I will allow the hon. gentleman, if he wishes, to accompany his friend and go *pari passu* with him through that report, and he will not stumble upon that oil-cloth factory there either. There is no such mention of any such manufactory. Here is the report, which I shall be most happy to send across the floor.

Mr. MILLS. I saw the report here in manuscript; I copied the statement myself; and if it is not in the report now, then the report as printed is not the report as laid on the Table.

Mr. CURRAN. All I can say is, here is the report. I am afraid there must be some cause for the difficulty about this original gentleman whom he sent out to discover these particular institutions. I will not say what it was or what it was not—whether he saw two institutions where there was but one, or whether he was so blind that he could not see anything at all. At all events, here is the document, and I send my statement to the country, along with the statement of the hon. gentleman; and I say, if all he has said to night is to be judged by the standard of this misrepresentation, his speech will not be of much avail.

Mr. MILLS. There is no misrepresentation.

Mr. BOWELL. You copied too far; that is all. You took the oil-cloth factory in the city of Kingston at the end of the London list.

Mr. CURRAN. I am much obliged to the hon. Minister. I was going to reserve that until the end of my speech. I thought I would leave the hon. gentleman in suspense for a little while, and then bring him around again. Really, Mr. Speaker, one would naturally have expected, from the experience we have had for some years past, that these hon. gentlemen would have come before this House rather as making an act of contrition than in the attitude in which they appear before us to-night. However, there are some people who cannot realise accomplished facts. The enemies of the old Bourbons used to say that they never forgot anything because they never could learn anything, and it would appear that the affliction which befell that unfortunate dynasty is really the one which has befallen the hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, we have been told to-night by the hon. gentleman who spoke last, that we falsely assert that they have been in the habit of maligning the policy of the Government. I say we never

have indulged in any such assertion. It is their right to attack the policy of the Government; they may slander the policy of the Government if they like; but what we have complained of, what we complain of now, and what, no doubt, we shall be called upon to complain of in the future, is not that they have slandered the policy of the Government, but that they have slandered the people of this country and the country itself. I have no desire to utter one sentence here which I cannot substantiate. Allow me, Sir, to quote the following words; and I trust that such of the people of this country as will do me the honor of perusing these remarks, will ask themselves can this be possible?

"The parties who are to blame, to say the truth, are no doubt the majority of the electors of the people of Canada, who were ill-advised enough, knowing the antecedents of the First Minister, to elect him to the important office which he now holds, and to confirm him again in 1882. That these unfortunate people are likely to pay a most heavy penalty for their folly will be, I am afraid, only too clearly shown when we have an opportunity of perusing the Public Accounts, and holding some further discussion on the result of the follies they themselves have committed. But if we are to blush for anybody, it is not for Her Majesty's officers, but for that portion of the people of Canada who had so little sense of public honor and self-respect as, after what the hon. gentleman has done, to again intrust him with further powers of injuring his country."

That is a part of the hon. ex-Finance Minister's speech, a speech not delivered in the heat of argument, not uttered under the excitement of the moment, not caused by some sudden outburst, but spoken in cold blood, with calm deliberation and premeditation, when the debate was first opened here this Session, in reply to the Address. There was no occasion then for any such outburst, there was no provocation given then, but he hurled this insult, not at the policy of the Government, not at the officers of the Government, not at any member of the Government, but at the people; for he tells us we have to blush for the people of Canada, who are lost to honor and self-respect. Now, Sir, in the course of a speech delivered a few evenings ago by the ex-Minister of Finance, he referred, amongst other things, to a number of tests by which to establish the state of the country. He took the school statistics as one means of showing that the country was going to the dogs. Well, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), I think, established pretty clearly the accuracy of the statistical reports upon which the argument of the hon. gentleman was based. He showed that they were of no value; he showed that they had not changed in certain localities, year after year; he showed that precisely the same number of pupils were supposed to be at school, year after year—an absolute impossibility. And my opinion is, that these reports were gotten up very much like the old sedentary militia reports that were sent in, year after year, in former times; when if we had, at any moment, wished to call on these brave defenders of their country, who were returned to the Government as being ready to die for the land, the response to be given by many of those who were marked in the list would not have been given to any other sound than that of the trumpet of the archangel. One-half of them, no doubt, were in their graves, and had been there for years. Just as these sedentary militia reports were valueless, so these school reports, as the hon. member for Cardwell has pointed out, are incorrect on the face of them. But the hon. gentleman said that he was perfectly willing to take the statistics of the Province of Quebec. He suddenly discovered it himself, and I hope it will be his permanent state, a reverence and love and affection for the clergy of Lower Canada. He was anxious to see their statistics; upon them he would place the most implicit reliance, and he hoped that some gentleman would take upon himself the duty of procuring from that source of infallibility the documents that would show exactly in what condition the Province of Quebec found itself; and with that prophetic spell which was upon him, with that insight into the future which characterises him generally, he had no doubt, not even the slightest doubt, but that the

same state of affairs, the same blue ruin, and the same decay he professed to have found in Ontario would also be found to exist in the Province of Quebec. Well, Sir, I sent down to the city of Montreal, that great centre of the National Policy, that point which must suffer from it more than any other, because that is the place in which it comes more actively into play, and in which its results must be manifest—I sent down to Montreal and procured the report of the Catholic school commissioners. I asked for that report, not only for the past two years, but from the year 1877. Those reports contain those schools which are directly under the control of the Catholic school commissioners in Montreal. There are numerous Catholic schools just as there are numerous Protestant schools which are not under the control of the one board or the other; there are there as many schools outside, perhaps, as there are in this particular class; but as a matter of statistics, as going straight to the class we desire to reach and finding out what is the actual state of prosperity or ruin of the people, I do not believe there is a more faithful record to be had in the Dominion than the paper I am about to read. I have these reports, and they are for the consideration of any gentleman who may wish to take communication of them. My friend Mr. Edward Murphy, one of the school commissioners, who acts jointly with the clergy, because there are both laymen and clergymen on the board, sends me this statement:

"I send this statement to show the progressive school increase in school attendance. From 6,405, in 1877, it increased to 7,005, in 1881; from 7,316, in 1882, it increased to 9,932, in 1884. This is the attendance at the commissioners' schools and those assisted by them. There are, of course, a great many others independent of the commissioners, but the report of the commissioners shows an increase in school attendance from 6,405, in 1877, to 9,932, in 1884, or 55 per cent. in seven years."

Now I shall go a little further. I was anxious to find something about the independent schools. I could not be supposed to go to each school, although I might point out here some of the establishments that would really strengthen this, such as the St. Ann's school, in the St. Ann's ward, in my own district where the pupils have doubled. But I went to the Christian Brothers, a body of teachers who have schools all over the Province. I said to them: I would like to find out what is the exact state of the various schools under your control at present, and what was their condition in 1877. I found that in 1880—that was the report that the reverend gentleman could lay his hands upon at that moment, and I was coming away, and had to take what I could get—there were 10,000 pupils in the schools in different parts of the Province, controlled by the Christian Brothers. Since that time these gentlemen have had to close their establishments at Chambly, Côte des Neiges, Beauharnois, and St. Thomas de Montmagny, on account of the rapidly increasing attendance in the other establishments under their control. They had not the teachers necessary to maintain those schools, as they had to devote them to the rapidly increasing establishments in other parts. These four establishments had 1,200 pupils when they gave them up to lay teachers; and yet, although they had four schools less than in 1880, they have 10,300 pupils in 1884. The same gentleman who furnished me with statistical information regarding commissioners' schools also directed my attention to our own City and District Savings Bank. We have had a good deal of discussion as to the value of statistics with regard to the Dominion Post Office Savings Bank. We have been told that these Dominion savings banks are a cause of drawing away money from the commerce of the country. Well, let us, first of all, take a bird's-eye view of this institution, see what progress has attended it or what ruin and decay has overtaken it. The depositors in the City and District Savings Bank have steadily increased from 1877 to the present date. On the 31st December, 1877, the amount of deposits was \$3,385,765, and the number of depositors

17,203. On the 31st December, 1883, the amount of deposits had gone up to \$6,212,635, and the number of depositors had increased to 29,756. On the 31st December, 1884, the amount of deposits had gone on still further, and the amount was \$6,328,093, and the number of depositors had increased to 31,241; and, as the report comes still further down, as we have still to show, now, in the middle of winter, what is the state of affairs, we find that on the 28th of February last the deposits had increased to \$6,596,000, and the number of depositors had risen from 31,241, in the space of two months, to 31,906. These are figures which are utterly uncontrovertible, but it may be well to ask what is the interest paid upon the deposits? What is it that induces people to take the money out of commerce and put it there? Is it the large and overwhelming interest paid, which induces people to lodge their money on deposit, in order to make more than they could in any legitimate undertaking? Why, the interest is 3 per cent. The average deposit is \$200, or less. It is the money of the mechanic, of the servant, of the small trader, of those who value that institution perhaps even more than the Government institutions. They have learned to know it and to love it; they have confidence in it; it is a standing monument of what an institution can grow to when it has the confidence of the people, and it is for that reason we find people depositing their money there and not because they are induced to draw it out of trade or commerce. Here we have this magnificent exhibit; we have this school attendance; we have this evidence of thrift, of industry, of sobriety, of the love of learning, of everything that contributes to make a people good, and that, in time, will make a people great. I ask you, Sir, in the face of these facts, need we blush for these people? Are they people without self-respect, people without honor, people for whom the members of this House need have a blush of shame upon their faces? If it were parliamentary to say so, if I dared say so here, might I not rather retort and say that the people who have thus been maligned and slandered might well stand up and say, that if there was any cause for shame, any cause for blushing, or any cause for feeling a sentiment of degradation in our land, it was that a constituency could be found in this Dominion to return a man to this House who would use such language. But there is more than all that. These figures answer an argument that has been used here. We were told the other night, by a gentleman who felt the prophetic spirit moving him, exactly the time and the date when this country was to fall to pieces. We were told the number of years it was to take. Well, we know that it is stated that as two suns cannot shine in the firmament at the same time, so two equally great men cannot figure in the same sphere in the same country at the same moment. It was a dangerous thing, now that we have Wiggins, the weather prophet, in this country, that we should have this other prophet springing up. It is a terrible thing. But there is the fact. What becomes of this prophecy that in eighteen years the workingmen and women in this Dominion are going to be wiped out of existence, are going to be taxed out of existence; are going to be ground literally out of existence by the exactions of this terrible Government with this terrible National Policy? With the progression which is going on in the school attendance and the doubling up of the millions in the savings banks of the workers, what is going to become of this prophecy? Now, Sir, we had a statement made that the workingmen of Montreal had shown that they did not appreciate the right hon. Premier. I have said, in my opening remarks, that when the hon. gentleman on the other side had made an allusion to this statement, he alleged what he ought, at all events, to have known was utterly untrue. I say, Sir, that I know full well that sometime before that great demonstration took place there was a movement sought to be put on foot by a small number of people in the city of Montreal,

Mr. CURRAN,

to counteract that magnificent demonstration. But, Sir, a gentleman who is now in his grave, who was an honor to his country, whose loss was a terrible loss to the party opposite—the late Thomas Cramp, of Montreal—said: “Don’t attempt it, gentlemen; don’t do it. The people of this country may not all follow Sir John A. Macdonald, but every man in the country, with the exception of a few, love and admire and respect him.” Sir, that little movement was crushed, that was nipped in the bud. The ward politicians who thought they could bring it to a focus, were told: The indignation of the people will wipe you out of existence. You may cause a few broken heads of your victims; perhaps you will interfere with the demonstration, but that demonstration will take place. Sir, I do not speak merely of the magnificent banquet at that celebration, where were met together the citizens of Montreal, the delegations from different parts of the Province, and people from other Provinces—not the rich men alone, not the great manufacturers alone, not the great merchants and bankers and others, but men whom I know are hard-working men, men who earn their bread by the sweat of their brow, went there to do honor to the old chieftain whom they were proud to hail as the father of his country. I say not merely at that great dinner but in that grand celebration that was held in the streets of Montreal, where all took part, where the city turned out as one man, where the streets were one blaze of light, where no effort could resist the grand outburst of enthusiastic demonstration—I say that on that occasion there was an attempt made to belittle the meaning and significance of that great uprising, for whilst that was going on the agent of the *Toronto Globe* met in solemn conclave with some persons whose characters I have had the pleasure of dissecting on another occasion, and these parties, professing to represent the workmen of the city of Montreal, and meeting in the municipality of St. Cunegonde, outside the city limits, undertook to put up a little job of sending a deputation to wait on the Premier—not at the Windsor Hotel, however; they dare not show themselves there; there was not a workman in Montreal who would not have been insulted by one of these men calling themselves his representative. They did not venture to go to the Windsor, but they sent a report broadcast that they had done so. Then they had a meeting a few nights afterwards, which I took the liberty of attending myself, in which they sought to ventilate this matter still further. Then it was announced in the *Globe* that the largest hall in the city of Montreal had been engaged. But it was the little hall of St. Cunegonde, a place that had been used as a small chapel a few years ago and had been converted into a public hall; it was outside the city limits. Who were there? How many workmen were there? Look at the names of the men on the platform. Workmen! Why, Sir, the thing is absurd. There was, however, one gentleman there, a personal friend of mine, although a political opponent. And what did he state at that public meeting, and in presence of those who were assembled there? I speak of Mr. L. O. David, a gentleman at all events on whose statements we can rely. He stood up in that meeting and he said: “Gentlemen, if this party now in power goes to the people again, with protection as their policy, and my party goes to the polls again with their old flag, I cannot go back upon my own party, I cannot work against them, but I am a protectionist in principle and I will stay at home. I shall be neutral, for I could not embark in that contest, I could not throw my voice and influence against the policy which I consider to be for the best interests of the country.” I spoke to those people there; the audience was not very numerous, and I said: Here, in this place, outside the city of Montreal, we know there may be, we know there is, a certain amount of depression.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRAN. Yes, you will hear a good deal before I get through. I said: What about these factories? What about these foundries? What about these industrial establishments on the very ground we stand upon? I say there is not one of them that is not open and in full blast at this very moment. That statement remained unchallenged. And, Sir, what did I find the Saturday before we opened the present Session? I happened to look at the *Montreal Witness*, the Free Trade paper *par excellence* of this Dominion, the paper that has never hauled down its Free Trade flag, the paper that has complained of the vacillating policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite, the paper that has told them they were trying to sail under false colors, that they ought to come out and take their stand boldly—and I am glad to see they are taking it now—what did that paper state, with reference to this very locality where that meeting was held? Under the heading "St. Cunegonde News," it said:

"Considerable building improvements are contemplated in the spring. More house accommodation is urgently needed. The several industries of the municipality are on full time, and there is no scarcity of employment. The Dominion tin factory employs 100 hands."

Now, Sir, I think testimony of this kind is really of some value in a discussion such as the present one, for we are now appealing far more directly to the hearts and minds of the people of this Dominion than we could do in reference to any speculation on the question of reciprocity or in the resur-rection of speculations upon the Washington Treaty. However, we were favored some time ago by a visit of the ex-Finance Minister to the city of Montreal. He went there to air his grievances, and amongst other things he said:

"I am, I admit, these men's determined enemy, and I am not so by reason of their assaults upon myself, though they have been uninterrupted since the time I took office. Providence sometimes tempers the wind to the shorn lamb, and having inherited an Irish constitution and an Irish temperament, and it may be some sense of humor, I must confess I rather enjoy the attacks made upon me."

This is from the *Globe* report of the speech of the ex-Finance Minister, delivered at Queen's Hall. He says he rather enjoyed those attacks. Well, I rather enjoy a part of that speech. It reminded me of what I have often seen before. Now, if there is one thing more than another that I hold in contempt, it is this particular snivelling about the Irish peculiarities of hon. gentlemen opposite, they never have the fit when they are in the hey-day of their prosperity—it suits when they happen to be in the cold shades. Then those people always discover that they have some Irish humor about them, some Irish blood in their veins; that their mother or step-mother was Irish, or something of that kind. And this hon. gentleman, no doubt, imagined he was making a deep impression upon the tender hearts of the Irish-Canadian people in this Dominion when he told them it was his Irish constitution, his Irish temperament, and his Irish humor that made him withstand and enjoy those attacks. I presume that an hon. gentleman who makes an appeal of that kind must, at all events, be following the course of public events in Ireland and elsewhere, wherever the people that he claims to be allied with are concerned. I will take this opportunity of saying that I imagine out of the mouths of those who are considered by the majority of the people to be the best judges of the best interests of Ireland I can convince the hon. gentleman that he is mistaken, in so far as that people goes. I am perfectly aware that very many hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House do not entertain the same views as I do with respect to the value of the opinions of the gentlemen I am about to quote. But, at any rate, so far as regards Irish interests, as compared with the interests of the adjoining country, England, a people of five millions lying alongside a people of thirty millions, as we occupy the position of a people of five millions lying alongside a people of fifty-five millions, there is a considerable parallel between the two cases, and some value must attach to the opinions of those who have studied out the question. I think no man in this country will dis-

pute that Justin McCarthy, the member for Longford, in the Imperial Parliament, the brilliant writer, the author of "The History of Our Own Times," and of many other works of great merit, himself a free trader in principle, is a pretty good judge of the matter in question. I happen to have here under my hand a letter addressed, during the course of last summer, by him, to the editor of the *New York Tribune* on this very question of free trade and protection, as regards this five million country along side of a thirty million country. I will merely draw this difference in favor of the position of Ireland, that it is lying alongside of a free trade country, while we are placed alongside a country which has double the protection we have. After reciting the story of how the different industries were wiped out, by what statutes and so on, Justin McCarthy says:

"Now, I am not going to discuss the free trade question as an economic doctrine here. I am, myself, a free trader—that is to say, I believe the economic doctrine of free trade is sound, and is destined to prevail everywhere."

Then he goes on to state what is the peculiar position of Ireland, which we all know. This was touched upon by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries this afternoon to some extent, and I need not again go over the ground, but will satisfy myself by making a single quotation. Justin McCarthy further says:

"That is the position which Ireland occupies with regard to free trade and English economics generally. I believe there are some leading Irishmen who go further than this, and have convinced themselves that protection would be for a long time the fitting policy for Ireland. I believe this is Mr. Parnell's opinion, although I do not remember that I have ever had much talk with him on the subject. He is a man who prefers, as a rule, to talk of what is actually going on, and does not much care to anticipate controversies. Mr. John Dillon, I know, is in favor of a policy of protection—for a time at least. On the other hand, we have among prominent Irish politicians many men who, like myself, are free traders on principle; that is, who regard free trade as the principle which will ultimately prevail. But I do not know of one single Irishman who is pledged to free trade as the English *doctrinaire* is pledged to it, or who would not be quite willing to consider the effects of a different policy upon the Ireland of to-day."

We have, moreover, an interview, dated London, 2nd December, between Mr. Parnell and a reporter of a public journal, which was telegraphed to this side, in the course of which Mr. Parnell says:

"England's unfair competition in trade is a great difficulty. Let me give an instance: Messrs. Lane, of Cork, started a starch manufactory. Coleman, the great English manufacturer, forthwith sent an agent over to Ireland, offering to sell starch 30 shillings per ton less than Lane's prices—in fact, under cost. Messrs. Lane retaliated by advertising their starch in England under Coleman's prices, who was ultimately glad to compromise."

This firm was strong and able to meet the enemy in his own country, and able to triumph. But what about struggling industries? He further says:

"With regard to tariffs, my opinion is that a certain measure of protection against foreign manufactures would benefit Ireland."

I do not think that any man on this side of the House, or any man in this country, who has either advocated or struggled for the introduction and maintenance of this tariff, believes that this protective tariff is perfection itself. No man has ever contended that this doctrine of protection for Canada was going to cure this country of all the evils which are attendant upon human affairs. There is no policy that can be promulgated that will not have such effects. But, all in all, it is the best policy, and the people believe it to be the best policy that could possibly have been inaugurated to take the country out of the slough of despair into which it was plunged, and raise it to the position which it has since occupied. The results prove it, and in the words of John Boyle O'Reilly:

"From soul to soul the shortest line,
At best will bended be;
The ship that sails the straightest course,
Still sails the convex sea."

No matter what you may effect, no matter what the human mind may conceive, there will be something about it that

will leave traces of the want of perfection in our nature. But to say—for any man who knows anything about the condition of this country for the past few years—to say that this policy has ruined the people, that this policy has left us in a worse position than we were in in 1877, that it is calculated in eighteen years to wipe us off the face of the earth, to make such a statement, and accompany it by the slanders which are cast in the face of the people, because they have supported this policy and the men who promulgated it—I say is unworthy of any man who considers himself sane—is unworthy of any man who would wish to enjoy the confidence of his fellow-countrymen in any question which he may put before the them. We have had several statements here with regard to different industries. We have had statements, for instance, with regard to the sugar industry. We have had statements with regard to certain importations which could have been made. We have had statements with regard to the prices at which sugar could have been brought here from Greenock, in Scotland, and other points in that country and laid down here. Well, really it is too bad to think that these questions, which are so complex in their nature, which involve not only protection in our own country but protection in Germany and other lands, should be discussed upon such a basis as to say—to show how thoroughly the people of this country are imposed upon, we will bring gentlemen on the platform who will tell you that they could have imported sugar at 1 or $\frac{1}{2}$ a cent per lb. less than it was sold by the manufacturers. We know that the reason why certain qualities of sugar are to be found in the markets of Scotland is on account of the protective policy of Germany, where there is a bounty of $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents per lb. on all beet sugar exported. That is the actual bounty. This sugar, on the other hand, which is referred to, is nearly all of the kind which is equal No. 9 Dutch standard; it is the refuse of the refineries, and it is of so low a grade as to be unsaleable in the Scotch market; and I am told, on an authority which cannot be contradicted—that of a gentleman in Montreal, who has been engaged for years in the grocery trade, who has given great attention to the subject, who has written to the newspapers about it, but who is now out of politics and does not wish his name mentioned—that if we take the prices of both whites and yellows, for the last two years, we will find that the refiners of Canada have been selling at a less price than the same grades have been sold for in the United States.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Take the quotations.

Mr. CURRAN. Take the quotations of the past two years, and I am informed, on this authority, that the prices have ranged in Canada lower for the same grades than in the United States. Sir, this sort of argumentation, as was pointed out by the Minister of Finance, which is employed in certain places, where the people have to be told you are not suffering quite so much as your neighbors, this kind of argument will not go down in Montreal. It will not go down in Halifax, or in Moncton, or in any place where the true state of affairs is known. I know it, because I was there in Montreal; I was there arguing the cause of this policy, when \$1,000,000 worth of the finest machinery in this country was lying idle in Point St. Charles; I was there when every third house in that place had "To Let" upon it; I was there when I said to these people: Drive these men out, who have eyes to see and will not see, who have ears to hear and will not hear; drive these men out; they will not listen to the voice of the people; you have rung it into their ears, but they will not listen; drive them out, and in twelve months that factory will be going and giving employment, not only within but without, to the carter, to the cooper, to a host of people outside, besides the two hundred or three hundred or four hundred men who will be employed, not merely in Redpath's great refinery, but in

Mr. CURRAN.

the St. Lawrence refinery; you will have the smoke curling out of tall chimneys, and you will not be, as you have been during the present winter, you will not have but one industry, and that the industry of the soup kitchen. The results proved my assertions. I go still further. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) in his effort here the other night, told us that the agricultural interests of Ontario are suffering. We were told by one that the refiners were being destroyed, and now we have another coming forward, as most of them did, with a jeremiad about the agricultural industries. We were told that the statistics were there, and naturally, coming from that source, we thought it was all right; but to speak candidly, when I heard that creamery butter could be bought in the city of Montreal at from 16 to 18 cents a pound, when I have been paying for butter for some years back, and know something about it—I said the man who can say that can say anything. But what are the statistics taken from the annual report of the Ontario Bureau of Industries for 1883, volume 16, part 7, of the Sessional Papers for 1884, No. 55, page 35? Here they are:

	1883.	1882.	Increase.
Farm Lands.....	\$854,793,025	\$632,342,500	\$22,450,525
Buildings.....	163,030,675	132,711,575	30,319,100
Implements....	43,522,530	37,029,815	6,492,715
Live stock	99,882,365	80,540,720	19,341,645
Total for Province..	\$961,228,595	\$882,624,610	\$78,604,985

Now, Sir, the fact is, that however we view the stand taken by hon. gentlemen opposite, we must come to the conclusion that they are not laboring in the interest of the country in the course they are now pursuing. I have some notes before me with reference to the immigration policy of the Government. I am happy to know that the policy, as now announced, is that no attempt is to be made to induce men of the class of mechanics to come to this country at all; and I see by the documents I have in my hand that nearly all the statements thrown broadcast by the Opposition press, with regard to the immigration policy of the Minister of Agriculture, and the result of that policy, were entirely erroneous. I do not believe at this hour that that I should be justified, after the exhaustive speeches that have been made, and having spoken myself longer than I had any intention of doing in making any further allusion to this point. But I will say that there was one thing in connection with this debate that made me feel sad, that made me feel indignant, and that was that, not content with this system of vituperation of the best interests of the country, of the country itself, and of the people, these hon. gentlemen should have made the statement in this very debate, accompanying all the damaging statements and calculations, and miscalculations and misrepresentations, that have been sent broadcast by these hon. gentlemen, especially by the ex-Minister of Finance—the statement, Sir, that to-day the people of Canada are a more disunited people, or a less united people, than they were twelve years ago. That, Sir, coming from a gentleman who tells us that he is not afraid or ashamed to stand up and talk in favor of Canadian independence—that, coming from a man who professes that this country is ripe to take care of its own affairs—what, Sir, must we think of it? If we are a disunited people, if we are dragging, one in one direction and another in another, if we are people against people, race against race, Province against Province, if every interest in this country is dragging in a different direction, what becomes of the argument of that hon. gentleman and of the friends around him? But I say that is another slander on the country; that is another untruthful statement. I know the people of Canada, and I know them well. As a native of this country, myself born and brought up here, brought up amongst a race different from my own, but with whom I have become identified by every interest that can identify a man with a people, I know and I feel, appreciating the differ-

ent races of whom this country is composed, that there is going on amongst the people of Canada a cementation of interest, as well as a linking of hearts, that no man, especially no young man in this country, can realise. No man in this country can realise how thoroughly and deeply and sincerely there is in his heart the feeling that this great Canada of ours is our country, that the interest of one Province is the interest of all the Provinces, that the interest of one people is the interest of all the people. I believe no man has yet realised it, and no man will realise it until the matter is put to the test by one of those emergencies to which every country is subject at some time or other. Then, these men will find—then, those who glory in the disunion of the people will find—that this country is peopled by a brave, a united and harmonious people. I send that out to-night, and I hope my words will be quoted; and I hope that long after the names of the growlers and grumblers and those who seek to sew discontent and disunion among the people shall have been forgotten, a great and united people will live and flourish here, and love the land even more patriotically than we love it now.

Mr. RINFRET. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, whatever may be the opinions entertained on the best system of tariff, viewed from a purely abstract or theoretical standpoint; whatever may be the opinions heretofore upheld, either in favor of a protective tariff, or free trade or a revenue tariff, from the general standpoint of the science of political economy, there is one essential and practical point towards which all ideas should converge to-day, and on which it has become impossible to differ; and that is the fact that protection has not been useful here, and is not the system of tariff which is suited to Canada.

During the first few years after the establishment of the tariff, it was quite proper to discuss the question from a theoretical point of view, and to compare the opinions of the several economists who have judged from absolutely contradictory standpoints, according to the influence of the places where they lived, according to the population and resources of the countries for which they have written. But to-day, Mr. Speaker, after an experience of several years, of which some were prosperous while other years were not, we are enabled to judge, not upon theory put upon facts. We are called upon not merely to give our opinions or to make suppositions; we are to give a judgment upon facts and results, compared to previous estimates. It may not be out of place at this juncture, to make a review of the opinions which have been put forward until now by both political parties now contending for power in order to judge which of the two has been borne out by the facts. I have already had occasion to state in this House that it is possible that absolute free trade may be the most useful system for England, who holds an exceptional position in the world at large owing to her geographical position and to her almost boundless commercial relations. It is possible, although it is not my own private opinion, that the protective tariff has not been injurious to the neighboring Republic, because that rich and immense country can, in a great measure, dispense with foreign trade, and can be self-sufficient owing to the great variety of its productions. The United States have all that is required from an agricultural, mining and manufacturing point of view. Besides they have a population of 50,000,000 of souls, distributed in several States, who have between them the most absolute free trade. I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that by reason of their peculiar position, it ought to have been immaterial to the United States, as far as their general prosperity was concerned, whether they adopted protection or free trade. No fiscal law could crush out or even delay, to any appreciable extent, a prosperity which was inevitable in a country having so much wealth and natural resources. As far as Canada is concerned, its position is

quite different from that of those two countries. It is obvious to any one that neither of these two systems can suit Canada if carried as far as their most extreme limits will allow. Canada is an agricultural country and does not possess what would be necessary to make it a manufacturing country. I do not infer from that that it would be good policy to have no manufactures at all. On the contrary, I hold and I have always held, that although Canada is not essentially a manufacturing country a great deal can be gained by having a sufficient number of manufactures, provided that the establishment of these manufactures does not become a burden on the farming community or the country at large, and provided the goods manufactured are not much higher to the consumers than the goods which may be imported from abroad. I have always said—and the facts bear me out to-day—that no manufacture created here through artificial means, maintained by means of a high tariff, can be useful in any way whatever; first, because such manufactures are a burden to the country, and secondly, because it will only be able to stand while there is general prosperity, and in years of depression will accelerate general ruin and accumulate on our markets goods that are useless and consequently injurious to trade generally.

During a few years, Mr. Speaker, owing to the enormous amounts invested in the various industries of the country, owing to certain special circumstances, such as abundant crops, the general revival of business, which have existed throughout the whole world, there has been real prosperity among a few manufacturers, and factitious and transitory prosperity among others. The real and even legitimate prosperity has existed among that class of industry which had no need of protection to stand their ground and to which protection has been given, at the expense of the people, an increase of wealth—such are the cotton manufactures, sugar refiners, and certain iron manufactures. That kind of industry existed before protection was adopted, and might have lived without protection. But manufactures which have been started here in spite of natural obstacles, which have only lived through governmental favor, could not expect any better than a factitious and transitory prosperity. What do we find to-day? After one year only of depression all these manufactures which had been fostered by the protective tariff, and whose existence was an economical nonsense, are disappearing, one after another, after having glutted the market. True, some of them are still alive, but they are dragging their wings; they have thrown half of their operatives in the street, and they are only paying reduced and inadequate salaries to those whom they still employ. The disaster would have been still greater had not the commercial world been forewarned by the crisis of 1876, which had rendered trade more timorous. The price of goods has been maintained to a certain extent, as was said some time ago by the hon. Minister of Finance, but the prices have only been maintained by means of a special agreement between the manufacturers. Any one can see to-day that our markets are fairly glutted, that there is too great a number of manufactures in our country for the consumption and wants of Canada, and that we are unable to find a market abroad for the sale of our manufactured goods. I believe the revenue tariff would have afforded sufficient protection, and under that system we might have had a sufficient number of manufactures, but none too many. The number of manufactures would have increased slowly but surely. There would have been no effervescence during the first years; the overcrowding of the market, which is to be seen to-day, would have been prevented as well as the crisis which threatens to extend to all the industries of the country. This is one of the cases in which the injustice consummated by the legislation of the Dominion Parliament has been detrimental, not only to the consumers who have been victimised, but even to

those who, from the outset, appeared to be gorged with Ministerial favors. In 1879 the hon. member for East York predicted what has happened since—that the protective tariff would increase the price of manufactured goods and would therefore impose a heavy tax on the consumers while making the fortune of those who would invest capital in manufactures. That is precisely what has happened. It is useless to recall here what has already been said about the enormous dividends which have been paid by the cotton manufacturers of Montreal, Valleyfield and other parts of the country, by Messrs. Redpath's sugar refinery and by some of the iron manufacturers. The second result predicted by the Liberal party, as a consequence of these uncommon profits, is the increase of the number of manufactures and the creation of monopolies or special agreements between the manufacturers, in order to keep up the prices. The third which has not been slow in coming is the overcrowding of the market and the manufacturing crisis which must necessarily ensue from over-production. All this has been realised with a degree of accuracy which is most discouraging. What do we see to-day? Manufactures which are closing their doors, operatives who are left without work; people who have given up farming to work in manufactories and who are now either working at a reduced salary, or working only three or four days in each week. The manufacturing cities of Canada, such as Montreal, Hamilton, St. John, Halifax, are suffering more from the present depression than any other part of the country, and it is quite clear, to any man who does not willingly shut his eyes, that their position must still, necessarily, be aggravated within a few years to come. One thing is certain; the crisis is felt more or less everywhere, but manufacturing cities are suffering more than others from it. All that which happens to-day has been foreseen by the Liberal party, and the prediction had been realised even sooner than had been expected. Facts are most emphatically giving the lie to the false representations which had been made by the Conservative party in order to court public confidence. Let us now examine what has been the effect of the tariff on the agricultural class. The promises made to farmers, during the election of 1878, were such as to induce them to support candidates who were in favor of protection. They had the promises of a national market, of good prices for breadstuff, coarse grains and farm produce, in exchange for the enormous taxes which are imposed by the present tariff. We said that the tariff could not increase the price of these products, because we have a surplus of almost every kind of farm produce, and we are obliged to export and sell them at whatever prices they will bring on the Liverpool market; that under those circumstances, the creation of a national market was physically impossible; and that the only result of protection would be to compel farmers to pay a higher price for what they buy, without giving them any benefit whatever on what they have to sell. What has happened? Since the adoption of the tariff the price of grain has been, as heretofore, regulated by the laws of offer and demand. If we take the average of the six last years as compared to the six years next preceding we find that these products have not brought a higher price. Neither have they been sold much cheaper; it has been about the same thing in spite of the three years of commercial prosperity which we have had out of these six years. I will say even more; if we compare the prices of 1873-74-75, which were years of prosperity, although we had no protection then, to the years 1880-81-82, which were also years of prosperity, we find that grain and other produce were then sold from 10 to 20 per cent. higher under the revenue tariff than under the protective tariff. All that the present tariff has been able to do was to extort from the farmers, by means of the enormous taxes which were imposed, an average of \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 for each year more than the old tariff on

Mr. RINFRET.

goods imported from abroad, and another amount of from \$8,000,000 to \$10,000,000, perhaps \$12,000,000, on goods manufactured in Canada. This increase is equal to \$1 per head of the population, or \$40 for an ordinary family of ten persons. This is a serious affair, if we bear in mind the general condition of Canadian farmers, who are obliged to live with the strictest economy. I do not think I am liable to the charge of exaggeration when I state that this unjust subtraction of \$40 per annum out of the income of each family has sent a great number of families to the United States. Those representatives of the people who live in the country places know that to the average farmer an annual deficit of about \$10 is a very serious affair, which must be a cause of ruin in the course of a very few years. It is a striking circumstance that the emigration of farmers to the United States has increased in the same proportion as the wealth of the tariff's favorites—for the good reason they were impoverished by the unjust contributions which the law of the country compelled them to pay out each year in order to enrich manufacturers. While dealing with this subject it might be proper to say a word about the famous theory set forth by the hon. Minister of Finance on the balance of our importations and exportations, or the balance of trade, of which so much has been said during the elections of 1878. To hear the hon. gentlemen in 1878, we were to be ruined, irretrievably ruined, if we did not find means to balance our importations with our exportations. They represented the excess of our importations over our exportations as being so many millions, vanished, wrenched from the national wealth. It is useless to repeat to-day the explanations which were given then and which were based on the science of political economy. I shall only give the conclusion; it is that the balance of trade is invariably against us during the years of prosperity, and that it seems to be in our favor in years when a crisis prevails. Facts have proved that the ideas of the Liberal party were right. The following took place since the adoption of the tariff in 1879. In 1879 there was an excess of the exportations over the importations, but it will be remembered that we were then undergoing the most acute period of the crisis and we had during that year, the first of the operation of the present tariff, a deficiency of nearly \$2,000,000. In 1880, our importations and exportations were balanced, but since then our importations have greatly exceeded our exportations. The following is a comparative statement of our importations and exportations from 1878 to 1884, according to the tables of the Trade and Navigation returns:

	Importations.	Exportations.
1878	\$79,323,667	\$93,081,787
1879	71,491,255	81,964,427
1880	87,911,458	88,489,747
1881	98,290,823	105,330,840
1882	102,137,203	119,419,500
1883	93,085,804	132,254,023
1884	91,406,496	116,397,043

The above statement shows that the tariff has not had the desired effect of reestablishing the balance of trade. Its most direct result was to increase in an enormous proportion the taxes which bear so heavily on the people. The following is a comparative statement of the receipts from taxes during these few last years: In 1867, \$11,700,000; when the Mackenzie Government came into power in 1874-75, \$20,664,878; in 1878-79, when Mr. Mackenzie went out of power, \$18,476,613; in 1882-83, \$29,269,698; in 1883-84, \$25,483,199. In 1874-75, with \$20,664,178 of taxation, the Mackenzie Government had a surplus. In 1878, with a taxation of \$18,476,613, they had a deficit of nearly one million, thus clearly establishing the fact that an average taxation of \$19,000,000 or \$19,500,000 was sufficient to cover the expenses of the Government of the country. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fact that in 1883 the Minister of Finance had a large surplus is not to be wondered at when it is borne in mind that the taxes levied on the people amounted to nearly \$11,000,000 more than in 1878-79. The surplus for the year

ending in June last has hardly exceeded \$700,000 in round numbers, in spite of the enormous taxes paid by the people, by reason of the large increase of public expenditure. The era of deficits will probably begin next June; and if the present system of extravagance is continued, if the Ministers continue to add millions to the public debt and to public expenditure, I think I am justifiable in predicting for next year still larger deficiencies, deficits which will probably amount to millions of dollars. Mr. Speaker, good Governments are those who economise the people's money, and who levy the least amount of taxation on the country. It matters very little whether they are called protection, National Policy or such other euphonious name, they are still a burden to the ratepayer. The present Government, which are a bad Government, have not only overtaxed the people, but they have also used their surpluses, the receipts of an unjust taxation, as an argument to justify their extravagance and their shameful waste of public money. The year which has just passed has been really disastrous for the country, not only on account of the commercial crisis and of the evil results of the tariff, but also on account of the increase of public expenditure, of the charges assumed by the Parliament of Canada, and of the enormous increase of the public debt. It may be useful to increase the debt of a country, provided there should be an equivalent received in the way of public works for the general interest of the country, provided the sacrifices imposed on the people should increase the importance of the country, its resources, its navigation, its territory. In this manner it is often possible to receive more than one has given. Therefore, it is not the amount of the debt itself which I intend to discuss to-day; it is only the manner in which the borrowed millions have been used. But the increase of the debt is a bad thing in itself, if it is not justified by reasons of necessity or of public interest. It is a pleasure for me to believe that part of the amounts which make up our public debt have been legitimately employed for the best interests of the country, and that this expenditure has been profitable to the country; but I cannot help regretting the improvident policy of the Government as regards the construction of the Pacific Railway, and whose evil results are daily becoming more apparent, until they will lead, in a few years hence, to actual disaster. I think I may remark here that a great portion of this debt should not have been contracted. I shall endeavor to prove that we have unnecessarily expended large sums for these purposes, and that the policy of the Government, as regards the construction of that railway, is an absurd policy. If the policy propounded by the Liberal party had been adopted the road might have been built without increasing the public debt to any great extent. The question of the construction of the Pacific Railway was first raised in 1871. Between 1871 and 1880 both parties repeatedly had to alter their views, their opinions and their mode of construction, before they adopted a well-defined line of policy. This is not to be wondered at; their ideas had necessarily to be modified as the North-West became better known. It is not my intention to make a review of the different policies followed since the last nine years. It was only in 1880 that both parties adopted a well-defined line of policy as regards the construction of the Pacific Railway. In 1880, when Sir Charles Tupper proposed to the House that the construction of the road should begin in British Columbia, the hon. gentleman who is now leader of the Opposition made a speech, which was echoed all through the country, and which defined the policy of the party on this important question. The hon. member for West Durham predicted on that day, with mathematical accuracy, that which is taking place to-day. His eloquent utterances did not fail to make a deep impression on the whole House. But as usual the whole thing ended by a straight party vote. The hon.

member for West Durham then made the following proposition: Not to build for the time being the British Columbia section, which was to be some 600 miles in length, through a sea of mountains, a country not very well suited for agriculture, to build the Pacific Railway through the fertile prairies of the North-West, but to build that section slowly, only as fast as emigration flowed to the North-West, and as fast as the resources of the country would allow; to build at the same time branch railways to be used as feeders to the main line. In the following year the Liberal party objected to the immediate construction of the line north of Lake Superior, because that line being 600 miles in length was to be built through a country in which there are no inhabitants, and which, in fact, is uninhabitable. They proposed at the same time to subsidise a company for the construction of the Sault Ste. Marie branch line which was to connect with the American lines on the south shore of Lake Superior. The rest is well known. The syndicate was then making proposals which Sir Charles Tupper, by his great eloquence and by a skillful exaggeration of the advantages offered by the syndicate, has made popular among his friends. Let us see what has been the result of that disastrous policy. During the first two years we have seen what can be produced by the best organised puff of any puff that has ever been organised in Canada. The railway was making giant strides in the prairies of the North-West. The construction of the railway was drawing thousands of immigrants. The great North-West has become a great field of speculation freely opened to all. Colonisation companies have been organised. Certain lands were acquiring great value as if by magic. During two years we have seen there something which had all the appearance of prosperity. But there was wanting a basis to this scaffolding; it was a policy of colonisation for the North-West, a system which would have made life more agreeable to the settlers and would have facilitated to them the buying of lands. All of that was wanting. The settlers have begun to emigrate and all the scaffolding has gone to pieces. A great number of those who came to settle in the North-West have emigrated to the United States. People who had made a little money by speculation at the outset have lost it, and some of them have become very poor. To-day we are face to face with a crisis in the North-West and we are left with the Pacific elephant on our hands, a road whose management will sooner or later be the ruin of the country, whether it is returned to us or whether we pay subsidies upon subsidies to make it go on. Those who are not totally blind are now beginning to see that that section of British Columbia which was to give us an immense trade with China and Japan, will be a road on which but very little traffic will pass. The hon. member for Cardwell, who is, undoubtedly, one of ablest men in his party, candidly admitted in this House, on the 13th of February last, that for several years to come there would necessarily be but very little traffic on the British Columbia section. As regards the section situated on the north shore of Lake Superior it was certainly very unwise to build it. It is becoming more and more evident that, during the winter season, it will be utterly impossible to work this line, owing to the dangers arising from cold weather and the total want of settlements along the line. If engineers are to be found who will run trains, very few, indeed, will be the passengers who will have the rashness to travel on them, passengers who will run the risk of being buried under snow storms with the thermometer marking 30° or 40° below zero, when there will be no possibility of receiving assistance from any body. The summer traffic might pass through it, but it will have to compete with the navigation of Lake Superior and with the lines of railway running on the south shore of that lake, which have for them the advantage of running easily in all seasons of the year. The British Columbia and Lake Superior sections have unnecessarily added millions upon

millions to our debt. The Ministers should be the first to perceive the great mistake they have made in building those two sections immediately. Another objection to the policy of the Government is the almost vertiginous rapidity with which the construction of the Pacific Railway has been carried on. I believe I am not exaggerating when I say that this rapidity must have added from 20 to 25 per cent. to the cost of construction. A higher price must be paid for men, materials, transportation, and the work must be pushed forward during seasons which are the least favorable. All these drawbacks, put together, have a great deal of influence on the price of construction. I would not recall these facts had not the people of Canada been called upon to pay for this as well as for the rest. It is a well known fact that in order to build the road rapidly the company has been obliged to take thousands of foreigners from the United States and from Europe to do this work, which for years to come might have given employment to Canadian laborers, as it would have done if the policy of the Liberal party had been adopted. By building the road slowly through the prairies of the North-West; by building branch lines, according to the proposition of the hon. leader of the Opposition, the following would have been brought about: The Government lands which are at a distance from the line would have had a far greater value than what they have to-day; we would have sold them to settlers instead of giving them away to colonisation societies. We would not have had the monopolies granted to the Pacific Company, and which have been so injurious to the colonisation of the North-West. The sale of these lands would have fully covered the cost of construction. The road which we would have built would have been a paying road—a road which would have ultimately become a great source of revenue, owing to the sale of lands in the North-West, and owing to the receipts of the railway itself. As it is constructed to-day, with the two lines of British Columbia and of Lake Superior, the road cannot be anything else but a burden, either to the Government if they take it back, or to the company, which will probably come to the same thing, if we are to judge by the intimate connections existing between them. We will have to pay subsidies every year, both for the construction and maintenance of the road. The consequences of the evil policy of the Government are, as I have said, an immense increase of the debt, an increase of two or three millions yearly on the interest of this same debt, an increase of public expenditure for running expenses in the future, the too great absorption of the capital of the country, owing to the too rapid construction which has obtained in the North-West, a crisis whose effects must have had something to do with the financial crisis which now prevails. I shall venture to make a calculation establishing the difference in the cost of construction under the two systems. In 1880 there was, under contract or actually constructed, all that part of the road between Port Arthur and Winnipeg. The construction of that part of the line which is to connect Winnipeg to Lake Superior being equally binding to both parties, I leave aside all that has been expended on this line, as well as on surveys and telegraphs lines. By the proposal of the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the construction through the prairies of a couple of hundred miles of railway each year, including the branch railways, would have cost a couple of millions of dollars yearly; adding a subsidy of two millions and a half for the Sault Ste. Marie Branch, we arrive at the conclusion that during the last five years we should have expended in all a little over a dozen of millions. The sale of lands alone would have been sufficient to pay this expenditure to the last cent; at all events this only represents at most the amount of interest on the present amount of the capital of the Pacific Railway. Besides we would have a paying road representing in value at least the amount which it would have cost us. But it may be said: You would have spent

Mr. RINFRET.

no money, but you would only have a part of the road. That is true; we would not have the British Columbia and Lake Superior sections—but it would be the greatest possible advantage not to have them; it would have saved us a heavy burden, that is all. Let us now see what we have paid in money since 1880, exclusive of land grants. The Government has expended in British Columbia for the sections from Yale to Kamloops and from Kamloops to Port Moody about \$15,000,000. Besides that, we have given \$25,000,000 to the syndicate under the contract of 1880; last year we have made them an advance of \$30,000,000, which makes \$55,000,000; if we add the \$15,000,000 expended in British Columbia, we have a total of \$70,000,000. And that is not all; everybody knows that new demands for money, which we will have to consider at a more advanced stage of the Session, are now before the Government. One thing is certain; it is, that, when the road is built we will have paid out in cash, from 1880 only, over and above the land grants, between \$85,000,000 and \$90,000,000, or \$20 per head of the population, or \$200 for every ordinary family of ten persons. This amount, high as it is, represents the exact difference between the policy of the Conservative party and that of the Liberal party, as regards the construction of the Pacific Railway. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I have shown that the policy followed by the Government in the construction of the Pacific Railway has been an absurd policy. What did we gain by it? I must say that this is just the question the people of the Province of Quebec are now asking themselves. We will now examine what has been promised when this enormous amount was asked, in order to make the people consent to vote in favor of the supporters of the Government. First of all, general prosperity for the country at large was promised as a consequence of the increase of trade generally. Besides that, there were special promises made by Sir Charles Tupper. He promised to give the railway terminus to several important cities in the country, such as Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax—in short, to every part of the country where difficulties might have arisen if it had not been for these promises. One thing is certain, and that is, that none of the cities to which the terminus was promised will have the terminus. Another fact is very certain, and that is, that the Pacific Railway Company has one great object in view—and we have repeatedly warned the hon. members opposite of that fact—they want to establish a connection with New York and Portland. All that is wanted to complete that connection is the construction of a bridge at Lachine. The moment that bridge is built, one thing is inevitable, and that is the terminus of the Pacific must be at Portland, because the distance between Montreal and Portland is about 300 miles, while the distance between Montreal and Halifax is 750 miles, either by way of Sherbrooke or by way of Quebec. It seems to me very evident that if the Lachine bridge is built the terminus of the Pacific Railway cannot be elsewhere than at Portland. Therefore, I say it is the duty of the Government—if they wish to fulfil the promises they have made to the Province and district of Quebec—to prevent the construction of the Lachine bridge; otherwise, they would have to admit that all their promises were delusive and that the electors of that part of the country will receive nothing to compensate them for the enormous sacrifices which they have made for the construction of the Pacific Railway. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House much longer, as the hour is late, but I do not think I can close my remarks without saying a few words on public expenditure. In 1878, when the Liberal party went out of power, the public expenditure amounted to \$23,503,000. In 1884 it was \$31,107,000, or an increase of \$7,500,000. In the first estimates of 1885-86 we find a demand for \$31,757,000. No doubt by the time the other estimates are introduced the expenditure will amount to \$33,000,000. It is easy to understand that there should be an increase of the public

expenditure to a certain extent, owing to the increase of the population and to the additional amount to be paid for interest on the public debt. There are many reasons why public expenditure should increase, but I think it has been proved to the satisfaction of the House that there was a possibility to increase the expenditure much less rapidly, and that it is impossible to justify the extravagance of the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury benches. I will give a statement of the ordinary expenses under the control of the administration for the period which has elapsed between 1878 and 1884:

	1878	1883-84.
Civil service	\$8,369 86	\$1,084,477 79
Administration of Justice	564,930 11	615,044 90
Police	10,616 44	20,124 49
Penitentiaries	308,101 69	296,996 32
Legislation	618,035 38	662,767 23
Geological Surveys	96,049 74	115,929 93
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics	92,325 62	38,187 55
Census	1,053 66	29,579 88
Immigration and Quarantine	180,691 44	575,326 72
Marine Hospitals	57,484 60	51,312 62
Pensions	105,842 05	95,542 70
Superannuation	106,588 91	192,692 72
Militia and Defence	618,136 58	989,493 22
Subsidies for Mail Carrying		238,054 01
Public Works	998,594 70	2,903,851 65
Railways and Canals		204,690 12
Oceanic Service	402,371 90	231,519 23
Lighthouses	461,967 71	520,524 38
Fisheries	93,262 28	286,700 14
Inspection of Steamboats	14,315 82	21,893 28
Insurances	8,577 48	9,854 56
Miscellaneous Expenses	81,167 81	336,370 00
Indian grants	421,503 66	1,116,158 87
Dominion Lands	87,628 52	166,898 69
Dominion Forces	11,210 12
North-West Mounted Police	337,749 50	485,983 66
Survey of the United States Boundary line	43,905 69
	\$6,542,510 27	\$11,294,314 63

I do not wish to take up the time of the House by commenting on each of the comparative items which I have just given. If I did so I would only be repeating what has already been said by the hon. gentlemen who spoke before me. I shall only insist on some of them. I have already had occasion, during last Session, in answer to the hon. Minister of Public Works, to call the attention of the House to the expenditure of the Emigration Department. Over half a million was spent last year for immigration. I think that the House will agree with me that we do not receive the value of our money. I will go further; a large part of the amounts expended under that head is used in direct opposition to the best interests of the country. It has been proved that the enormous expenditure made to draw into this country immigrants belonging to the laboring class has been made in a worse than useless manner; the result has been detrimental, because people have been brought here to compete with the laborers of the country, and the consequence has been the increase of the flow of Canadian emigration to the United States. It seems also that there has been real abuses in that Department. Public moneys have been distributed right and left, without economy, for appointments to offices more or less unnecessary; for printing and advertisements of all kinds. In this respect we find a large increase on previous years. The printing accounts are numerous and generally pretty high. There are numbers of officers, paid agents, travelling expenses, accounts of all sorts. All these items, taken as a whole, cannot but convey to the public and to hon. members the most unfavorable impression on the administration of that Department. What has been the result, as far as the settlement of the North-West is concerned? Nobody knows. The Government did not even take the trouble to find out what has been the result obtained by that immense sacrifice of public money. How many immigrants settled in the North-West? How many came here and went right through to the United States? How many Canadians emigrated to the United States? Is the

number of those who left larger than the number of those who came? Nobody knows. One thing is certain, and that is, that the system is defective and ought to be changed. What is perfectly known is, that the policy of monopoly and of favoritism adopted by the Government, the bad system of sales of lands, the bad system adopted as regards settlement, has succeeded in discouraging the settlers, in deterring them from going to the North-West, in spite of the enormous sums expended yearly to bring them here. Let us adopt a good policy of colonisation; let the Government give justice to the settlers, and they will come of their own accord without any expenses for immigration. Last Session I felt it my duty to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the repatriation of our fellow-countrymen who emigrated to the United States. I reminded him of the speech he made at Montreal, and to which the hon. member for West Durham alluded in the motion he made this afternoon, asking that the papers concerning the repatriation of our fellow-countrymen be brought down. Are we still to hope that the hon. Minister of Public Works will make it his duty to carry out his promise and that he will, during the present Session, introduce a measure to aid repatriation. The question of the repatriation of Canadians was mooted not only in the speech made by the hon. Minister eighteen months ago, but it was one of the planks of the platform of 1878. Therefore Mr. Speaker, I hope the hon. Minister of Public Works will soon fulfil his promises on that point. I will venture to make a few remarks as regards the militia expenditure. In 1878 that expenditure amounted to \$618,000; it amounted to \$989,498 in 1884. In the Estimates of this year there is a demand for \$1,135,000. From a military point of view, Canada occupies a very peculiar position. Our possessions are immense and our population is really small. The boundary line which separates us from the United States is hundreds of leagues in length. In case of war with our neighbors a powerful army and a large amount of money would be needed. Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, if it is within the range of possible events that we may have war some day or other, it may be said that it is highly improbable. There is at the bottom of almost every war a general reason, which is often hidden under pretences; it is the desire of acquiring and the hope of extending the limits of States which have become too small for the population by which they are inhabited. One fact which is perfectly established is, that the general causes for war, which exist in Europe and in other countries, do not exist here in Canada. Indeed, I think we have absolutely nothing to fear from our American neighbors, who are noted as being the reverse of a war-like people, so much so, that they have been spoken of as a model people by philosophers and humanitarians of Europe, who consider them as a peaceful people, as people who only care for the material progress of their country, without thinking for a moment to invade the neighboring countries. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if we bear in mind the fact that we have very little to fear from our neighbors or from other nations, it seems evident to me that the maintenance of an army would be quite useless to the country and that all we want is a few troops, in view of the internal difficulties which might arise, and in order to maintain authority within the limits of the country itself. To attain this object the forces at our disposal are far too numerous and involve unnecessary expenditures. We have now a force of 36,000, at least on paper. Our active militia does not probably exceed 18,000 or 20,000 men; it is not numerous enough to resist an attack from outside, but it is by far too numerous for the maintenance of peace and authority in Canada. There is another consideration to which I desire to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia, and that is, if we see fit to have soldiers we must also have arms. It is a well known fact that Canadian soldiers have not the kind of arms that they should have. For instance, our

volunteers are still armed with the old Enfield rifle and the soldiers of "A" and "B" batteries with Snider rifles. Therefore, if we were to send our soldiers to battle with these arms to oppose modern arms, we would be sending them to certain death. I might add, that we should have less soldiers and have the necessary arms. To-day, war is not only a question of bravery, it is also a question of arms and strategy. I will now say a few words about the military college at Kingston, another plank of the Conservative party in 1878. There was a great deal of noise made then about this college. Still, that institution is alive yet, and besides we are expending to-day for its maintenance double the amount which was expended in 1878. Here are two planks of the platform of 1878, of which I took the liberty of reminding the House—the repatriation of our fellow countrymen and the abolition of the Kingston military college. In the Province of Quebec, during the elections of 1878, these are the two questions on which we have been the most fiercely attacked; the abolition of the Supreme Court was also spoken of. The hon. Minister of Public Works made it one of his strongest arguments in the county of Rimouski. He was to abolish the Supreme Court as soon as he would come to power. Well, instead of abolishing it, we have been greatly surprised when we saw him the other day voting against the Bill of the hon. member for Montmagny (Mr. Landry), which only asked to limit the jurisdiction of that court. Another plank in their platform was the reduction of public expenditures. It is unnecessary for me to repeat that the hon. Minister of Finance had promised to govern the country with an expenditure of \$22,500,000. To-day the expenditure amounts to \$32,000,000, and, no doubt, next year it will reach \$33,000,000. There was also a great deal said during the elections of 1878 about the increase of the public debt. The fact that the debt had been increased to the amount of \$32,000,000 was considered as an enormous crime on the part of the Mackenzie Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe that on the 1st of July next the liabilities of the country will be increased to the amount of nearly \$100,000,000, and for the last eighteen months, from 1st January, 1884, to 1st July, 1885, the Government have contracted engagements which will amount to not less than \$65,000,000 or \$70,000,000. Another complaint made against us in 1878 was the increase in the number of public employees. The Liberal party was charged with overcrowding the public offices. However, the Civil Service expenditure only amounted then to \$823,000; in June last it amounted to \$1,084,417, and in this year's estimates there is a demand for no less an amount than \$1,200,000. Thus it will be seen, Mr. Speaker, that far from reducing the expenditure of the Civil Service, it has been increased by 30 to 35 per cent. Another plank of the Conservative platform was the re-adjustment of the tariff without increasing taxation. I have proved a while ago that the taxes have been increased, on an average, by \$6,000,000 to \$8,000,000 yearly. There are other articles of the programme on which I would have desired to say a word, but I shall leave them aside in order not to take an unfair advantage of the attention of hon. members. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is far better not to have any programme at all than to have one of that kind, and not follow it at all. The electors must see to-day that their votes have been extorted through false promises and under false pretences. The programme of the party in power is to expend the greatest possible amount, and to waste the public money. It is extravagance erected into a political system. It is to favor the wealthy and influential classes which may be useful in election time, to the detriment of the farming and laboring classes. Add to that the fomentation of prejudices of all kinds and you will have the whole programme complete. We are charged with having no programme. It is a very vague charge, and it is, above all, a very false accusation. Is it possible, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. RINFRET.

for anyone to set forth their opinions or views with more frankness than the hon. leader of the Opposition has done on every question that has been discussed in this House? What we ask is this: The equitable apportionment of taxes, without any privilege to manufacturers. No privileges for the wealthy and influential classes at the expense of the farmers and laborers of Canada. The abolition of monopolies and favoritism of all kinds. The abolition of the duties on light, fuel and bread. A good policy of colonisation for the North-West. Economy in the administration of public affairs. In this respect we have shown what we could do when Mr. Mackenzie was in power. We desire that in the Dominion all Canadians, whatever their nationality, whatever their creed, may work together to insure the greatness and prosperity of Canada. To attain this end we must respect every creed while claiming our religious and national rights. It is for that reason that we have resisted the encroachments of the secret societies, whatever may be their nationalities. It is for that reason we have resisted, especially, the encroachments of the Orange lodges in the Dominion of Canada. We believe, Mr. Speaker, that our religious and national rights are intimately bound with the rights and privileges of the Provinces in their relation with the Dominion Parliament. It is for that reason that the Liberal party have made themselves the champions of the Provinces with regard to the granting of licenses, and in all cases when the Dominion Government interfered with our provincial affairs. What we ask is to do away with all barriers which stand in the way of our trade; we ask for reciprocity with the United States, and, if possible, commercial treaties with all the nations of the world. What is wanted, Mr. Speaker, is a market for our agricultural produce and the immense products of our mines and forest, if we wish to make Canada a wealthy and prosperous country.

Mr. TASSÉ moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

RETURNS ORDERED.

Copies of all memorials, communications, representations and statements made or presented to the Government respecting the duties on wheat and flour.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Statement showing the number of seizures made at each port of entry in Nova Scotia, during the last fiscal year; also during the six months ending the 31st December last; and the names of the parties from whom such seizures were made, the amount of fines exacted at each port during each of the said periods, and the manner in which the said fines were disposed of, giving the names of the officers receiving any portion thereof, and the amount received by each of such officers out of the said fund.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Return showing:—1st. Copy of form of tender for Indian supplies in the North-West, for the year 1884. 2nd. Copies of all tenders received by the Government for such supplies in 1884. 3rd. The action or decision of the Government on such tenders and the reasons therefor. 4th. Copies of all contracts made by the Government with parties whose tenders have been accepted. 5th. All correspondence with the Government respecting all tenders and contracts.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

Copies of petitions or correspondence in reference to making Ridgetown a port of entry.—(Mr. Casey.)

Copy of all offers made to the Government for the construction of a railway connecting the Ontario railway system at or near to Gravenhurst with the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return of all contracts made by the Government for the erection of wire fences on the line of the Intercolonial Railway, and the names of the contractors and the number of miles put under contract.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Return of the wharfage collected at the Digby pier from the 1st January, 1884, to the 31st of December, 1884. Also, a return of the wharfage collected at the Metaghau River pier, in the county of Digby, for the same period.—(Mr. Vail.)

Copies of the report of Mr. Clovis Caron, fishery overseer, and all details therewith connected, for the year 1884; also copies of the report of Mr. Jules Gauvreau, fishery overseer, and all details relating thereto, for the year 1884; also copies of the report of the enquiry made by J. U. Gregory, against Mr. Clovis Caron, fishery overseer, and of all documents relating thereto; also copies of all documents, plans and reports furnished to the Department of Marine and Fisheries by J. U. Gregory, in relation to the porpoise fishery of St. Anne de la Pocatière.—(Mr. Blondeau.)

Copies of all Orders in Council, agreements and correspondence in the possession of the Government, since 1872, respecting the Windsor Branch Railway; also copies of pleadings and verdicts in the various suits at law respecting the same branch.—(Mr. Kinney.)

Copies of all memorials, letters and other representations, in writing, received by the Government on the subject of the non-payment by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company of amounts due to contractors, subcontractors, or laborers, engaged in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.—(Mr. Charlton.)

Copies of all judgments rendered by the Supreme Court, from the period when it was first established up to this date, reversing decisions of the Court of Queen's Bench of the Province of Quebec, with a succinct summary of the reasons given by the judges.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)

All correspondence with reference to the making of a road on the Indian reserve at Fort William, Ontario; and the expenditure thereon of funds belonging to the Indians, and particularly with reference to the payments to be made to the licensees, for stumpage or otherwise, for the timber required in the construction of the bridges on the road.—(Mr. Blake.)

All correspondence which has taken place between the Dominion Government and Local Government of New Brunswick, with reference to the Northern and Western Railway, since May, 1884, up to February, 1885.—(Mr. Temple.)

Return showing all properties or rooms leased by the various branches of the public service from private parties or companies in the city of Ottawa, stating the amount of rental paid in each case; also, the purposes for which such properties or rooms are used.—(Mr. Somerville, Bran.)

Return showing:—1. Total number of depositors in the savings banks (post office or other) holding deposits of \$1,000 or upwards; also the total amount so held; 2. Total number of depositors having deposits of less than \$1,000 and more than \$500 each; also the total amount so held; 3. Total number of said depositors holding less than \$500 each; also total amount so held.—(Sir Richard Cartwright.)

Copies of all correspondence with the Government of British Columbia in relation to the eastern boundary of that Province; also, correspondence with the Imperial Government on the same subject, if there be any.—(Mr. Mills.)

Statement showing the names and addresses of all shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, with the amount of stock held by each, as of the date of 16th February, 1885.—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all correspondence between D. M. Fraser and the Department of Agriculture, in reference to the sale of 6,000 pamphlets of "A Trip to the Dominion of Canada," by Hugh Fraser; all vouchers for the payment of the sum of \$600 to D. M. Fraser, and copies of receipts showing to whom said pamphlets were delivered by D. M. Fraser, and all information in the Department showing where said pamphlets were distributed.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Copy of all correspondence between the Government of Quebec and the Government of Canada, concerning the application of the sum of \$960,000, reserved by the statute 47 Victoria, chapter 8, for the extension of the Canadian Pacific Railway from its terminus at St. Martin's Junction to the harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. Laurier.)

Copies of all correspondence between the Government of Prince Edward Island and the Government of the Dominion, since the last Session of Parliament, relating to the claim made by the former Government for moneys expended by them in the construction and maintenance of piers and wharves from 1st July, 1873, to January, 1883; also of all reports made to the Minister of Public Works or any of his officials, since last Session, upon such claims, together with all Orders in Council made thereon.—(Mr. Davies.)

Return of the amount of duty collected on wheat flour, cornmeal and corn, in the several ports of the Province of Nova Scotia, between the 30th June, 1884, and the 31st December, 1884.—(Mr. Vail.)

Return of all animal charcoal imported into the Dominion, whether as fertilisers or for manufacturing purposes, the value of each kind, and the duties collected thereon at the respective ports of the Dominion, for the last fiscal year, ending 30th June, 1884.—(Mr. Stairs.)

Copies of all correspondence, reports, Orders in Council and papers relating to the scheme for immigration mentioned by the Minister of Public Works in a public speech at Montreal, in November, 1883, in which he is reported to have used the following language:—

"And, gentlemen, this demonstration is also an approbation of the great measures which have been adopted by the Administration of which I am a member. First, there was the Confederation Act, and since we returned to power we have adopted the National Policy, and the great Pacific Railway measure, and finally we have adopted another measure, scarcely less important, in respect to the encouragement of immigration into this country."

"But, gentlemen, our mission would be but half accomplished if we forgot that we have on the other side of latitude 45 a great number of our fellow-countrymen who would like nothing better than to return home and sit down to the family table and eat with us, and to earn their living under the institutions now existing in Canada. (Loud cheers.) I need not say, gentlemen, that it is with the greatest satisfaction and pleasure that I am able to announce to you this evening that the Government of Canada intend to take measures, and energetic measures,

to recall into the limits of our own territory all our fellow-countrymen in the United States who desire to return and live with us. You will understand, gentlemen, that in a banquet like this I must be excused if I do not give all details of the Ministerial measure that we propose to bring down next Session. But in any case, it is well you should know that our compatriots in the United States, whether they be of French origin or of any other origin, they are not forgotten, and all that can be done to bring them back to this country we shall do most heartily."—(Mr. Blake.)

Copies of all notices asking for tenders for supplying the fog-whistles and lighthouses in the Bay of Fundy and on the south shore of Nova Scotia with coal; copies of tenders submitted, names of party or parties whose tenders were accepted; copies of all vouchers, bills of lading and receipts, upon which moneys were paid, and all other information in the Department in reference to this service.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Copy of report of the Superintendent of Burlington Bay Canal, of the soundings taken during the summer of 1884, the plottings and cross-sections made, showing the present conformation of the bottom of the said canal, together with a statement showing the depths on both sides, as well as all plans giving information in reference to said soundings.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

Return from all official assignees in the district of Montreal under the Bankrupt Act of 1869, and subsequent Acts in amendment thereof, for a list of all estates of which they were assignees. The estimated value of the several estates when taken possession of by the assignees. The amount realised from each estate. A list of creditors of each estate severally, and the amount of dividends severally paid to each of the said creditors. The several amounts in detail retained by the said assignees in each estate for their charges for management thereof. The amounts severally held by the several assignees which they have neglected or declined to pay over to such creditors as are entitled thereto, on each and every estate. Also, a copy, severally, from each and every assignee on each estate, of the certificate of his discharge from the court, as laid down by said Act and the amendments thereof.—(Mr. Mitchell.)

Detailed list of all the unsold Indian lands in the township of Trafalgar, in the county of Halton.—(Mr. McCraney.)

Statement showing:—1st. The names of all persons who tendered for the construction of the drill shed at Quebec; 2nd. The amount asked by each person so tendering; 3rd. The amount of the cheque deposited by each such person in support of his tender, with the names of the signers and endorsers of each cheque, and the names of the several banks by which such cheques were accepted.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)

Copies of all reports, Orders in Council and correspondence not already ordered, on the subject of the effect of the decision of the Supreme Court as to the License Act of 1883, and of the steps to be taken to review the same, and of the steps to be taken under the Act meanwhile, with copies of all letters or telegrams to the commissioners or inspectors, giving them instructions as to their conduct or action or information as to the intentions or action of the Government.—(Mr. Blake.)

Return showing the number of the members of the active militia authorized to perform the annual drill for the year 1884-85. The number who did perform such drill, the amount of money placed in the Estimates and voted for such purpose, and the amount actually paid out for such annual drill, as performed in the year 1884-85.—(Mr. Mulock.)

Return of all hardware purchased at Halifax by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from 1st July, 1878, to 31st December, 1884; the names of the firms who furnished the supplies; amount supplied by each firm in each year; the names of firms who supplied stoves, galvanized iron and tinware in each year, from 1st October, 1878, to 31st December 1884; showing, if by tender, whose tender was accepted, and if tenders were asked for each year.—(Mr. Forbes.)

Copies of all reports, correspondence, petitions, etc., in reference to the seizure of the schooner *Lion*, of the port of Barrington, in Nova Scotia, in December, 1883.—(Mr. Robertson, Shelburne.)

Return of all leases or licenses issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to fish on non-tidal waters in the Province of New Brunswick, the names of the lessees or licensees, and the respective territories and streams leased or licensed, and the respective amounts of rent paid by each lessee or licensee annually.—(Mr. Weldon.)

Return of the quantity of coal carried from the Spring Hill coal mines by the Intercolonial Railway, from the 1st of January, 1884, to 31st of December, 1884, showing the distance carried, the several places delivered, and the rate per ton or per car for the carriage thereof from the mines to the several points of delivery.—(Mr. McMullen.)

Return showing the number of petitions presented during the present Session, severally praying that no change be made in the Temperance Act of 1878, and for the passing of a prohibitory liquor law; indicating also in the same return the Provinces from which the petitions come and the aggregate number of signatures attached thereto.—(Mr. Foster.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:30 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 13th February, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the Western Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCallum.)

ENQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. KIRK. Before the Orders of the Day are called I would again call the attention of the Secretary of State to the fact that a report brought down a few days ago, ordered by this House, is in an incomplete condition. The Secretary of State stated that all the return that was in the office of Inland Revenue was brought down, and that he could not bring down anything which was not there. Now, I am very anxious to have the return, and I know of no other means of obtaining it than through the Government. The officer appointed by the Local Government to look after this matter is required to make a return to the collector of Inland Revenue, whose duty it is, of course, to make a return to the Department. Unless this return is made to the House through the Department I do not know how we are to obtain it at all, and I am desirous that the Secretary of State, the Government, or any member of the Government whose duty it is to perform this business, will see that the return is obtained from the Inland Revenue officer in Nova Scotia and laid on the Table of the House. I wish further to correct the hon. gentleman, when he said, the other night, that I had accused him of knowingly placing an incomplete return on the Table. I accused him of nothing of the kind; I used no such words.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said the other night that the House was given to understand that the report I put before the House was not a complete report. I said I had been accused—and I added, jokingly, that the accused had the right to give evidence in his own favor—by the statement that the report was not complete, and I said that it was complete, that the Secretary of State had given the whole report as made by the officers in Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman has read the law which says, that druggists selling liquor should send a report every six months, or every year, of the quantities sold, and for what purposes. That is true. I have not, however, found in the law by what process those persons can be forced to make a report. I only stated that the report was not in the Inland Revenue Department, that I had received all that was there, and that there ended my duties.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. McLELAN. Before the debate be resumed, I desire to make an explanation to the House in connection with the remarks I made yesterday. It will be remembered that a statement I made was flatly contradicted by the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), and as positively contradicted by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie); and when the hon. gentleman for East York, at a subsequent period of my remarks, rose with the report of the Railway Department for 1878 in his hand, and from that report stated to the House that I was entirely in error and was making a misstatement, I felt that the House expected me immediately to apologise for having attempted to deceive the House and the country. If you will allow

Mr. KIRK.

me, I will just read the report of yesterday's remarks in order to give the House a better idea of what took place. I asked:

"What facilities did they provide for going into the country?"

"Mr. LANDERKIN. Railroads.

"Mr. McLELAN. Railroads where?"

"Mr. LANDERKIN. From Emerson to Winnipeg.

"Mr. McLELAN. You had not a single mile.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. We had 50 miles.

"Mr. McLELAN. There was not a single rail laid.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. It was all laid.

"Mr. McLELAN. It was graded for three or four years, and you had piles of rails rusting in the North-West, but not a single rail laid."

Subsequently the hon. member for East York, rose with a volume of the Sessional Papers in his hand, containing the railway report to the 30th of June, 1878, when the following took place:—

"Mr. MACKENZIE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to correct his statement?"

"Mr. McLELAN. Well, he can do so after I get through, as I want to finish before recess.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. I have merely to say that every rail was laid before 1st July, 1878, and the road was finished to Selkirk, 22 miles beyond Winnipeg.

"Mr. McLELAN. That is from Selkirk to Winnipeg.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. That was completed, and from the boundary to Winnipeg every rail was laid. Here is the report.

"Mr. McLELAN. I went specially to the Railway Department to enquire and was informed that every rail was laid from Selkirk to Winnipeg, but between Winnipeg and Emerson not a rail was laid.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. That shows how well informed the present railway management must be.

"Mr. McLELAN. If I am wrongly informed, the fault is with the Department and there is an oversight on their part.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. The Minister ought to know.

"Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman will not claim that the railway was opened?"

"Mr. MACKENZIE. I will.

"Mr. McLELAN. And running?"

"Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes.

"Mr. McLELAN. Why, it was not opened and running until the winter, if my memory serves me at all. However, it is better that we should not enter into a discussion now, before we have the papers from the Railway Department.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. This [holding up his book] is from the Railway Department.

"Mr. McLELAN. It is not of very serious importance. The hon. gentleman had not opened it for traffic, he had not commenced the running of trains—I am satisfied on that at least—and there was no communication or traffic when the Government went out of power.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. You said there was not a railway.

"Mr. McLELAN. That is what I was informed. There was no traffic at all events.

"Mr. MACKENZIE. Yes, there was traffic."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I went to the Railway Department this morning and procured the original estimates, which I have here. By them I find that on the 30th September, 1878, the return for track-laying is a blank—that there was not a rail laid on that date; I have the returns to the 31st October, 1878, after the present Government took power, and they show that there were 24 miles laid on the line between Emerson and Winnipeg; I have the original estimates for November, 1878, showing that the amount of work done to the 30th November, 1878, ran up to 58 $\frac{3}{4}$ miles; and I have the original estimates for the month of December, showing that the whole line was completed by the 31st December, 1878. Now, the House may, perhaps, enquire how it was possible that the hon. member for East York could have been so mistaken, and could have so positively contradicted me, and could have shown to the House this book containing the report, in order to put me in the position of having attempted to deceive this House and the country by such a statement. The explanation is plain. This report of the progress of the railway up to the 30th

June, 1878, was written on the 31st of December, 1878, and at that date it says :

"On the Pembina branch, between Selkirk and St. Boniface, 22 miles have been completed, including track-laying and ballasting, and from St. Boniface to Emerson (62 miles) the grading has been completed and the track laid."

But in brackets here, which escaped the eyes of the hon. member for East York, are the words, "31st December, 1878." The hon. gentleman overlooked these words, and therefore he was in the position of contradicting me and conveying to the House the impression that I had made a false statement. I endeavor to be as careful as possible in the statements of fact I make to the House and the country, and it would be a matter of great regret to me if I should even give the appearance of having made a misstatement, and it would cause me great pain if an hon. member should convict me out of the books of making a deliberate falsehood to the House and the country. I lay these papers and the report on the Table, and any hon. gentleman interested in the matter can see how the error, to say the least of it, arose yesterday.

Mr. MACKENZIE. I have merely to say that I accepted the report as correct, and my impression still is that the rails were laid at the beginning of 1878, not in the fall of 1878.

Mr. McLELAN. I will place the papers on the Table of the House.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, the papers the hon. gentleman has read do not prove anything at all. There was a contract entered into in the fall signed by myself, I think some time in September, for finishing the road, that is, ballasting it and rebuilding bridges, and various matters of that sort ; but I still maintain that the rails had been laid long before that.

Mr. LISTER. I just wish to say, in answer to the hon. Minister of Marine, that I went to Winnipeg in July, 1878, and the road was then open—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LISTER—and then running ; no "oh" about it.

Mr. FOSTER. After the many able speeches we have had in the present discussion upon the finances and the condition of the country, and especially after the elaborate statistical statements which have been made by the Finance Minister and the hon. gentleman for Cardwell (Mr. White) upon this side of the House, and the statistical statements that have been made by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) and the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) on the other side, I do not intend to go at any length into further statistical statements in reference to this matter. As we listen to the statements which are made and which are backed by figures brought from different standpoints, on different sides of the House, it may very well be that we find our minds a little unsettled, especially if we have not an accurate knowledge of the real state of the case and of the condition of the country in its broad and general aspects. However, there is one tribunal to which we may appeal, and that is the common sense, the common experience, not only of members of this House, but as well of the intelligent business men and thinking men of the country at large ; and very often when statistical statements and arguments seem to lead to different conclusions or cause confusion in the mind, one may come to a proper conclusion simply by referring the matter to the tribunal of common sense and common experience. In this House we have some 200 members or more who come from different constituencies of Canada, every one of us having more or less intimate knowledge of the condition of his constituents, and I think we can very well, in this

matter, bring our experience and knowledge together, and come to a pretty fair conclusion with reference to the broad aspects of the condition of the country and the state of the people who live in it, and it is to that tribunal that I propose to address my remarks more especially to-day. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, although enemies of monopoly, seem disposed to get up a little corner for themselves and have a monopoly of their own in respect to two or three different things. If we look over the statements of their press outside, and take the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite inside, we will find that the three articles in which they are disposed to form a monopoly and have a corner, are: firstly, independence; in the second place, integrity; and in the third place, truth-telling. If you go through their press, and watch its different phases from year's end to year's end, if you listen to the statements of the hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, you will find nothing more common nor more prominent than the idea that, on their side and belonging to their party is all the independence, all the integrity, all the truth-telling that is worth anything in this Dominion. Why, it crops out so far, that once the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) brought himself under the rules of this House when he stated that hon. gentlemen on this side were here merely to register the wishes of the Government. The hon. gentleman plumes himself upon his independence, and talks to us of our lack of that quality. I remember a circumstance which took place not a thousand years ago nor a thousand miles from this House when that same hon. gentleman, upon a certain occasion, made his exit from this House in double quick time, and gave a vote neither for nor against a certain railway resolution which was introduced and ably spoken to by his leader. If he has so much of that article he talks so much about, why was he not independent enough to face the music and give his vote one way or the other? Last night I noticed another specimen of that same independence. The hon. gentleman in the beginning of his remarks came full tilt against that most monstrous tax on coal and flour, and was just launching out into a wholesale denunciation of it when a thought struck his mind, and, contenting himself with mentioning the total sum of the tax, he referred no more to the matter. Was it possible that when he struck the item of flour, he began to think of some flour mills in the Province of Ontario? Was it possible that the idea came into his mind just then that a great number of influential millers were here in Ottawa, the seat of Government, having something to say in reference to that same duty, and he let that subject drop as if it were a hot bullet from his hand. Now before hon. gentlemen talk so much about a lack of independence in others, they should show more independence in themselves. I am told the hon. gentleman is philosophically inclined. If so, I think I can give him something upon which to exert a little of his philosophy. Let him go down to Bothwell in the early summer months after the Session, let him visit one of his supporters there, let him visit a farmer, and in the morning let him go to the farmer's barnyard and there he will probably see something like this. He may see a fine looking motherly old hen with eight, ten or twelve chickens, nicely grown up ; he may see that old hen, proud in her consciousness of motherhood and in the strength and progress of her flock, walking along as peacefully and as self-possessed as possible, for she has a strong brood and knows it, without making any noise or clucking. He may see another hen who, after having sat a fortnight or thereabouts, brought out two or three little scraggy chickens, and he will find that hen strutting about and clucking far more than the other. And of all the hens there, he will find that the one that clucks most fiercely and bristles up most defiantly, is the one that the farmer had that morning thrown off from a nest of addled eggs, and the one which

has no chickens at all. The hon. gentleman can bring that comparison as near to his own case as he chooses. His boasted independence may be compared to the addled eggs; a wholesome regard for the rules of the House prevents me carrying the parallel any further. They claim also the monopoly of integrity, and the mild mannered member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) went so far, in the opening of the Session, as to declare that the Government were the tools of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The evident deduction being that the supporters of the Government are the tools of the tools of the Canadian Pacific Railway. And, on a later occasion, the leader of the Opposition had not the very good taste, in replying to an argument from my hon. friend from Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Ives), to say that that hon. gentleman gave his vote servilely—in a selfish way—because he was looking after a vacant portfolio, or one that would soon be vacant. And the member for Norfolk, in the ending of his speech, turned to this side of the House and characterized us as ignorant and reckless and indifferent supporters of a Government. Sir, I think we had better keep to argument and leave insinuation. It is a pretty good test that a man has run out of rocks when he commences to throw mud, and, if argument cannot be found, insinuation will not do the work. But it is when they come to that third article of the cherished monopoly, truth-telling, that we find these gentlemen on their strongest point. They are truth-tellers; they cannot do anything else than tell the truth; a woe is upon them if they do not stand up in this House and tell the truth; so they make it a point to state that they must tell the truth, and that, damage whom it will, the truth shall be told by them. There are some cases in which it may be contended that it is not necessary to tell the truth. There are a great many things that occur in the family circle, but we do not think they will be mended or helped much by one member of the family getting up on the street and publishing them to every passer-by. There may be many things which occur in a business concern, but it will not help that business much to have one prominent member publish them to the world; and I say, with the assent, I believe, of every member of this House, that, by persons who occupy a high and representative position in the Legislature of the country the greatest care should be taken, when statements are made with reference to the condition of the country that these statements are the truth, that they are the whole truth, and that there is not so much left out that what is stated will convey a false and erroneous impression to the world at large. The first speaker after the Finance Minister commenced with an apology. He reiterated the strong desire and the strong necessity that was upon him to speak the truth. He says he wishes he could have been relieved from the necessity of telling the truth, but he feels it must be done and the facts with reference to the country brought out. I desire to bring, out of many that might be brought, some few of those facts that were alleged by the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright)—the facts which he stated he did not want to publish, but which duty compelled him to publish, in order to see how much they are worth. The first of these facts that he published was this, that the outlying Provinces of this Dominion are clamoring for annexation. Now, that comes from a representative man standing in this Parliament, speaking where those words can go to all parts of the country and to all parts of the world that are interested in Canada, and he states here in his representative position that the Provinces of this Dominion are clamoring for annexation. I leave it to the good sense and common experience of the members of this House if there is one word of truth in that statement, and I want to call the attention of the House to the mischief that such a statement is apt to create. Do we not know that a great many people inside and outside of this country looked upon the Confederation of these Provinces as an experiment?

Mr. FOSTER.

They said: There are Provinces different and distinct from each other in many respects; they lie along side a great republic with a population of forty or fifty millions; is it possible that they will stand by themselves, is it possible that they will keep their independence, or is it not a great probability that they will go over to that greater republic to the south of them and cast in their fortunes with it? And, while that is the thought in the minds of a great many people in this country and more out of it, a man in a representative position stands up here and publishes to the whole world what he says is a fact, that the Provinces of this Dominion are clamoring for annexation. I say there is mischief in a statement like that, and the mischief is just proportioned to the standing and position of the person who gives it publication. I defy any gentleman in this House to prove that. Clamoring for annexation? Can any gentleman point out a single public man who has appeared upon the hustings of this country and has advocated annexation to the United States of America? Can you point out any Legislature in which any resolution has been passed asking for annexation? Can you find any prominent paper on either side of politics which makes annexation its watchword and advocates it in its columns? I say you cannot; and, in these years past that I have had experience of, I know of no single public meeting from Cape Breton to British Columbia that has ever been called anywhere, the object of which was to urge the annexation of these Provinces to the United States of America. The second statement this hon. gentleman made which I will take up is this, that there is less real union among the people of Canada than there was twelve years ago. Let us look at the mischief that may be caused by a statement of that kind coming from the source it does. Do we not know, as I said before, that the Dominion of Canada was looked upon by a great many as an experiment, because they said the Provinces are different, they have different interests, they have different races, they have different religions, is it possible that Confederation can ever be successful, that these diverse elements can ever be amalgamated and that out of them can be built a great, a united, and a prosperous people, or will it not come to pass in the wear and tear of their political organization, with their diversified interests, that the rope of sand will give way and they will become dismembered? And here we have a gentleman who occupied a prominent position in the councils of the nation, and who occupies a foremost place in the ranks of a great party, who stands here in his representative capacity and publishes to the world that there is less real union in this Dominion now than there was twelve years ago. I appeal to the common sense and experience of the men who are here to know if that is true or not. Less real union? Why, how can it be possible that there is less real union? Have we not bound the different Provinces together by a line of railway stretching from Halifax and St. John into the very heart of our country, and is it not as true as truth can be, that along with the union of commercial interests there goes the union of social and political interests? Have we not bound or nearly bound the Provinces in the central and eastern portion of our Dominion with the Pacific coast by a great line of railway which, when completed, as we hope it will be in a few months' time, will give commercial and social and political intercourse to every Province of this Dominion, one with the other? Is it possible that gentlemen meet here to transact the business of the country, that they meet in commercial lines, that they meet in legal lines, that they meet in political and social lines, and have been doing it for twelve years, and yet that to-day there is less real union in the country than there was twelve years ago? The statement I do not believe to be a true statement, and the mischief, as I said before, is just in proportion to the standing and position of the man who publishes the statement,

Again, he states that our population remains stationary. That has been dealt with by gentlemen who have preceded me, and it has been dealt with well. I hold that these statistics that have been given have not been impugned, and no gentleman has proved to the satisfaction of this House or of the country that the population of the greater Provinces of the Dominion is stationary, while all precedent, and all calculation, and all experience that we have, goes to show that it is not stationary, but that, taking all in all, new with old, it is progressing, and progressing satisfactorily. Again, he states that we have handed over the most valuable part of the continent to a monopoly—and mark the words—the like of which was never created and never existed in any country under the sun. Sir, that marks the extravagance of a statement which is a characteristic of the speeches of the member for South Huron. No country under the sun; ever; that goes from the earliest dawn of history to to-day. I think history tells us that there were some pretty hard monopolies in the old Roman empire, when the Praetor farmed out the Provinces, giving a certain sum of money to the central Government and taking everything for himself which he could wring out of the poor people in the Provinces—that was a monopoly. But the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly beats that “higher than a kite,” as the saying is. I think there have been great monopolies in the middle ages. In England there were great monopolies under the Kings before representative Government was established, but here is a monopoly worse than any that ever existed in the world. I take up the *Ottawa Free Press* of last night, and I see a statement in it which I will read to the House and which I will leave alongside of the statement of the hon. gentleman opposite:

“In the Immigration and Colonization Committee this morning Mr. McKay, from the vicinity of Crystal City, Manitoba, was examined. He considered Manitoba a desirable field for immigration and as an instance of the way settlers could succeed, he cited his own case. In a year and a half he had paid for his farm, and saved up \$312.”

Under this, the greatest monopoly that ever existed under the sun.

“Railway communications are an absolute necessity. He said the farmers were well satisfied with the way they were treated by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the grain elevator companies at Port Arthur. The people in the Canadian territory were treated much better by the railways than were the Dakota settlers, and some of these were bringing their wheat across into Canada and sell it there. No objection could possibly be made to either the soil or climate of the country, and he said that he knew no place where, with good farming and good seed, a better return could be received for labor expended.”

Is that a monopoly, the greatest and most grinding of any that was ever known in any country under the sun, which has opened up communication with the great North-West, and the most valuable part of our continent, which has enabled the settlers there to get in their effects for almost a third or a half less than they could a few years ago, which has opened up the coal regions under the Rocky Mountains, and brought to Winnipeg the comforts of coal heating at one-third the price they paid for their coal only a few years ago? Is that a monopoly which has opened up the country, and which takes the settlers' grain out and the settlers' goods in, on a comparison of point after point, at a cheaper and better rate than either of the great railways that run through the north and centre of the United States—is that a monopoly, “The like of which was never created and never existed under the sun?” But, Sir, there is more. “As a simple matter of fact,” said that hon. gentleman “capable of mathematical demonstration”—there are no “ifs” and “ands” about that—“which is capable of exact mathematical demonstration, this country has lost more in six years of evil government than the whole of the United States, in comparison with its population and resources, did in four years of desperate civil war.” That is to say, the six years of

Government just past have cost this country more, according to the chosen financial light of the party opposite than that desperate and devastating civil war, relatively to their population and resources, cost the people of the United States. Has the hon. gentleman ever looked at the cost of that war? Does he know that the individual States paid out in hard cash for bounties 286 million dollars? Does he know that a Federal war debt of 2,708 million dollars was incurred? Does he know that interest has been paid on that war debt since amounting to 2,070 million dollars? Does he know that pensions for persons engaged in that war and for the relatives of those who fell, amount to 617 million dollars? That taking these items together 5,704 million dollars is the cost of that great American civil war? Now, then, I take it that by the lowest estimate the resources of Canada in population and wealth are surely one-tenth that of the United States. That is, reduced to a mathematical demonstration which he so much talked about, this country, in six years of the Government just passed, has lost \$600,000,000, or at the rate of \$100,000,000 per year. But, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) stated that in this war 500,000 brave men were lost on the battle field, and we know that the destruction that took place north and south, the retardation of industry, the taking of valuable labor out of the field, are something that, if counted up, would be equal to the total I have given. Yet the hon. gentleman opposite, the chosen financial mouthpiece of their party, rises here in Parliament and states that in six years this Dominion of Canada has lost more proportionately, than it cost the people of the United States in that desperate civil war. Sir, he made another statement. In 1878, I think it was, when he made his last financial statement, he stated distinctly that there could be no fair parallel as to the incidence of taxation in Canada and the United States unless the municipal taxation and debt were taken in. You have heard him discuss that question in this House. Did he touch the matter of municipal debt and taxation? Did he do it when he discussed the question in Toronto, in Montreal? But when a certain interruption was made, I think by the Minister of Finance, this is the statement that the ex-Minister of Finance made: “The municipal taxation of Ontario compares with the state and municipal taxation of the United States of America.” Sir, in the United States census of 1880 we have a complete statement of the *per capita* debt and the *per capita* taxation of all the States of the union. Let me read you a few figures to show you how they stand. In Maine the State and municipal debt is \$34.50 *per capita*; in Massachusetts, \$51.19; in New York, \$43; in Wisconsin, \$9; in Minnesota, \$11; in Nebraska, \$15; in Colorado, \$18; in Dakota, \$7.39; in Montana, \$19.25; in the whole of the United States, \$21; in the New England States, \$11; in Ontario, in that same year of 1880, it was but \$8.60 per head. The authority I have for the statement as to the municipal indebtedness of Ontario is Treasurer Wood, in his speech of 1881, and he based it upon two returns which had been called for from different parts of the Province of Ontario, and from these returns he totalled up his amount. Now, Sir, what must we think of the financial genius, of the financial ability, of a gentleman who has, presumably, studied this question—and if he has not he should have done so before he made this statement—but who seems to know so little about it as to venture the assertion that the municipal debt and taxation of Ontario compare with the municipal debt and taxation of the United States of America? And more than that. If we take the state and municipal taxation in the different States and compare it with that of Ontario, what do we find? In Maine it is, *per capita*, \$7.99; Massachusetts, \$13.64; New York, \$11.10; Wisconsin, \$5.77; Minnesota, \$5.77; Nebraska, \$6.17; Colorado, \$11.07; Dakota, \$3.54; Montana, \$9.80; the whole United States, \$6.23;

the New England States, \$10.47; Ontario, \$4 per head. And yet the statement is made that the municipal taxation of Ontario will compare with the State and municipal taxation of the United States of America. I leave these statements with the House and with the country. But suppose we take the towns and cities and compare them. The debt *per capita* of Bangor, is \$157.87; of Portland, \$127.84; Boston, \$77.84; Detroit, \$19.62; St. Paul, \$36.81; Buffalo, \$52.93; New York, \$30.71, and of Toronto, the Queen City of Ontario, \$64. Thus all those I have named, with the exception of two, are higher than the *per capita* debt of Toronto. When we come to taxation what do we find? The taxation per head in Bangor is \$12.11; Portland, \$22.32; Boston, \$21.13; Detroit, \$10.47; St. Paul, \$8.10; Buffalo, \$10.10; New York, \$23.40; in fifteen cities of Connecticut, \$12.31; in 23 cities in Illinois, \$9.53; 39 cities of Massachusetts, \$14.74; in 32 cities of New York, \$16.75; and of Toronto, but \$10 *per capita*. So much with respect to this question of municipal taxation. I leave it with the House, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to disprove the statement; and I say again that an hon. gentleman who has been a Finance Minister of this country, who goes about the country declaring that relatively as compared with the United States we are more heavily taxed and have heavier expenditures, should either have looked into the question or should not have ventured the assertions he did with respect to it. Sir, these hon. gentlemen pretend that in the quartz of condition and circumstance, which lies all around us in the Dominion, there is pure gold; that they are the men who have the hammers and mallets which alone can break out the nuggets, and they are the men who alone can coin them and send them current through the country. And yet when they break up the quartz of condition and circumstance, this is the kind of gold they take and coin and send current through the country and world! I say if there be any man who secretly strikes down his fellow-man and the blood of an individual dyes the sand, that man is a murderer and an assassin. If there is a man who does not do that, but attacks that which is more than life, reputation and character, he is doing what Shakespeare rightly described as worse than taking a man's property for himself. What, then, shall we say of a man who was born under his country's flag, of a man who was nurtured under its protection, admitted to its secret councils, of a man pledged to protect her, of a man distinguished with her honors, and who yet has nothing better to do than to stand up in this House and send forth these statements to tarnish the fair name and fame of his country. Now, Sir, I wish to look at some other statements. Not only is it bad when a directly false statement is made and attempted to be proved, but there is another way by which the true is concealed and the false is brought out, when men forsake the proper grounds, the legitimate conditions of argument and of discussion; when they take premises not true and argue from them, when they discuss things from different premises, different conditions and circumstances where no proper parallel can exist. What do we find? Take the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). He is fond of playing the Don Quixote. He has a hobby horse, which he mounts here year after year. He tilts at an imaginary enemy, whether it be a windmill or whether it be a flock of sheep it makes no matter. And the hobby that he mounts here every year is the balance of trade. Every year that I have been in this House the hon. member for North Norfolk has mounted that hobby and ridden full tilt as if at a real enemy. He rides his hobby horse: he puts the rowels in the side of his steed, and he gallops first over the Finance Minister of this Dominion; he gallops over him, and then he gallops back again, and then he takes a third ride over him; and then he makes his steed mount up on its heels, and looking at

Mr. FOSTER.

the prostrate form he says: I have ridden you down. Why did you ride me down? I have ridden you down because you could not bring about equalization of the exports and imports, because the balance of trade was not made equal in this country. That is why I have expended my force upon you, that is why I have taken all this trouble of giving you battle. Then the hon. member spends a full half hour in proving to his own satisfaction, if not to the satisfaction of this side of the House, that there never can be a balance of trade in any well regulated and prosperous country, and that there must be more imports than exports in order that a country may be rich and prosperous. If the hon. gentleman believes that it is not necessary to have a balance between exports and imports in order to have a country prosperous, what is the use of spending one hour ever Session in trying to knock over what is simply a straw man. He believes it is not necessary, yet he spends the time of the House and his own argument in condemning the Government and condemning this party because the proper equality is not brought about between imports and exports. I want to show to this House a characteristic way of arguing adopted by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). In order to prove that the balance of trade was not necessary, he took England, and compared England's exports and imports. He says that the imports have exceeded the exports by millions upon millions, and he states that England has been prosperous and is wealthy; and he concludes from that fact that a balance in these two items, exports and imports, is not necessary. How does he make that out? In this way: He says that 11 per cent. of the value of exports must be added as profits of carriage, 11 per cent. of the value of imports must be added, and this 11 per cent. of each comes into the coffers of the British people; therefore that offsets the larger imports. He goes on to state that England has a great deal of money out in different parts of the world, from which she receives in interest, £56,000,000 per annum, equivalent to \$10 per head of the people, and that helps to do away with an adverse balance. Then he states that England is a great manufacturing and trading country, and that she draws immense profits from these sources. Then he concludes that we do not need a balance of trade in Canada, because this is the condition of things in Great Britain. What he should do in order to make his contention good, is to prove that Canada earns 11 per cent. of the value of her exports by her carrying trade, and 11 per cent. of the value of her imports by the carrying trade; that Canada receives \$10 per head of her population on account of wealth invested in foreign countries; that Canada has this particular energy and power all over the world to enable her to make up these profits. The hon. gentleman compares things not similar, and he comes to a conclusion from a comparison of inequalities. I think there is no member in this House but will come to the conclusion that, other things being equal, it is a sign of the prosperity of a country when the exports of a country equal or go beyond the imports; and yet the hon. gentleman opposite laid down this queer law, this law that an excess of exports over imports shows the indebtedness of a country. The hon. gentleman states that the United States has enormously increased in wealth, and yet, taking his own calculation, the United States, from 1877 to 1883, has run in debt to the tune of \$1,320,000,000, because, by exactly that amount did her exports exceed her imports. Sir, I think I can give the hon. gentleman an illustration which will convict him before his own constituency any day. A farmer goes out with his produce, exports it to town and sells it for \$100 and takes manufactured produce from the town, out of the stores to the value of \$80. His exports were greater than his imports by \$20, and he goes home with \$20 more cash than when he started out; and yet, Sir, according to the hon. gentleman's reasoning, the farmer is \$20 the poorer—is that much more in debt! Well, Sir, it is the common fashion for hon. gentlemen opposite to con-

demn the Government because they have not done thus and so. The hon. gentleman who represents South Brant (Mr. Paterson) gets up and condemns the Government—for what? He leans over his desk in a threatening attitude, points his dexter finger at the Finance Minister, and on pain of almost instant death demands that the Finance Minister shall bring up the prices to where they were at a certain time—shall bring up the price of wheat to where it was at a certain time, shall bring back the old wooden ships and the old shipping trade to the city of St. John, shall clear away the depression and shall in fact do away with the confusion of business which exists over the wide world. He says, you must do that; I demand it on pain of instant execution, or I will publish you to the country as no Finance Minister, and as a member of a Government which has no claims upon the people. Then he turns round and for an hour or more he sets himself to the most diligent and consecutive argument he could possibly make, to prove that no Government in the world could keep up the prices, that no legislation could prevent depression from coming, and that it is impossible that disturbances in trade could be prohibited by the action of Parliament. I say again, What is the use of the hon. gentleman coming here and condemning the Government and the party because they do not keep prices up or keep the depression away, because they do not keep the shipping trade on a good basis, and at the same time believing and arguing that it is impossible for any Government or any legislation to do so? Sir, hon. gentlemen opposite will tell me that they condemn this Government and this party because they promised to do this sort of thing. I say to them, that they cannot bring any statement, made by any responsible member of the party, they cannot bring its platform of principles, they cannot bring what was enunciated at its convention in 1878, they cannot bring any authoritative statement to show that this Government or party have pledged themselves to keep prices always good, to keep trade always level, to keep depressions always back, or to influence to the point of continual or absolute control the great markets of the world. So I say that hon. gentlemen pursuing that line of argument are condemning us for what, afterwards, they take time to prove it would be impossible for us to perform. While I am on that point I wish to call the attention of the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson) to this one fact; he said the balance of trade was not kept, and he condemned the Finance Minister for not keeping it. Now, Sir, I read the very statement he read, and in that statement the Finance Minister makes no pledge to bring the imports and the exports to a perfect equality. He makes no statement that it is necessary for the progress of the country that the imports should be made equal with the exports, but he states that it is well and should be striven for, looking at the immense excess of imports in the Dominion for a number of years, that equality should be more nearly approached, and that the great excess of imports should be diminished. And this has been done by the Government, as the figures taken from the Trade and Navigation Returns will show. Since Confederation \$20,119,084 is the average yearly excess of imports over exports for the whole period. In the period from 1875 to 1879 the excess was \$21,022,213, or nearly one million of dollars per year over the average for the whole period; and from 1880 to 1884 the average yearly excess has been but \$16,411,873. Not only does the period from 1880 to 1884 show about \$4,500,000 as a yearly average less, as the excess of imports over exports over the period from 1875 to 1879, but it shows as well pretty nearly \$4,000,000 less than the average excess of imports over exports since Confederation. The hon. member for Botolph (Mr. Mills) last night when he was nearing the end of his speech, and getting ready for his peroration, said that this Government were to render foreign markets unnecessary, that they were to turn all

urban districts into towns, all towns into cities and all cities into great marts and metropoli like New York and other great cities of the United States. He says the pledge of the party and the Government policy was to keep wages always good, and he says that the policy is hollow and baseless because it has not done that. I say it is only necessary to state the hon. gentleman's contention to show that it is an absurd one, and that it is not possible, as it never was contemplated, that any Government or legislation should do this.

Mr. MILLS. It was promised.

Mr. FOSTER. It was not. I challenge the hon. gentleman and I will give him time now to do it—I challenge him to read a statement of any responsible member of this party or Government which proves that they were to make foreign markets unnecessary, that they were to turn all urban districts into towns and make all towns into cities and turn all cities into metropoli. I challenge him to show a single written or published statement where it was authoritatively pledged that wages should always be kept good. If he can do it let him do it.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman calls on me to give such a statement. I have not the papers, but I can refer him to several speeches and I can produce them. I refer him to a pamphlet of which it is stated that 80,000 were circulated in Ontario by the Conservative Association, a pamphlet which was prepared by Mr. Phipps, where those very expressions were employed.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman knows as well as any person, with the intelligence he has, that you never could judge a party from the utterances of men who are not in sympathy with its policy, that you never can judge a party by the utterances of stray persons here and there. What I challenge the hon. gentleman to do is this—and let him laugh and say "hear, hear" if he chooses, I challenge him to bring the platform of the party as brought out in convention, to bring the resolutions of Sir John Macdonald, the statements of the second Minister, or of any Minister—I challenge him to bring these, and to show to this House that it was ever promised or pledged that foreign markets would be rendered unnecessary, that towns would be turned into cities and cities turned into metropoli, and that wages would always be kept good. It is a habit of exaggeration that hon. gentlemen opposite have fallen into. They take the partial to include the universal, and then boldly declare that the general assertion was made.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman asks for the utterance of the First Minister, or something of that sort. Would the utterances of the Finance Minister do him?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. CASEY. I have one extract which seems to claim a great deal of what is proclaimed. He says:

"The hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Richard Cartwright) imposed burdens on the people, but gave them no food to supply them with strength to carry them. We asked Parliament to give us such changes in the tariff as would not only protect the industries of the country, but give us an increased revenue. Was there a response? I stated at the outset that the response was ample, provided the money had been paid in for the year 1879 that belonged to that year. And the year that followed what was the response? They gave us a surplus of \$4,000,000 and upwards, because we found employment for the people, because, by obtaining for them employment and higher wages, they were able to buy more than formerly. Men who were formerly working at half time and on low wages received their higher wages and were working overtime. Farmers who had low prices and found sales difficult received high prices and prompt cash sales."

"High prices and prompt cash,"—that did not mean 70 cents a bushel.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. member for West Elgin the least appreciation of the difference between references to

facts that have occurred and promises which are to stretch over an indefinite future? The hon. Minister of Finance was speaking of facts which have occurred; he was speaking of a certain year; and hon. gentlemen opposite do not contend and cannot prove that his statements were not true of that year. But that is different from promising that markets would never fail, that good times would never pass away, that confusion and distress would never come, that all towns should be turned into cities, and all cities into marts. Sir, the kind of argument that the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) depends upon is shown by the reasoning he used last night. He wished to condemn the immigration policy of the Government, and how did he do it? He cited a newspaper extract stating that two poor Danes had got into trouble somewhere in the United States. He said that these were scalliwags, and therefore the immigration policy was bad—that they were a sample of the whole. Does the hon. gentleman know that it takes more than one swallow to make a summer? Does he know that the condition of two Danes out of 100,000 immigrants, is not a good proof as to the condition and quality of the immigration as a whole. Now, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) compared Canada with the United States; but with the United States of what period? With the United States of 1800, 1801 and 1802. Why did not the hon. gentleman, when he was at it, go back further? Why did he not go away back to the patriarchs of Palestine who lived very economically? Why did he not go back to the Germans of the time of Tacitus, and read from the history of Tacitus to show how cheaply and how well they fared? Does the hon. gentleman not know that in order to come to any reasonable conclusion, he has to compare things similar in kind and equal in time and circumstances? He compared the United States of 1800 with the Canada of to-day to our disadvantage. Sir, what was left out in that comparison? He left out in the first place the difference in the scope of the expenditure of the United States then and that of Canada now. He will find if he looks into the matter, that the scope of the expenditure is very different in the two countries. They have no subsidies in the United States to the different States. The States have to take care of their Governors, of all their legislation, of their whole judiciary, of their savings banks, their fisheries, their prisons, their militia, their canals, their railroads, their immigration, and to a large extent their harbors and rivers, and quarantine. And so I say the parallel does not hold. Neither do the times nor the circumstances make the comparison at all reasonable. 1800 and 1884 are very different times in the world's history, to afford the basis of a comparison of expense of family living, of the world's work, of the world's government. If I were to take a farmer of 1884 and attempt to compare his scale of expenses to that of a farmer of 1800, he would very quickly tell me that he did not admit any such parallel or comparison as that. To-day the farmer has to have his improved implements, and to pay for his municipal advantages and for all those improvements which result from development and advancement. The same is true with reference to states and countries. Railroads abound now; they did not then. All those improvements in the development of the world and in the transport of its commodities, have come in and have added to the expense. Therefore, Sir, there is no parallel between the United States of 1800 and Canada of to-day on the scale of expenditure. Now, the hon. gentleman said that time was solving the protection question. Yes, I think he is right. Time is solving it in Europe, and the legislation of the last few weeks has shown in what direction it is solving it. It is solving it in the lines of increased protection among the great powers of Europe, so that the Cobden Club, instead of converting Europe and the world to their principles in the short space of ten or twenty years, find themselves very nearly in

Mr. FOSTER.

the line of being themselves convinced by the stern logic of events, and the necessities of the commercial situation around them. Sir, time is solving the question in Canada, and each year that the people look more thoroughly into it, and see what we are doing and what we must do in order to preserve our commercial autonomy, they must see that it is solving it in the line of a settled conviction that a moderate protection cannot be dispensed with in this country so long as we are alongside of and have to deal with countries that have high protective tariffs. I think I see two indications that time is solving the question also for hon. gentlemen opposite. What are these? The hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), says:

"What is really damaging to our position is not the effect of the protective system so much as the effect of the enormous extravagance of the Administration."

Is that the beginning of a road which shall lead them out to the next elections, to go on the hustings upon the line of not attacking the protective policy in its principle? It seems so. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) gave it an additional lift last night when he said: We never declared that a 17½ per cent. tariff was all that was sufficient; we contended for what was necessary. That is an elastic provision. He may stretch it to take in the National Policy itself; and the fact that we have not now many resolutions or speeches in the direction of free trade is additional proof that time is solving the question for hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. MILLS. The public debt is solving it.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir, it is well to contrast the opinions of hon. gentlemen opposite when they come to speak of the condition of the country as the hon. gentleman who has preceded me did, especially in the few last sentences of his speech. What do they think of this country? Why, Sir, the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) thinks that the last six years of Government have been more disastrous to this country than the civil war was to the United States. The end is near in this prophetic deliverance. The hon. member for North Norfolk says in the concluding sentence of his speech, or nearly so: What is the state of our country? What have we to show for our expenditure? This is his opinion of the condition of Canada: Public Works paying $\frac{1}{3}$ of 1 per cent; \$40,000,000 sunk in the Canadian Pacific Railway; assets comparatively worthless; \$40,000,000 sunk in the Intercolonial Railway, which ultimately will have to be closed; in eighteen years the goal of ruin will be reached at the present rate of progress. Can you imagine a more doleful picture of the condition of Canada, to be sent broadcast throughout the world, coming from one who lives in the Dominion and occupies a leading position in the Liberal party, than that? The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) is not more cheerful or happy for he says: What is the condition of Canada? Hundreds of thousands of unemployed; Canadians leave at the rate of 88,000 per year—not one less, not one more, mathematically demonstrated; people fleeing from the country as if a pestilence were upon it, and then declaring that there is a pestilence upon the country. That is the opinion of the hon. member for Bothwell, and I leave the admirers of that hon. gentleman to make the most they can out of it. But I am certain that the young men of Canada, the men who are growing up in its various Provinces, and who have hopefulness in their hearts and energy in their physical frames, who look forward to the time when their country shall be made great and strong with the resources it has and the energy and intellect its sons possess—I am certain that such utterances as these will only have the effect of weaning from the party of the hon. gentlemen opposite any young men who may have a leaning to it, and of binding the young men of this country in a common bond, stretching from ocean to ocean, of cementing

them in the common determination to keep this country united, and to make it prosperous, and to relegate growlers and grumblers to the background. Then the hon. member for Bothwell has outlined a little plan of reciprocity, in which he has followed in the wake of the hon. member for North Norfolk. We have often wanted to know what particular stand hon. gentlemen opposite took on this question, and we have obtained at last an inkling of what they may possibly do, and of what line they propose to take. The hon. member for North Norfolk declared that we could not get a reciprocity treaty such as we have had before; He declared that if the Government get reciprocity, it will not be the one-sided reciprocity that we had years ago, but it will have to be a reciprocity which will include manufactures as well as natural products. The hon. member for Bothwell outlined practically the same plan. Is that to be the platform of hon. gentlemen opposite? Is their platform to be that they pledge themselves, in order to get certain advantages from the commerce and trade of the United States, to throw down all barriers and leave our manufacturing industries open to the in-sweeping tide of American manufactures? Will they allow our manufacturing industries, which have been established and which have prospered by means of the protected skill and accumulated capital, to be swept away the very moment these barriers are broken down? Do they intend to leave our mills without operatives and our industries in the condition in which they were years ago, when necessity compelled us to adopt a change in our fiscal system?

Mr. MILLS. That is very doleful.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very doleful, and it is doleful for a purpose. It is so doleful that when hon. gentlemen opposite go to the country and enunciate that as their platform, they will find that the people will tell them: We are willing to have a reciprocity treaty on fair terms, but we do not propose to give up everything for the sake of having a commercial treaty even with the United States. It has been noticed in this debate that more has been said about the condition of the country than about the tariff, and there are certain statements which have been formulated by the Opposition. One of these is that there is discontent everywhere in the Dominion. Let us analyse that statement, and I appeal to hon. gentlemen who represent the different counties and interests of Canada to say whether that be true or not. Is there great discontent in the Dominion of Canada? Of what kind is it? Is it that discontent which, unhappily, is rife in some countries where labor is arrayed against capital in a stern, strong fight against monopoly and privilege? Is that kind of contest, which shows itself in breakings-out like the Pittsburg riots and the Hocking Valley riots in the United States, and the disturbances which are taking place in Great Britain, going on here? Does any hon. gentleman hold that such discontent as that is rife in the Dominion? No, Sir. Is there discontent here of class against class, or sect against sect, as there is in some of the older countries of Europe, where the privileged autocratic classes above are being upheaved by the outbursting force of free impulses of the classes which have been trampled down? No, Sir. This is a free country; this is a country in which the ploughman's son may come from following the plough and afterwards step into the high position of Premier, if he has talent and character and energy sufficient to work his way. Is there any widespread political discontent in Canada? I deny it. But I will tell you what discontent there is; there is a discontent in this country—and here again I have to utter a dolorous and mournful strain—there is discontent in the party that is not in power and in such a case there always will be discontent. The man who has made a bee line for an open door and finds that another has stepped in just before him and closed it will always be discontented; his discontent will be chronic until the door is reopened,

until the man inside is put out and the man outside gets in and warms himself. That is the only kind of discontent there is in this country; and it is that discontent of party which is engineered by its members, heralded by its press, and brought by its leaders as a piece of machinery into this House. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that annexation is clamored for in this country. I ask from which party comes the clamor? I ask them to point out a Liberal Conservative newspaper, a Liberal Conservative politician, or any gentleman prominent in the Liberal Conservative party, who has, during this past year, uttered one word in favor of annexation; but I take them to the only annexation organ I know of in this country, the *St. John Globe*, which belongs to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, the proprietor of which sunned himself for a few years in the comfortable position of postmaster given to him by hon. gentlemen opposite, and who has been terribly discontented ever since he had occasion to leave that snug position and attend to his newspaper work. Is there any talk about dismemberment? Do you find it in the Liberal Conservative newspapers, in the Liberal Conservative party or from any member of prominence in the Conservative ranks? No, Sir, and the resolution moved in the Nova Scotia House of Assembly was not moved by a member of the Liberal Conservative party. You find it in the press and you find it amongst the politicians that belong to the gentlemen opposite. So I say you may take everything, the secession trouble in the North-West, annexation, dismemberment, independence, commercial treaties, whatever look to the unsettling of the present stable condition of affairs in this country, and you find it always voiced by the hon. gentlemen opposite and their press; that is where the discontent is. So long as it remains there and is a party discontent, it will not sink very deep into the vitals of the country and will not produce either dismemberment or disruption. It will all be cured in that happy day—we know not when it may arrive—when they step to this side of the House. Then discontent will disappear and happy smiles will take their place on the countenances of those gentlemen. The next thing they state as a general proposition is that the Liberal Conservatives are trying to make the country prosperous by Act of Parliament. That has been partly touched upon by remarks I have already made. I will simply refer to it. Everywhere through the press and through the country that epigram is used, and you know what power there is in an epigram, and most gentlemen who have looked into the matter know what untruth there is in an epigram. An epigram may be the most taking thing at first sight, and yet when you look into it the most deceptive of any in the English language. And this is put through the country. These men are going to make you prosperous by Act of Parliament; and ridicule follows upon that. That was not the pledge, that is not the platform of this party, but I will tell you what is the pledge and what is the platform of the party, as far as I understand it, and what, speaking for myself, is at all events my platform and my position. It is that you cannot pass a single Act of Parliament without in some respects affecting the fortunes and prosperity of the country, that you must assume that legislation at any given time is perfect if you do not hold the proposition that it may be made more perfect, and that consequently things may be made better by legislation. Do you mean to say that it is not possible to help a country by legislation? Look at the converse of the proposition. Is it possible to harm a country by legislation? There is no doubt that it is. Then it is possible to remedy the harm by legislation, and, unless you assert that laws are perfect now, it is a proposition to be contended for and sustained that it is possible to make things more prosperous by judicious legislation. It was judicious legislation which brought about the abolition of the corn laws.

It was judicious legislation which laid the foundation of those great railways in New South Wales and the other Australian colonies, which my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) spoke of last night as such a great source of revenue in those countries. I can imagine the counterpart of the member for Bothwell in those Legislatures, when they proposed to make a loan and build those railways, asking: Are you going to make the country prosperous by Act of Parliament? And yet the Act was passed, the loan was made, and the railways were built, with the great amount of traffic which goes over them and the great revenues which are brought into those countries by them. If ever legislation was necessary to the protection of the great interests of this country, that time is to-day, when over-production is rife as never before in the producing centres of the world; to-day, when there is a greater facility for the manufacture of goods at short notice than at any previous time in the world's history; to-day, when the means of transport are so great that commodities from the most distant parts of the world can be thrown into any market which offers an opportunity for them; to-day, when the great commercial interests in the world are merging together in common cause and for common purposes. I say it is now, when such a conjuncture of circumstances has taken place as that, that legislation stops in at its best, and protects the people of this country in their manufacturing interests, in their markets, and in all that pertains to a moderate protective policy. They say: Get markets in foreign parts. I say so too, but it is a fact that cannot be gainsaid that you must first establish yourselves in home markets before you can go out to conquer foreign markets. Here is the statement of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1884. Mark the parallel between what he speaks of and our own country of Canada. He shows the immense expenditure made in the Western States for railways and canals and the like, and says:

"What this vast region needed was a market and facilities for reaching it, with both of which it was soon supplied. It is now penetrated in all directions by railroads, and the cost of transportation has been so cheapened that farming lands far west of the Mississippi have become nearly as valuable as the lands in the seaboard States. To the rise in the value of lands resulting in the construction of railroads, the wonderful increase of the national wealth is very largely attributable."

Our great west lies here. We must penetrate it and interpenetrate it with facilities for transportation before we can expect our lands to rise in value or expect to share the rich increase from our fertile country. The next thing that is stated by these hon. gentlemen is that we are trying to make the country rich by taxing it, or, as the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) says:

"The force of folly can no further go
Than taxing men that they may richer grow."

That is another epigram. They say: What! You make a country richer by piling up taxation? That, of course, at first sight, seems very absurd, but let us look into it. It appears to me that there are two kinds of taxation. One you may call productive taxation, and another you may call unproductive taxation; or, more closely, there is one which is the result of productive expenditures, and the other which is the result of unproductive expenditures, and the first thing to get at in any discussion of the matter of taxation is to find whether the expenditures were wise and productive, and, if so, it is a question which cannot be doubted that, through this expenditure and the taxation consequent upon it, the country is made rich and prosperous, and so helped in all its material interests. But I wish to draw the attention of the members of this House to the comparison between the United States, which is so much referred to, and this country of Canada with reference to its expenditures. In the United States, in 1883-84, Customs and Revenue taxation amounted to \$316,653,561. Watch the expenditures out of that: Pensions for the war, \$55,429,228;

Mr. FOSTER,

military expenditures, \$39,420,603; naval expenditure, \$17,292,601; interest on public debt caused by the war, \$54,578,368; sinking fund, \$46,790,229; redemption of war debt, \$54,120,000; or a total of \$267,640,039, as taxation for an expenditure which was not only unproductive, but destructive in every point. The *per capita* expenditure of customs and internal revenue of the United States was \$5.75, and \$4.85 of that was spent for these unproductive purposes. Otherwise put, 85 per cent. of the whole revenue from Customs and Internal Revenue was spent to pay the interest and cost which came from the expenses of war and the waste of war in the United States of America. The Canadian income from Customs and Revenue last year was \$25,483,199, and for military purposes, corresponding to those above, what did we spend? On Dominion police, \$20,124; militia pensions, \$27,268; mounted police, \$185,983; then there is militia, if you choose to put that in, though you should not, because that expenditure by the Dominion corresponds to the expenditures in the United States for militia by the States themselves. If you do not put that in, which you have no right to do, the *per capita* taxation of Canada spent on unproductive expenditures like those I have mentioned in the United States, is only 14 cents per head out of a total of \$5.66 per head collected. So it is plain, that compared with the United States, the revenue which we have collected is expended—not for war, as an hon. member stated the other day, but for the development of our Provinces and the debts incurred therefor? They were expended for the opening up and improvement of the country, for the construction of railways, for waterways and canals, and for the great public works of the country, which alone can make a country prosperous. Now, I wish briefly to approach what is really the most important question I shall have to deal with on this occasion, and that is the comparison of the United States of to-day with the Canada of to-day. The hon. gentlemen opposite, in and out of Parliament, have compared the United States and Canada, and have come to a conclusion disadvantageous, as they say, to Canada. I ask hon. gentlemen present, could they not have taken a more fair comparison for a country like Canada, than to compare it with the United States? Is it fair to compare a grown, intellectually and physically developed man, with a child of tender age, and because the one has not the strength of the other, to make it disadvantageous to that one? Surely not. But in comparing Canada with the United States of America much like that is done. The United States have been more than one hundred years on their national course. They had provincial prejudices the same as we have, they had provincial differences as we have now. They had to merge those, to outgrow them; they have had one hundred years to do that and to become a great and united nation. I think it may be fairly said that Canada cannot be fairly compared with the United States of America. That country has been over one hundred years on its national progress, it has vast and varied resources, climatic and otherwise, it had a reputation as a nation extended all over the world when Canada was little heard of, it has received by immigration twelve millions of people in addition to its own population, from 1820 to 1883; it has a vast heritage of accumulated skill and accumulated capital, and a population of 55,000,000 of people; and I say it is not quite fair to compare Canada with such a country; if we expect to make Canada show equal it is not a fair expectation. But, Sir, let us look at this question of comparative debt. Now I think hon. gentlemen will agree with me when I say that if you are going to talk about the incidence of debt or taxation relatively in the two countries, you must take the whole debt and the whole taxation. You must take in the United States the federal debt, the state debt, and the municipal debt; and you must take in the Dominion of Canada equally its federal debt, its pro-

vincial debt, and its municipal debt. There is no other fair way, because the functions and scope of the federal powers in the two cases are as diverse as they can well be, as also are the functions and scope of the States as compared with the Provinces. Now, Sir, what do we find? The federal debt of the United States on November 1st, 1884, was \$1,408,482,984; the net federal debt of Canada last year was \$182,161,850. Now, Sir, I deduct from the net federal debt of Canada the debts which have been assumed from the Provinces, because they represented what would be represented by the State debts in the United States. The provincial debts which have been assumed by this Dominion amount to \$106,815,214. Subtracting that sum from the whole net debt of the Dominion of Canada, corresponding to the United States federal debt, and we have left \$75,346,636. Now, Sir, I say that that method of comparison cannot be gainsaid. The federal debt of \$1,408,482,984 in the United States corresponds with what is the real federal debt of Canada, amounting to \$75,346,636. Reducing them to *per capita* we find the federal debt of the United States is \$25.60; while the corresponding federal debt of Canada is, *per capita*, but \$16.40. Now, Sir, let us take the state and provincial debts. In the United States, by the official statistics for 1883, the State debt amounted to \$267,762,175; and the corresponding provincial debts of Canada, that is the debts which are either now held by the Provinces or have been taken over by the Dominion, amounts to \$112,815,214. Reducing these to *per capita*, we find the state debt in the United States is \$4.83, and the corresponding provincial debt of Canada is \$24.30 per head—only \$4.83 per head in the United States, but \$24.30 per head in Canada. That shows a great disparity against Canada, but let us look into it for a moment. What have the different States of the United States done with reference to meeting their indebtedness from year to year? They have met it by direct taxation upon the people of each State. Last year Massachusetts paid \$1,500,000 in direct State taxation; while the Provinces of this Dominion have never taxed themselves one cent as direct taxation, but have rather put their expenditure in the form of loans and have preferred to carry it as interest. So that if we go back for ten, twelve or fifteen years, the States of the American republic have paid by direct taxation that which has prevented their debts from being much higher, *per capita*, than the debts of the Provinces of Canada. Then Sir, we come to the municipal indebtedness, and that is the most important point. The United States municipal debt in 1880 was \$822,147,888; the increase during the last decade was about 22 per cent. Adding that percentage of increase, the municipal debt of the United States at the present time is \$904,362,676, or a *per capita* municipal debt of \$16.40. What is Canada's municipal debt? Well, Sir, I take the municipal debt of the Province of Ontario, which I believe is a high average. In the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia it is comparatively small, the municipal taxation is comparatively small. The same is true, I think, with regard to Quebec, while in Ontario we have the highest municipal debt. The municipal debt of Ontario is \$17,000,000 or about \$8.60 per head. The municipal debt of Canada, I have estimated at \$6 per head. The municipal debt of Ontario being \$8.60 per head, and that being by far the highest, I have taken the average as \$6 for the whole Dominion, which I am certain is a high average to take. That makes \$27,600,000 as the municipal debt of Canada, being a *per capita* municipal debt of \$6 per head. Taking those totals over, what do we have? The United States has a federal debt of \$25.60 per head. Canada has a federal debt of \$16.40 per head. The United States has a state debt of \$4.83 per head. Canada has a provincial debt, corresponding to that State debt, equal to \$24.30 per head. The United States has a municipal debt equal to \$16.40 per head, while the municipal debt of Canada is not more than \$6 per

head. Adding these together we have the total debt, federal, state and municipal, of the United States as \$46.83 per head, and we have the total debt of Canada in the same way, \$46.70 per head; or a balance in favor of Canada on the score of indebtedness of just 18 cents per head. So much with respect to debt. But the strongest point is when you come to the taxation which is paid, and which is a better measure of the burden than the debt which has been calculated per head. The United States federal taxation last year for Customs and Inland Revenue was \$316,653,561, a *per capita* tax of \$5.75. The state tax in the United States was \$61,434,095, or \$1.11 *per capita*. The municipal tax in 1884 was \$282,591,694, or a *per capita* tax of \$5.14, making a total taxation in the United States under these heads of \$660,679,350, or \$12 *per capita*. Let us take Canada. The federal taxes, taking Custom and Inland Revenue the same as in the United States, amounted to \$25,483,590, or \$5.66 *per capita*. The provincial tax is nothing. The municipal tax is \$2.60 per head, or \$12,000,000 for the whole, which gives \$8.25 per head as the taxation paid, federal, provincial and municipal in Canada, corresponding with \$12 per head paid in the United States. So that in the matter of total debt, Canada has 18 cents *per capita* of advantage, while in the matter of its taxes Canada has \$3.74 per head, which is a yearly saving on taxes alone of \$16,204,000 for the whole Dominion. I leave these figures and these calculations to be looked into by hon. gentlemen and by the country, and I believe they will stand the test in all important particulars. There is a little question as to the estimate for Canada's municipal debt, but I have made the estimate high so as to be sure I did not err in favor of my country. It is said by hon. gentlemen opposite that the people are being driven out of the country. I want to put one practical question. If they are driven out of Canada, by what are they being driven out? We will throw statistics all aside. We will leave these clashing and clanging statistics of the United States, school and other statistics all aside, and now appeal to common sense and common experience. Our people are being driven from Canada, say they. What drives them out? The answer comes: Debt, taxes, tariff—those are the three things that are driving Canadians from Canada. Where are they driven to? The answer comes: To the United States. I am going to put this question in such a form that we must either conclude that the people of Canada are almost born fools or else that they are not being driven out to the United States by debt, taxes and tariff. Driven out to the United States! Driven out by debt, taxes, tariff! Where do they go? Take the metropolis of my own Province. They are driven from St. John, are they? On account of debt, taxes, tariff? And where do they go? We will say that they go to Bangor or Portland, the two largest cities in Maine. They are, of course, going to a city and not to the country. The debt of St. John is \$1,009,048, or \$36 *per capita*. The debt of Bangor is \$2,661,000, or \$157.87 *per capita*. Any sensible man, if he is driven out owing to the heavy city debt, would go directly from a city in which the *per capita* debt is \$36 to a city where the debt is \$157 per head. No doubt about that. But perhaps the individual might go to Portland; and if he did so, he would find a city with a debt of \$4,322,154, or \$127.84 *per capita*. Driven from St. John, he would go to a place where the debt is three and a half times as great! But let us look at the taxation.

Mr. McMULLEN. Give us the figures for Baltimore.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not choose to go to Baltimore. If the hon. gentleman wishes to go there, he can do so. If he will, however, wait for a moment I will give him as many cities as he can travel over between this time and to-morrow. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to suit my own convenience in making this address I shall feel

obliged. The taxes in St. John last year amounted to \$223,687, or \$8 *per capita*. In Bangor they reached \$204,166, or \$12.11 *per capita*. In Portland they were \$754,623, or \$22.32 *per capita*. But you will say that the individual will probably choose to go, not to a city, but to the rural parts. Let us see how the taxation of New Brunswick compares with Maine. The provincial debt in New Brunswick is \$750,000, or \$2.25 *per capita*. The state debt of Maine is \$4,682,741, or \$7 per head. The individual will, of course, go direct from New Brunswick, where the provincial debt is only \$2.25 per head, to Maine, where the state debt is \$7 per head. Or if it is taxation from which he is fleeing, it is, of course, likely that he will leave New Brunswick, where the provincial taxation is *nil*, to go to Maine where it is \$1.63 per head. Or if it is municipal debt he is fleeing from he will, of course, leave New Brunswick where the municipal debt is \$1,660,000 or \$5 per head, and go to Maine where the municipal debt is \$17,644,075, or \$27.50 per head. Or if it is taxation he is afraid of, he will go to Maine where there is a municipal tax of \$4,118,625, or \$6.26 per head, when the municipal taxation in New Brunswick is estimated at about \$3 per head. There is a practical answer. Suppose we take, for New Brunswick, the federal *per capita* taxation at \$5.66 per head, the provincial at nothing and the municipal at \$3 per head, the total is \$8.66. In Maine the federal *per capita* taxation is \$5.75, state \$1.63, municipal \$6.36, being a total of \$13.74. That is to say that in New Brunswick the people have to pay only \$8.66 per head as against \$13.74 in Maine. We come now to Ontario, and if an individual goes from Toronto to Boston, what does he find? He goes from a city having a debt of \$5,800,000 or \$65 *per capita* to a city which has \$28,241,018 of a debt, or \$77.84 *per capita*. He will go from Toronto which has a yearly taxation of \$901,376 or \$10 *per capita*, to Boston, which has a yearly impost of \$7,666,534 or \$21.13 per head. And now as my hon. friend on the back seat wanted to have a few more cities, if he should take all the thirty-nine cities of Massachusetts and lumped them together he would find that the taxation *per capita* is \$14.24, whilst in the City of Toronto it is but \$10 per head. Perhaps, however, your fugitive citizen will not care to go from Toronto to Boston, but will go to the country places. He will leave Ontario and go to Massachusetts. He will leave a provincial debt of nothing at all, but instead a surplus in the treasury which is variously estimated at from \$2,000,000 to \$5,000,000, and he will go to Massachusetts where the state debt is \$20,159,478, or \$11.30 per head. He will leave Ontario, which has a municipal debt of \$3.60 *per capita* and go to Massachusetts, which has a municipal debt of \$40 per head. Or if you take the taxation he will leave Ontario, which has a municipal taxation of \$4 per head, and go to Massachusetts, which has a municipal taxation of \$13.64 per head. That, Sir, is why people leave this country, because of the debt and taxation; and what is more reasonable and common sense than to believe that they will leave a country like this for its debt and taxation, and go to a country where the debt and taxation are very much higher? The hon. gentleman wanted some States and I am going to give him some; and you will recollect that I have tried to be fair in this comparison in not taking the older States entirely, because they say the people leave our Provinces and go to the new territories. What do we find? Bear in mind that Ontario's provincial and municipal debt is \$8.60 per head. He will find that the State and municipal debt of Wisconsin is \$9; Minnesota, \$11; Nebraska, \$15; Colorado, \$18; Dakota, \$7.39, or 21 cents less than Ontario—enough to buy some bread to keep them on the way; Montana, \$19.25. The same holds good with reference to State and municipal taxation. In Maine it is \$7.39; Wisconsin, \$5.77; Minnesota, \$5.77; Nebraska, \$6.17; Colorado, \$11.07;

Mr. FOSTER.

Montana, \$9.80, while that of Ontario is \$4. Now, my hon. friend will listen to the figures for the cities. In 15 cities in Connecticut the *per capita* taxation was \$12.31; in 10 Iowa cities, \$9.24; in 23 Illinois cities, \$9.53; in 8 Maine cities, \$15.39; in 39 Massachusetts cities, \$14.24; in 42 New York cities, \$16.75; and in 10 Wisconsin cities, \$8.47, whilst in Ontario, in Toronto it is but \$10 per head, and taking the Province as a whole, it is but \$4 per head. I have not got as far as Baltimore yet, but I have no doubt that if we took Baltimore with the other cities, they would be on the average about the same. As to whether these people leave for debt and the taxation, we must settle that question on the basis of common sense. But hon. gentlemen say the tariff drives them out of Canada and they go to the United States. In Canada the tariff on all imports, dutiable and free, is 17.32 per cent.; in the United States it is 30.05 per cent., while on dutiable imports in the United States, the percentage is 42.64. So that by their reasoning, the tariff drives them from a country which has a certain tariff into another country with a tariff from two to two and a half times as great. I leave that subject with the House and the country for further consideration. Mention has been made of my Province and of the Maritime Provinces. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) made allusion last night to the discontent which existed in Halifax and St. John, and he made allusion to the annexation boom which was sent through the country with reference to something which occurred in St. John not long ago. I have simply this remark to make, that I lay it down as a rule that wherever you find a man who talks or advocates annexation you will find that he belongs to the party of hon. gentlemen opposite; and as to the annexation boom in the City of St. John, I know it—I was there and I know all about it—there is not a man in this House who can tell me anything that I do not know about that so-called annexation movement.

An hon. MEMBER. Or anything else.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not say that. That is a sample of the way which hon. gentlemen have of exaggerating all the way through. I stated that I knew as much about this particular matter as any one else, and he says I stated that I knew as much about everything as anybody else. That is the way that they act with their tariff arguments. On this side it is said that legislation will so improve the country that laborers will be employed and better wages paid. They go out and say that we state that by legislation for a country we will always keep wages up. So with the hon. member for Halton. When I said I knew as much about the annexation boom in St. John as anyone else, he says I stated that I knew as much about anything as anyone else.

Mr. McCraney. I did not say that. When the hon. gentleman said that there was no man in this House could tell him anything he did not know about that question. I said: "Yes, and I suppose about anything else."

Mr. FOSTER. As to this annexation talk which took place in St. John, or as to the meeting which was subsequently held, there is only one man, if there was one, that did not rise up in the meeting and either openly denounce any sentiment of annexation, or who was not loud in his statements and his demonstrations of loyalty to the flag under which we live. I say the people of St. John are loyal, that they are descendants of men who were loyal. They came to the country, and to the city, which, when they landed, had little to recommend it; they carved out homes and fortunes for themselves, and against disadvantages which probably no city in this continent has had to contend with, the merchants, business men and people of St. John have held their own, and have striven manfully for their social, political and commercial position. And I say it is wrong to spread through this country on the wings of the newspaper press

the statement that there is annexation or disloyal sentiment in the city of St. John or the Province of New Brunswick. With reference to St. John, it made large gains by its shipping trade which has gone down; it depended largely on the building of wooden ships and this industry has declined, and the people of St. John have had to contend with that drawback. They depended largely on lumber, and the depressed state of the lumber trade, due to no National Policy, but following the general over-stocking of the great lumber market and the supply necessary for it in the world, and they have lost on that. They lost in one day and night more than \$10,000,000, of hard earnings, the accumulation of years of patient industry and hard toil, yet, under all these circumstances, the Province of New Brunswick stands to-day in the proud position of having doubled its trade from 1867 to 1884. In 1868 the exports of New Brunswick were \$4,626,727, and the imports \$6,523,395, a total trade of \$11,150,122. That makes as near as can be the whole of the export and import trade of the Province at that time. In 1874, we find that the exports increased to \$6,503,934 and the imports to \$10,233,871, a total trade of \$16,727,805. In other words, the exports increased from 1868 to 1874 40 per cent., the imports increased 56 per cent. and the total trade increased 50 per cent. When we come to 1879, we find that the export trade had decreased 17 per cent., that the import trade had decreased 48 per cent., and that the total trade had decreased 37 per cent. Coming to the year 1884, however, we find that the export trade has increased again 28 per cent., the import trade has increased 34 per cent., and the total trade has increased 38 per cent. These are the figures taken simply from the Trade and Navigation Returns. Now, I want to call the attention of hon. gentlemen to one fact. Whereas in 1868 the imports and exports represent what was about the actual trade, to-day the exports and imports do not show the total trade. There is the interprovincial trade with Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and with the Upper Provinces. Sir, I am in a position to state, and I do not believe I can be truthfully contradicted, that, adding the total interprovincial trade of the Province of New Brunswick, on a fair estimate such as has been made by some of the leading business men of St. John, the total trade of the Province has doubled since 1868. Various great changes have taken place since then. Then the city of St. John was almost the only outport and in-port of the Province; but since then other ports have taken trade; railroads have been built, and various lines of communication established; and trade has taken different channels from what it had in 1868. In that respect the course of trade has worked somewhat to the detriment of the city of St. John, although the total trade of New Brunswick has increased in the ratio I have stated. I say, moreover, speaking from my own knowledge, that I believe the people of the Province of New Brunswick now raise more agricultural produce and meat produce on their farms and get more for it, and that they live better and are worth more, than in any preceding year in the history of the Province. Mr. Speaker, I have in closing, only to ask the attention of the House to a matter which has been noted in this debate. We have had the medical men sitting in council; we have had the diseases diagnosed from every possible standpoint; we have had theory after theory stated; we have had fear after fear expressed; but I ask hon. gentlemen on this side to look at the whole course of this debate and say if they can what single nostrum has been prescribed for the diseases of the body politic. Everybody knows that it is far easier to destroy than to build up, but after all we might suppose that they would put something in the place of what they destroy, propose a substitute for what they condemn. They ask us to throw aside what we have at present, but what do they give as a plank to step on? They ask us to go aside from the plain beaten road we have

been travelling on since 1878, and they give us nothing to travel on in its place. So long as the Dominion of Canada progresses as it has done, so long as it possesses a people so strong and hopeful and resources so wide and rich as it is every day finding that it possesses, so long as it looks forward to a career, alongside and independent of the countries that border it—a career that involves in itself difficulties which have to be met by hard toil—it is the determination of the young men of this country, and of the people of this country to hold their fortune in their own hands, to keep their own country together, and make it stronger and stronger by the bonds of common intercourse and commercial ties, and in a hopeful spirit to go on in the development of our great heritage, as men who believe they have a country which has a present as it has a past, and which will have a future more grand and glorious by far than either past or the present give us any indication of.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 95) respecting explosive substances—(from the Senate.)—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)

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

After Recess.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 83) to incorporate the Kootenay Railway Company, British Columbia.—(Mr. Small.)

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman from Pictou (Mr. Tupper) who addressed the House the other day congratulated the House and the country upon the fact that the hon. Finance Minister was able to draw a picture of the commercial sky tinged with blue. I am sure that he must have been much more gratified at hearing the hon. member for King's, N. B., (Mr. Foster), because that hon. gentleman was not content with putting in a bit of blue sky but painted the whole sky cerulean blue, unfecked by a single cloud. One would imagine from the speech of the hon. gentleman that there was no such thing as depression, that the country was satisfied with the existing Administration from one end of Canada to the other, that the people of the Maritime Provinces, the people of the North-West, the people of Ontario and Quebec were all satisfied with the existing condition of things; but if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had heard the Finance Minister on previous occasions and had compared his speeches on those occasions with his last utterances, he would have found the style in each very different. On former occasions his style was one of attack and of glorification; to-day he adopts the style of defence and of apology. He was sorry that this and the other thing had happened, he was sorry that matters were not as bright commercially as he would wish; but towards the close he rose very patriotically, pictured a bright future for the country, and declared that there was not an annexationist to be found in the whole of Canada unless in the ranks of the Grits. I shall have a word or two to say about this later. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) asked what particular nostrum had been proposed by the Opposition to relieve the country. But that is not the question at issue. The question arises out of the fact that the particular nostrum proposed by the Finance Minister and supported by the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) and all his friends, has brought this country to the condition in which it is, and it remains for them to give explanations as to how they are going to remedy that condition. I do not know that it would be a crime if a man honestly believed that annexation was preferable to the

existing state of things in this country. I do not believe in annexation myself.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It would only be high treason.

Mr. DAVIES. It may be high treason. I do not know that the statute of limitations runs against that crime, and if it does not it is time for the Prime Minister to prosecute some of his colleagues. Our memories are not so bad after all, and I think it is within the recollection of more than one hon. gentleman of this House that not many years ago certain gentlemen published a manifesto to the people of Canada, in which they declared that annexation was the one nostrum, as the hon. member for King's calls it, which would save this country. Who were these gentlemen who went about proclaiming that annexation should be accomplished by any and all means? Were they Grits? When I give the hon. gentleman, the Premier, the names, I hope he will make a memorandum of them, and if he will not prosecute them I hope, at any rate, he will not associate with them. The first name I find on the list is no less than that of Sir John Rose, who formerly held a high financial position in this country, who was in the Cabinet of the hon. gentleman, and who is now in England, where at times he assists us in our financial operations; then there is the name of an hon. gentleman who often beams on us from the opposite side, the hon. member from Argenteuil (Mr. Abbott). His name, if I mistake not, is appended to that memorial. Then there is the name of a gentleman who for some years back has, by the good will and votes of the Conservative party, occupied the high position of mayor of Montreal, no less a person than Jean Louis Beaudry, ex-mayor of Montreal, a Tory of the Tories, a Tory incarnate; he signed the manifesto, and through occupying the high position of mayor of Montreal, he has had occasion to come before the Prime Minister again and again, and though the hon. gentleman knows Mr. Beaudry is guilty of the crime of high treason, though he knows he can be convicted because his name has been fixed to this manifesto, yet there has been no prosecution. I fear the First Minister has been derelict in his duty in this matter. The name of another gentleman, a gentleman occupying a high position in the country and in the council of the hon. gentleman himself appears on this treasonable document. The old adage says, "a man is known by the company he keeps." Would it be believed that an hon. gentleman who has had the accolade laid across both shoulders by Her Majesty, who is associated with the right hon. gentleman at this moment as Minister of the Interior, affixed his name to this manifesto? He, too, is guilty of high treason, and yet the First Minister associates with him, although he knows he is a man disloyal to Her Majesty whose subject the right hon. gentleman so proudly professes to be. And that is not all. High in the councils of his country and standing high in the confidence of the Prime Minister is the Finance Minister, and I am told there exists a document signed by S. L. Tilley—whether he be the Finance Minister or not the hon. gentleman will be able to state—declaring in favor of this high treason, and pronouncing himself an annexationist. I hold in my hand a proclamation from which the following is an extract:—

"The time has come for this Province to address the Sovereign with an explicit declaration that unless relief be obtained, separation from the Empire and the independence of the North American colonies will be desirable and inevitable."

(Signed) S. L. TILLEY,
Secretary and Treasurer.

He held all the offices in the society. My hon. friend beside me says that he always does hold all the offices. He was then in high repute as a financier. He was treasurer of the society for the annexation of this Dominion to the United States, he was guilty of high treason; Mr. DAVIES.

he afterwards received the honors of knighthood from Her Majesty and sits in the councils of the right hon. the First Minister, and I have never heard him retract his disloyalty yet or regret his high treason. Now I want to know what the Prime Minister is going to do about it? It is an important question. It deserves his serious consideration, for we find that hon. gentlemen in the year of grace 1885 associating and consorting with, and daily taking into his confidence, these gentlemen who have declared themselves in favor of annexation and who, according to the hon. gentleman himself, are guilty of high treason. Will the member for King's (Mr. Foster) say whether they are Grits or not? I have a suspicion that he follows their lead, and I say that, until they retract their high treason, he is an accomplice in the crime.

The hon. gentleman has said, echoing the cry which comes from many of his colleagues, that the truth shall not be told in this matter of the real condition of Canada, or rather that it is desirable as far as possible to conceal the truth provided the statement of that truth prejudicially affects the country in which you live. That I understand to be the result of the hon. gentleman's statement.

Mr. FOSTER. The whole truth.

Mr. DAVIES. He says that proclaiming that there is such a thing as an exodus to the States it is calculated to injure the country, and that it should not be stated though it is the truth. He has gone further than anyone else and has denied the exodus, and, with his logical mind, he has laid before the House the reasons which have induced him to come to that conclusion. He says this country is more lightly taxed, that this is a better country for farmers to live in, that it is a better country for merchants to make their living in, and that it is absurd to imagine that people would leave this country and go to the United States, where there is more debt, more taxation, and less opportunity to make a livelihood than here. Therefore, having proved that this is a better country, having proved that there is less debt and that there is less taxation here, the statement that there is an exodus cannot be true, because the people would be fools to go away. No doubt he has satisfied his own mind that the logic is good; but what are the facts? I would re-echo the statement which my hon. friend from Brant has made historical, quoting from the elaborate report of the gentlemen appointed to enquire into our manufacturing interests, and I would say to my hon. friends: A truce to sentiment, let us have facts. What are the facts? It is a fact contained in the census report, a fact well known to the hon. gentleman, a fact which he could not shut his eyes to, a fact which he has heard repeated and has never heard challenged in this House, that in the United States there are 712,000 Canadians to-day, and yet he says there is no exodus. If that is so, what is the meaning of the language the Minister of Public Works used the other day. He is not a gentleman who usually indulges in any gasconade. I have found him a pretty practical gentleman, one who talks about practical subjects in a pretty practical way, but a short time ago he was lamenting in the most eloquent language that so many of his compatriots had left this country and gone to the United States. What did he say?

"But, gentlemen, our mission would be but half accomplished if we forgot that we have on the other side of latitude 45 a great number of our fellow countrymen who would like nothing better than to return home and sit down to the family table and eat with us, and to earn their living under the institutions now existing in Canada."

The member for King's has proved to a demonstration that, if they could have earned their living here they never would have gone away. The Minister of Public Works says they have gone. The member for King's has proved with his inexorable logic that they could not have gone. There must be something wrong in the logic or about the facts. Prob-

ably it is so much the worse for the facts. The Minister of Public Works continues :

"I need not say, gentlemen, that it is with the greatest satisfaction and pleasure that I am able to announce to you this evening that the Government of Canada intend to take measures, and energetic measures, to recall into the limits of our own territory all our fellow countrymen in the United States who desire to return and live with us. You will understand, gentlemen, that in a banquet like this I must be excused if I do not give all details of the ministerial measures that we propose to bring down next Session. But in any case, it is well you should know that our compatriots in the United States, whether they be of French origin or of any other origin, they are not forgotten, and all that can be done to bring them back to this country we shall do most heartily."

What position will the hon. member for King's take when this Government measure comes down to spend the money of the country and bring back the people from the States who, according to his logic, never went there at all? Will he back up the Government measure, or will he have the independence to act up to his convictions and say: I have proved that it is impossible that these people can have gone, and therefore I must vote against the expenditure? But in addition to those 712,000 Canadians, who, according to the census of the United States were living there in 1880, it has been proved beyond doubt, it has been admitted by the gentlemen on the other side that over 400,000 of our population have gone to the United States since. There is over a million of people who should have been in Canada, who are in Canada according to the hon. member for King's, for it is only a figment of the imagination to suppose that they are not here; but the trouble is they do not pay their taxes here and do not earn their living here; an ungrateful country has turned them off and they are now in the United States. But, if he wants more authority, I would call his attention to a paragraph which appeared in the organ of the hon. member from Montreal who, in a very loud and very eloquent speech addressed the House last night. I believe this is known as his organ, and at all events it endorses the views the hon. gentleman is pleased to enunciate, and holds him up, I believe, as a man of very high authority in this House. I find in the issue of that paper of March the 12th, no longer ago than yesterday, a paragraph headed "Departure of French Canadians." And this in the year of grace 1885, under the régime of the hon. gentleman, assisted by the Minister of Public Works, and supported by the member for King's—

"During the last week more than 100 Canadian families'—

That is 500 people—

"have left from the different districts of the Province of Quebec, and have gone to establish themselves in the United States or in the North-West."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. "Hear, hear," says the hon. member from North Perth (Mr. Hesson). Never sing out till you are out of the woods. Just wait till you hear the remainder of the paragraph, which is either penned by the member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) or published with his approval.

"Most of them, however, have gone to the United States, mostly to Illinois and Wisconsin."

And, worse and worse :

"Lots more are preparing to emigrate."

The hon. gentleman does not cheer that statement. Well, Sir, is it wise, I ask seriously, is it prudent, is it right, for the representatives of the people, with these facts staring them in the face, from all sources, from the census of the United States, from our own census, from the organs of the hon. gentlemen opposite, to shut their eyes to them and say: We do not believe them; or to indulge in some theories such as the hon. gentleman who spoke before dinner indulged in, to prove that they do not exist? No, Sir; our part as repre-

sentatives of the people and as statesmen will be to acknowledge the facts and try to find some remedy for them. I remember that in 1878 hon. gentlemen went on pilgrimages through this country from one end to the other, proclaiming that the country was being ruined because there was an emigration to the United States. Oh, it was right enough then; it was their duty to do it; honest souls, they could not shut their eyes to what was before them. Their hearts were bursting and bleeding for their poor country, and they were bound to tell the truth. But now that they are in power, now that the exodus is going on worse than ever before—fourfold greater than ever in the history of Canada, those gentlemen say: Hush! not a word. Don't injure your country. Don't be unpatriotic. Keep perfectly quiet; perhaps things will right themselves. No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way. We meet hon. gentlemen now with the statements that they made then. When they introduced their political nostrum, their National Policy; and made Canada a dearer country to live in than it used to be, we told them the result would be to drive the poor man out of this country to another country which was cheaper to live in. I am sorry to say, I regret it as a Canadian, I deeply regret that the financial positions of the two countries now, as compared with what they were sixteen or seventeen years ago, are such as to justify, to a great extent, the exodus of our people. Now, Sir, my hon. friend from King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) says there is no such thing in the country as discontent; that it is all one beautiful harmony from the east to the west, cemented by the iron rails that run from Halifax away to the Rocky Mountains; that everybody is happy, everybody is contented; that there is no truth in the statement that there is discontent; that it is simply the outs trying to get in, and there is no principle in it. Well, the hon. gentleman may believe that the whole of his opponents are actuated by motives of the worst kind. He may choose to believe that there is no such thing as principle in public life—he may know there is no such thing as principle, for aught I know. He may know his own mind, but he cannot know the minds of those who sit opposite to him. I say there is such a thing as principle. I say the members of the Opposition in this House and their supporters out of it have as great a stake in this country as the hon. gentlemen opposite, and they know it right well. This is our home, it is where our families are, where our all is, and we desire to make it a fine country in the future. But it is madness, it would be folly, the height of folly, to shut our eyes to the facts staring us on every side. Why, Sir, take the very city of St. John, that the hon. gentleman says he lives in. What did I see the other day? I find the business men of St. John meeting in that commercial centre as a board of trade. I have the names, but I am not going to weary the House by reading them—the names of the leading men of St. John, the leading commercial magnates of the commercial emporium of New Brunswick, the men who form public opinion there, who control the commerce of New Brunswick, I may say. I find them meeting in solemn conclave and formulating their views in a resolution expressing very different ideas from those which the hon. member wishes us to believe exist in their minds. I would take the liberty to quote that resolution :

"Resolved, That the boards of trade of the Maritime Provinces, and the Local Legislatures and Governments of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick be requested to take such steps as to them may seem right for the pressing upon Parliament and the Government at Ottawa the need there is that the foreign and intercolonial trade of these Provinces should not be allowed to be injured by such adverse action as can be avoided, and that such steps should be taken by the Maritime Provinces as may enable them to exercise more influence at Ottawa upon the course of legislation and executive action than hitherto we have been able to; and that as far as this board has power to express its opinion, it declares, irrespective of political parties, that since the union of these Provinces the just expectations of the Maritime Provinces have not been realized, and dissatisfaction with the union has become a general sentiment among the people, who desire a remedy

under, rather than against, the constitution, and whose loyalty to the Crown and respect for the laws of the country is the only reason why stronger and more unmistakeable action has not been taken in the matter.'

Sir, that language is strong and to the point, and I think it is true.

Mr. FOSTER. How many signed it?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman opposite has not reflected in any sense the opinion of the commercial public of St. John, or of the people of New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. How many signed it?

Mr. DAVIES. I am glad the hon. gentleman asked me the question, because my answer will enable the House to gauge exactly the public opinion of St. John. There were twenty-four merchants present; sixteen voted in favor of the resolution I have read, and eight voted against it. What does the hon. gentleman say to that?

An hon. MEMBER. All Grits, were they not?

Mr. DAVIES. Well, I have looked over the names; I happen to know some of the gentlemen. I do not live so far away that I do not know the leading merchants there, and I tell the hon. gentleman that some of the strongest Conservatives in St. John voted for that resolution, and the hon. gentleman knows it well.

Mr. FOSTER. Who?

Mr. DAVIES. I will hand the paper across the floor, if the hon. gentleman wishes to see it. It is not necessary to take up the time of the House by reading the names.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Names, names.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. member can take the paper. Any hon. gentleman who wishes the names can take the paper and see them for himself. Now, Mr. Speaker, I find this resolution declaring in unmistakeable terms that dissatisfaction has become a general sentiment among the people, and I find a vote of two to one in the commercial centre of New Brunswick in favor of that resolution. I find these facts recorded in the public press and forwarded to the members at Ottawa, and yet the hon. gentleman does not hesitate to stand up and say there is not a word of truth in the whole statement, that the merchants of St. John have been guilty of deception, that they have been guilty of more than deception—of deliberate lying—that is what it comes to; that they have not expressed in any way or sense the opinion of the people. Now the hon. gentleman went on to show further, that everything in the sky was lovely, that the prospects were delightful, and the existing state of things were everything that could be desired. I have had handed to me to-day a copy of Bradstreet's report, issued in the month of January, giving the report of the failures in the United States and Canada during the past year—I may say during the past five years. I would like hon. gentlemen to take note of the figures, for they speak louder than any mere words can speak, and they point to a conclusion very different from that which the hon. member's rosy speech would lead us to believe exists. I find that in 1880, in this Dominion, there were 907 failures, with liabilities of \$7,900,000; in 1881, 635 failures, with liabilities of \$5,751,000; in 1882, 797 failures, with liabilities of \$3,587,000; in 1883, 1,384 failures, with liabilities of \$15,940,000; and in the last year, 1884, 1,327 failures, with liabilities approaching \$20,000,000.

Mr. HESSON. What were the failures in the Grit régime?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman and his friends have given them often enough. They have been read from every platform in the Dominion; they have been the political stock-in-trade, and the only political stock-in-trade, of some

Mr. DAVIES.

hon. gentlemen for years. Why, Sir, it is not a matter of dispute. We know that in 1877-78 there was a great depression, not only in Canada, but over the whole commercial world. We admit there were failures in Canada, as there were failures in the United States, and as there were failures in Great Britain. We never sought to deny it. But our position at that time was this: We said that commercial depression was the result of natural causes, which were pointed out from time to time, and that mere Acts of Parliament, mere resolutions of the people's representatives, could not remedy that state of affairs, and that time was the only remedy for it. But they said, no; we can remedy it by Acts of Parliament. The hon. gentleman opposite denied to-night that they had said so. He issued a challenge, and assuming a theatrical position and raising his voice, he challenged any hon. gentleman on this side to come forward and give one single statement from any authorised leader of the party to the effect that they had declared they could remedy the then depression by Acts of Parliament, could make a country by Acts of Parliament more prosperous than it was. He issued that challenge not once, but two or three times. I accept the challenge, and I tell him we can do it. I tell him more, that they carried this country, not only by promises of the kind to which I have referred, but by other promises, which they have not kept and have not attempted to keep, but which they are to-day repudiating. I remember when Sir Charles Tupper, who will be acknowledged to have held as high a status in the party at least as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), who had as much to do with the formulation of the National Policy as the hon. member for King's, or any hon. member on that side—I remember when Sir Charles Tupper went through the country, previous to the elections of 1878, and declared what the policy was and what remedies were to be proposed, in case the party were elected, to remove the distress. I remember his coming to Charlottetown and speaking there for a length of time. I remember, among other promises he made to catch the people of the Maritime Provinces and induce them to vote for the National Policy, was, that within two years they would give us reciprocity with the United States; and I say, and I say it deliberately and with a thorough knowledge of the views of a large section of the people of the Maritime Provinces, that these promises, reiterated as they were on every hustings, with all the solemnity and force that the hon. gentleman could give to his words, had as much to do, if not more to do, with returning the party to power than anything else which occurred. Hon. gentlemen opposite came into power on the strength of those promises, and they have repudiated them. They have betrayed the people who placed trust in their promises, and to-day, with this policy, we are further away from reciprocal trade with the United States, and they wish us to be further away than our people were in 1878. I quoted this language, which I shall read, in the presence of Sir Charles Tupper in this House, and he accepted it as correct. On the occasion to which I refer, that gentleman said:

"All you have to do to-day is to support the protective National Policy of Sir John A. Macdonald, in order to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States within two years."

Mr. WOODWORTH. What year was that?

Mr. DAVIES. In 1878, in the drill shed at Charlottetown, when there were between two and three thousand people present. That declaration and certain telegrams which came down from the leader of the Government, to the effect that taxation would not be increased, had much to do with their success at the polls.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). What carried the last election?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. The colonisation companies and the Gerrymandering Bill.

Mr. DAVIES. We will see whether any leader of the party was guilty of the offence which the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) declared no leader was guilty of, namely, that of making what he called a puerile declaration. I hope some of the friends of Sir Charles Tupper will defend the character of that gentleman. The hon. member for King's said it would be puerile to declare that by Act of Parliament a Government could bring about commercial prosperity or commercial distress. We have been teaching hon. gentlemen opposite for years that doctrine; it has been one of the political platforms of the party, that mere Acts of Parliament cannot bring about commercial prosperity. What said Sir Charles Tupper in 1878, and I would not repeat it if we had not been challenged by the hon. member for King's. Sir Charles Tupper said, as reported in *Hansard*:

"The hon. gentleman ought to know that if Governments are good for anything, they are good to increase the prosperity of the country by Acts of Parliament."

Why do hon. gentlemen opposite not do it? There is distress now, there is depression now, from one end of the country to the other; where is the Act of Parliament? Bring it along; let us see it. But hon. gentlemen opposite know they are powerless, that they are flies on the wheel. They have to-day to accept the political axiom laid down by the hon. member for Centre Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright); they have to adopt that in the sense of which he used the words, that Parliaments are powerless to remove great depressions of trade; Parliaments are powerless by means of Acts of Parliament to bring about commercial prosperity. Talk about political planks in a platform. What plank could the hon. member for King's have laid down firmer and stronger than the declaration of the gentleman who was second in command in the Government, a declaration given in his vigorous language, which cannot be misunderstood and which has no double meaning. He goes on to say, at page 556 of *Hansard*:

"The hon. gentleman [myself, I suppose] says that the prosperity of the country cannot be obtained and promoted by Acts of Parliament. We deny it. We say that you may make the very taxation necessary to sustain the public credit by meeting the interest on the public debt and discharging the ordinary administration of public affairs, a means of so fostering our industries as to give to the people the money that is required in order to pay the taxes."

Let hon. gentlemen opposite admit they have changed their views; let them say that those declarations were puerile, as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) calls them, and then we meet on common ground. Perhaps we may even pardon some of their past transgressions if they come acknowledging their sins. Sir Charles Tupper further said:

"The policy the Government has pursued has had the effect of depopulating the country."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman says "hear, hear." Then why do you continue it? Here is a document issued by the Finance Minister, a report of gentlemen who visited every town in the Maritime Provinces, who say there is great depression, depression in this branch of trade and in the other. Why do hon. gentlemen not bring in an Act to restore prosperity? What is the use of a platform if you do not act on it, and when you bring part of it forward it is so musty as not to be worth anything? Either acknowledge you are wrong and say you deceived the country, or bring in an Act and fulfil your pledges. These remarks had to be made in answer to the hon. gentleman's challenge. If they had not been made, hon. gentlemen opposite would have risen in their seats and said that although the challenge has been given, we had refused to accept it. Then, Sir Charles Tupper goes on to say:

"It has sent away the most skilled and intelligent labor, the finest sons of Canada, to a foreign country, to obtain the employment their own country denies them."

He said, in effect, that the then Government did not do anything by Act of Parliament, and the consequence was that the country was depressed. Apply the same reasoning now. The country is being depopulated in a ratio four times as great as then; and by your own showing you are the cause of it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are directly responsible, by their own reasoning, for the work of depopulation that is now going on. Sir Charles Tupper said:

"That is a fatal policy, and one which must induce us to forego all our aspirations for anything like a rapidly increased greatness for this country in the future, and to consent to become hewers of wood and drawers of water for our friends across the line in the great Republic of the United States."

This is a fatal policy, and still you are going to pursue it. Hon. gentlemen, so far as Acts of Parliament are concerned, are to remain inactive when they should fulfil their pledges; they called for Acts of Parliament then. It did very well in opposition to make that declaration; but now the member for King's declares that no responsible person ever used such language, and that if he did, it was puerile. It is too late to make that declaration now, for hon. gentlemen opposite rode into power on the strength of their promises, and they must either fulfil them or retract them.

Now, Sir, I will make one further remark on the argument of that hon. gentleman, and one only—an argument to which the Finance Minister has given his *imprimatur* and which he has endorsed several times—that the best evidence that there is prosperity exists in the figures respecting the savings banks. I do not accept that as conclusive evidence that the country is prosperous; I do not accept it as very cogent evidence that the country is prosperous. I contend, Sir, that the fact that money is being hoarded up in the savings banks at 4 per cent. to the extent and in the mode in which it is hoarded up, is evidence, not of prosperity, but of depression in commercial circles. It is an evidence that there is not that demand for money in paying channels which justifies the people in taking it out of the savings banks. The hon. member may laugh, but it would be better for him to answer the argument instead of laughing. I have great respect for the hon. gentleman, although I think he is somewhat bigoted in his views, but I call attention to one period, and I think they will not deny that if, in the most prosperous period in this country's history, there were not increased deposits in the saving banks, it will show that they are not correct in arguing that large deposits are a sign of prosperity. What are the facts? Take the years 1872-73-74, and I think it will be acknowledged that we never had such prosperous times. It is universally acknowledged that we were on the wave of prosperity, that a boom existed from one end of the country to the other. Were the deposits in the savings banks, at 4 per cent., increased during those years? No, they were not; and the reason was that money was in demand for profitable use in commercial circles, and men would not put their money in the banks at 4 per cent. if they could make 6, 7, and 8 per cent. in reasonable commercial ventures. In 1872 the deposits in the savings banks were \$3,096,000; in 1873, \$3,207,000, and in 1874, \$3,204,000. Those are the figures and those are the years, and if hon. gentlemen are correct in stating that increased deposits in savings banks are evidence of prosperity, then they will have to ignore or repudiate the fact that the three years I have named, when the deposits did not increase, were prosperous years. They were prosperous years, and the amount in the banks did not increase, and therefore the fact that they have increased since is no evidence that the times are good. But I give the hon. gentleman another evidence. Does he remember, a few years ago, when the leader of the Irish party rose in the House of Commons and, backed by a number of his friends, told the Government of the day that Ireland was in great distress? Does he remember that the leader of the Govern-

ment told them that starvation and famine were imminent, and does he remember the reply that came from the ministerial benches? It was said: That statement cannot be true, because the deposits in the savings banks are increasing. The very same evidence was pointed out, but the facts that depression and starvation were impending were true nevertheless, and before another year rolled by gaunt famine stared the people of Ireland in the face, and this Parliament rose to the occasion and sent a contribution of \$100,000, I believe, to assist in getting bread for that starving people. At that time the deposits in the savings banks had run up to an unprecedented amount. What was the cause of it? The simple cause was, that there was not that confidence in the commerce of the country which justified the people in going into commercial ventures, and they preferred to hoard their money in the savings banks at 3 or 4 per cent. interest. I say this, that speaking my own mind, it is not conclusive evidence, it is not cogent evidence of the existence of prosperity, that these sums on deposit are mounting up as they are. I tell hon. gentlemen, those of them that come from the Maritime Provinces, at any rate, that we know, every one of us knows, it to be a fact that these savings banks deposits are not the savings of the laboring classes at all, to any appreciable extent. They are the moneys belonging to trustees, to well-to-do farmers and others, to lawyers and those kinds of people. We know that the laboring classes do not, to any appreciable extent, deposit in them. People can get 4 per cent. there, and we know that money has been withdrawn from the ordinary banks of the country, when they reduced the interest to 3 per cent., and put into the savings banks, which allow them 1 per cent. higher. Any hon. gentleman knows that no man would be foolish enough to leave his money in the ordinary chartered banks at 3 per cent. when he can get 4 per cent., with a Government guarantee, in the savings banks. I say that the savings banks returns do not bear out the conclusions which hon. gentlemen have urged they do.

Now, I propose to say a word or two with reference to the speech delivered by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. That hon. gentleman complained of the Opposition very seriously. He says a few years ago you denounced the Government because by their policy those who invested money in manufactories were drawing enormous dividends, and to-day you denounce them because they are not getting any dividends at all. He says you are inconsistent. Surely that hon. gentleman cannot have forgotten that the very effects that have followed the carrying out of this policy were foretold by the leaders of the Reform party, by the free traders of this country. They told him, time and time again, if you offer a premium to place capital in certain lines of business you will draw to those lines of business a larger amount than should legitimately go there, and the result will be that the first-comers who go into the business will derive large profits, and when more money is invested in those lines of business than they will justify, and when the result is over-production, the profits will be dissipated. Those who went in first will, perhaps, make large fortunes, and those who go in afterwards will get nothing at all, and so it has been. It is always the case. If you offer a high premium to induce capital to go into a certain line of business you are sure to get more capital into that business than it will justify. And so it has followed here. We have had two results. Capital went into cotton mills and sugar mills, and at first they were making 10, 20, 30, 40 and 50 per cent., but now there has been over-production when more capital went in than the business would justify, more spindles have been put in the mills than they required, more cotton was produced than could be consumed, and the results are depression, stagnation, the next thing to ruin—no dividends; and to-day many who have invested their money in cotton mills find that the fine promises made to them have not been kept, and while those who went

Mr. DAVIES.

in first got 40 per cent., to-day they cannot get 5. But the hon. gentleman must not conclude from that that there is any inconsistency in our argument. I say that the two things follow each other as the natural consequence of their policy. Then the hon. gentleman goes on to say that over-production has not been caused by the policy of the Government, but by the speeches of the Opposition. Well, Sir, I never heard such nonsense uttered in my life. How can the speeches of the Opposition cause over-production? Over-production has been caused by having more capital in business than the consumption of the country justified. You cannot compete with foreign markets; it has been proved here by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) and others, that your exports of manufactures are not increasing; you cannot compete abroad. It costs too much, under your policy, to make the goods; you are confined to the home market; you have over-stocked the home market, and the result is ruin—unemployed or unremunerative capital locked up. The tall chimneys which once emitted volumes of smoke are no longer active; the hum which the hon. gentleman found from one end of the Dominion to the other is silent; he takes no pilgrimages to-day to find out the truth for himself; his ear does not listen to the sweet hum of industry now, but he sends his friend, Mr. Willis, down to the Provinces, and he finds stagnation and depression. He thinks trade will revive. People, he says, are foolish to imagine, like Sir Charles Tupper, that Acts of Parliament can build up business; they were very foolish to put so much capital into the business, and they are now reaping the reward of their folly. No, Sir; they are reaping the reward of the folly of the Government, who induced them to put faith in a policy that offered a premium to those who invested their money in these manufactories. The result is, as I say, that many of the factories are shut up, and others are working at half or two-thirds time. Let the hon. gentleman go through the Province of New Brunswick to-day, and what will he find? Take his own report. His agent was sent out for the purpose of seeing if he could not find the hum. He found it only in a few instances; he found it very weak—only a little squeak, in some places. But the hon. Minister of Marine waxed indignant over the remark that was made on this side of the House, that his Government were not the friends of the workingmen. The best evidence he said that could be given that they were, was that they continued to pay 4 per cent. interest on deposits in the savings banks. That is assuming that the deposits are those of workingmen. I say that is not so, as regards the Maritime Provinces at any rate. But what was the policy of these hon. gentlemen towards the workingmen when they got into power? They had hardly got themselves safely and snugly ensconced into their seats on the Treasury benches before they issued an edict cutting down the salary of every workingman on the Intercolonial Railway and on the Prince Edward Island Railway. For fear that any man would get paid for bur-nishing the brass on the engines, they actually sent out an order that it should be painted with tar. That is the kindness they exhibited towards the workingman. The workingman may well say: Save me from such friends as the Minister of Marine and his colleagues. Sir, the hon. Minister waxed very eloquent—he does not speak often, but when he does he always waxes eloquent—over the fact that there was a large debt in the United States after the civil war, and that there was nothing left to show for it but the dead soldiers and the white tombstones that marked their last resting-places. I hope, Sir, that his remarks will be read not only in this country but across the border, so that the people of the United States may see what an intelligent appreciation some of our public men have of that brave struggle in which they engaged for so many years and out of which they came triumphant. I think most of the people in the United States believe that there was more left to them than the bodies of the dead soldiers and the white tombstones over

their graves. I think the hon. gentleman will find that a great country arose out of that war—the greatest republic of ancient or modern times. I think he will find that one of the results of that war was the blotting out of the great curse of slavery, which was for many years such a drag on that great country. Yes, Sir, if that war did nothing else than to make all men, as their Declaration of Independence says, free and equal before the law; if it did nothing else than abolish the curse of slavery, and weld all those great States into one great nation, it would be worth double the money they spent on it. The hon. gentleman is very narrow-sighted or weak-sighted, or he must have read history backwards, to speak in the way he did of that great struggle. I do not propose to deal further with any of the remarks of that hon. gentleman.

I will, for a few moments, call the attention of the House to some facts and figures—and I shall be very short in doing so—which make me, Sir, at any rate, consider the situation in this country as a very grave situation—a situation so grave and so serious that a mere speech is not going to dissipate the gloom which hangs over it—a situation so grave and serious, Sir, as to call for the thoughtful consideration of the best men on both sides of the House and in the country. I remember that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) the other day rose and said that after hearing the speech of the Finance Minister he felt as if a weight had been taken off his shoulders—that he felt somewhat reassured; and why? Because, he said, he, in common with a great many people in this country, after reading the speeches of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), had come to the conclusion that this country was in a very bad plight—had come to the conclusion that we were doubling our taxation and debt at a rate unprecedented in the history of any other colony—had come to the conclusion that, in the brief language used the other day by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), the time had come when we should call halt. I want to call attention to the facts and figures which so startled the hon. member for Pictou, and as he tells us, a large number of his constituents. The statement of the hon. member for South Huron was so serious that I repeat it. It was that this country could only thrive and become prosperous and great if it could succeed in inducing a large portion of the emigration from the old country to come and settle here permanently; that it could only do so by showing to them that this was a cheap country to live in, where a man could get an honest day's wage for an honest day's toil; and he said that was the kind of country it was some years ago. He said that seventeen years ago, as compared with the country to the south, which is absorbing so much immigration, Canada occupied a splendid position. In 1867 the United States emerged from the civil war with a debt of \$2,500,000,000 upon its shoulders—a debt of \$69 per head, with 36,000,000 of a population in the country—a debt great enough to make the strongest mind almost despair of the future of his country; while at that very time Canada, young, buoyant, hopeful, was bounding forward on the path of progress with the comparatively small debt of \$75,000,000, or \$22.50 per head, with a population of 3,400,000; and he pointed to the fact that the balance was so much in our favor that wherever it was known, those who were seeking new homes, where they and their children after them might live permanently, preferred to come to a low-taxed country and one cheap to live in, and with a debt so much less than that of the country to the south. He called attention to the fact that in the year 1884 all that has been reversed, and that while they have reduced their \$2,500,000,000 debt to \$1,438,000,000, or \$25.39 per head, Canada, by the 1st of next July, will have a debt of at least \$240,000,000, or nearly \$50 a head.

Mr. HESSON. Did they raise it by free trade?

Mr. DAVIES. The hon. gentleman should understand that there is free trade over a greater area of country in that great confederacy of nations than almost anywhere else in the world. From the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the border line of Canada down to the Gulf of Mexico, there is not a Custom house existing. The trade between one State and another is free and untrammelled, and were it not so, that country could never have attained to the pitch of greatness which it has attained. We are not now entering into an investigation of that subject. In discussing the serious fact which I have just stated, that the relative positions of Canada and the United States have been entirely reversed within the last seventeen years, and that this country has now a debt per head nearly double that of the United States, I would like to ask the hon. member this question: If he were an intelligent artisan or farmer going to make a home for himself in the west, would he choose the country that is rapidly reducing its debt or go to the country that has trebled its debt in the space of seventeen years?

Mr. HESSON. Do you want an answer?

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. A million of Canadians have, unhappily, already given it.

Mr. DAVIES. I suppose that the hon. gentleman's answer would be that he remains here; but as the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) pertinently remarks, a million of Canadians have taken the opposite view, and have gone over to the States in that time. Yes, a million; I will repeat it; these facts cannot be repeated too often; it takes a good deal of repetition to get a fact into some people's heads: 720,000 Canadians are in the United States, according to the census of 1830; 400,000 of our population have gone over since; that makes a total of 1,100,000. Those facts call for serious attention. It will not do to brush them away with a waive of the hand; and there are other facts in that connection that require to be considered. A few years ago everybody hoped that our progress would be steadily forward. We had every reason to hope so. The statement was made, and I believe it to be correct, that we have a great heritage, that we have a glorious future before us; and I believe there would be millions more people in the country now but for the mismanagement of hon. gentlemen opposite. We were told that we had a great heritage in the North-West, we were told that millions of acres were waiting the plough of the immigrant; we were told that our country must go ahead. I must say that I believe those gentlemen had faith at the time; I believe that they were in earnest; I believe, although their predictions turned out to be incorrect, that they were confident there were going to be millions of people in the country; and one secret of the reckless extravagance that has marked the expenditure of this country during the past five years is that hon. gentlemen opposite, five years ago, expected that by to-day there would be millions more people in the North-West. They unfortunately have been disappointed, their extravagance was not checked, the people did not come in to make up for it; and the result is depression and gloom, not only throughout the North-West, but throughout all parts of Canada. What has been the increase of the population of the country? Are we going on, not only adding our natural increase to our population, but bringing in fresh immigration? The outlook is a sad one, but it is true that we are relatively going back. What are the facts? In 1871 we had 3,481,000 people in the Dominion, according to the census; in 1881 we had 4,044,000 or an increase of 553,000. Let any hon. gentleman take the percentage of natural increase referred to by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) 2 per cent. per year, and he will find that in that decade this country, instead of increasing only 553,000, should have increased 697,000, by the ordinary natural increase; so that, as a mat-

ter of fact, during the decade from 1871 to 1881, as was shown by the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), we have lost actually 138,553 people from the natural increase we should have had. And, this remember, is altogether irrespective of the hundreds of thousands of immigrants whom we paid to come to this country. That is a very serious fact. When we come to examine the census of each country, the United States and Canada, we find that one man out of every six born in Canada is now in the United States. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries said we had as many Americans on this side, relatively to their population. That is not so. We have only one out of every 570 people born in the United States; we have 77,753 Americans in this country, or one out of every 570, while in the United States they have one out of six of our population. We find our population not only stationary but going back; we find our people not only not remaining in this country but emigrating to the United States; we find that after an expenditure of millions and millions of dollars to open up the North-West, with its large areas of land to be brought into cultivation, with the millions of bushels of grain to be grown or about to be grown there—we find that the volume of our trade to-day is not as great as it was in 1873. In 1873 the volume of our trade was \$217,800,000; to-day, instead of its having advanced by leaps and bounds, as we had a right to expect, and as I do not hesitate to say, it would have, had there been ordinary prudence exercised in the management of affairs in the North-West, had there not been reckless extravagance shown in the administration of our affairs, the volume of our trade is but \$207,873,000. More than that; not only has the volume of our trade not increased, not only is our population decreasing in the sense that we are not keeping our natural increase, but we find also that the exports of our own products have remained stationary, when they should have gone on almost doubling in this period. Do hon. members remember that last Session, when we were asked to sanction the expenditure of some \$22,000,000 as a gift to the huge monopoly of the Canadian Pacific Railway, that the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Railways, who proposed the grant, made a startling calculation, by which he proved that—I don't know how many millions on millions of bushels of grain would be grown in the North-West—if we could only get a certain number of immigrants into the country who would cultivate each so many acres—640,000,000 bushels was the figure he gave. The number was so great that I don't think one man in a thousand could appreciate it. What are the facts to-day? The Government tied up the country; they refused to let immigrants go on the land; they tied up the best homestead land; they harassed the people with regulations on regulations; they drove the people out of the country to a poorer country, I believe to the south, where they are not harassed by these regulations, and the result is, to-day our exports have remained stationary when they should have increased by leaps and bounds.

I heard an hon. gentleman opposite, and must ask pardon of the reading men of the House for referring to the fact, point out that England, the great commercial emporium of the world, is not progressing in the same ratio as other countries; that, as the result of her free trade policy, poor England is becoming crippled; and the paupers of England are increasing, says the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper), and there is dire distress in Clerkenwell and Marylebone and other districts in London. I was surprised at such an argument from a member of a learned profession. It would be bad enough coming from an ignorant man, but the hon. gentleman ought to know better. Let him take up any of the statistics published in England and he will find that pauperism is decreasing, that crime is decreasing, that the mass of the people are better fed, better clothed, and better paid to-day than they ever were in the past history of Great Britain. He will find figures which will almost startle him.

Mr. DAVIES.

He will find that the total trade of that country has not remained stationary, as perhaps it might be supposed in an old country like England to have remained; he will find that, instead of remaining stationary, as Canada has, she has gone forward by steady bounds until to-day the statements of her total trade can hardly be understood when it is mentioned. I find that in 1867 the total trade of England was £501,000,000, or \$2,505,000,000. In 1882, instead of remaining stationary, as ours has done, the total trade had gone up to £720,000,000, or \$3,600,000,000; and I call the hon. gentleman's attention to this important fact that, of the total imports of that country, 91 per cent. consists of raw materials, and barely 9 per cent. of manufactured articles; while, in contrast with that, 92 per cent. of her exports consists of manufactured goods, and only 8 per cent. of raw material, and that raw material is chiefly coke, coal and pig iron. These figures speak volumes. All the talk in the world will not lead to conclusions as clear as these facts and figures, which show that, while this young country, possessing millions of acres awaiting the plough of the immigrant endowed with youth and hope and energy, and with a finer population, I believe, than England is endowed with, is remaining almost stationary, the old country is going ahead, until she is mistress of the seas, not only in a naval sense, but commercially. Her flag floats on every sea; she enjoys a monopoly of the carrying trade of the world, and has swept the flag of protective nations almost off the seas. They talk about the protective tariff in the United States. What are the facts? The facts are that, in spite of a tariff which is almost prohibitory, they imported last year £31,000,000, or \$155,000,000 worth of the manufactured goods of England. They may put on their tariff as much as they like, but the free trade country, that has cheap food and enables its products to be manufactured cheaply, can send \$155,000,000 worth of her manufactures and undersell the people of the United States in their own markets. The hon. member for Pictou says that the poor people in England are getting poorer. I will recommend to his attention a little pamphlet which I wish he and other members on the other side would read, written by a distinguished political economist, Mr. Mongredien. It is a small pamphlet of only a hundred pages, but you will find from it that the poor people in England have better food and that the purchasing power of their wages enables them to buy double the quantity of food they did ten years ago. I may be pardoned for reading the figures in regard to five articles. In 1871 they consumed per head of bacon 1.38 lbs., and in 1877 8 lbs.; of wheat and flour they consumed per head 150 lbs. in 1871, and 203 lbs. in 1877; of raw sugar they consumed per head 41 lbs. in 1871, and 54 lbs. in 1877; of tea per head 3.92 lbs. in 1871, and 4½ lbs. in 1877; and of tobacco 1.36 lbs. in 1871, and 1.49 lbs. in 1877. Here we see that this coarse, good food—leaving out the article of tobacco—bacon, and wheat, and flour, and sugar, are consumed per head in double the quantities in England to-day that they were ten years ago. The wages of the English workman enable him to buy better and more food for himself and his family than he could ten years ago. Can you say as much for Canada to-day? I say you cannot. You cannot show me another country where such results have been produced in the same space of time. Then we remember very well that before 1860 the United States, in her shipping, competed with England on every sea, that the Union Jack and the Stars and Stripes were rivals for the carrying trade of the world. The war came, and after the war came the protective tariff, and by whom is the carrying trade done now? Where is the Stars and Stripes now? It is almost confined to the coasting trade and the inland waters of that great country, and the millions and millions of profits belonging to that traffic are flowing into that little isle, that gem of the sea, that free trade England.

Before I close, I want to express my regret that a very important industry in this country has been overlooked by hon. gentlemen opposite. I did not expect, perhaps, when the Finance Minister addressed the House, that he would have deemed it his duty to refer to it; but I thought, when some of the maritime gentlemen rose, representing shipping ports and the shipping interest, that then we should have had some reference to it. A year or two ago, before the National Policy had developed itself, I remember that reference was made to the shipping interest. They were not ashamed of it then, but to-day they are ashamed to refer to the statistics of one of the largest interests of this Dominion—the shipping interest. As they have not done it, I will remind them of it. I have extracted some figures from the Trade and Navigation Returns. When the Minister of Marine, the gentleman who controls that Department of Government, who should be cognisant of the facts, and who, through his Deputy, has sent us a report of the shipping, rose in his place to address the House, and, through the House, to address the country, I thought we should have heard from him something about the great shipping industry of this country. Is it increasing in volume, or not? What remedy was he going to propose to stop its decay? They had an Act of Parliament for everything a year or two ago; where is their Act now? Hon. members will remember how proud, and how justly proud, every Canadian was, a few years ago, of the fact that Canada stood fourth in the commercial world as the owner of shipping—fourth among all the nations of the world. We were proud of it and we were never weary of proclaiming it at home and abroad. What is the fact to-day? I find that, in 1873, we had 6,783 vessels, of a tonnage of 1,073,718 tons. I find that, from that year, when that dreadful Grit Government, led by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), was in power, that tonnage continued to steadily increase year by year until, in the year 1878, it reached the enormous figures of 7,469 vessels and 1,333,015 tons, an increase in that period of time of 686 vessels and 259,297 tons. Now I find, by the report the Minister of Marine brings down, that the value of that tonnage is \$30 per ton. I find that that industry alone, in the years between 1873 and 1878, increased in value \$7,778,000. It was something to be proud of. It was a steady increase that went on from year to year. Sir, what is the tale that we have to tell to-day? Has that increase and that prosperity continued? Has it remained even stationary? Are we to-day, so far as our shipping interests are concerned, holding the same position relatively to the other nations that we held when the abominable Grit Government went out of power? I am sorry to say it is not the case. I am sorry to say that since the National Policy came in that industry has been steadily decreasing from year to year, until, in 1884, we find the number of vessels have decreased to 7,254, and the tonnage to 1,253,747, or a decrease of 215 vessels and of 79,270 tons, of a value of \$2,378,100. We went on increasing by 259,000 tons and nearly \$8,000,000 in value between 1873 and 1878, and we have been steadily decreasing since 1879 down to the present time. We find the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries making a report which the Minister himself was very glad to shy clear of when he rose in his place, and for fear he did not read his own Deputy's report I will read an extract from it:

"The total number of vessels remaining on register books of the Dominion, on 31st December, 1884, including old and new vessels, sailing vessels, steamers and barks, was 7,254, measuring 1,253,747 tons register tonnage, being a decrease of 120 vessels and 13,647 tons register as compared with 1883. The number of steamers on register books on same date was 1,073, with a gross tonnage of 207,669. Assuming the average value to be \$30 per ton, the value of the registered tonnage of Canada, on 30th December last, would be \$37,612,410."

If it had gone on progressing at the same ratio as it did previous to 1878, instead of the value being \$30,000,000, as it is to-day, it would have really been \$40,000,000. Now, Sir, still looking at the ship-building industries, we find that

in 1874 we built 496 vessels, with a tonnage of 190,756. I will not read the figures for each year, but there was a steady increase up to 1878, marking a steady business, a business built upon a good foundation, and at the end of 1878 I find we had 2,163 vessels built during the five years; making an average per year—as the hon. Finance Minister is fond of averages, I will give him the average for these five years—of 433 vessels, or 139,000 tons per year, or an average yearly value of \$5,560,000, and a total value of \$28,000,000 for the five years. Well, Sir, since they came into power, what have they done? The country has only built 1,922 vessels, or 320 per year, as against 433 per year in the previous term; and 70,228 tons, as against 139,000 tons each year in the previous term; an average value per year of \$2,800,000, as against an average value of \$5,560,000 in the years preceding. Now, it must be remembered that this industry was in the main an industry of the Maritime Provinces, an investment for the money of the people of these Provinces. The National Policy asked them to do—what? It asked them to withdraw their money from the shipping and invest it in the cotton interest and in the sugar interest. They did so, and to-day they find themselves deceived. Instead of earning the profits they once did in their shipping, to-day they see their cotton mills are idle, their sugar refineries are idle, and their money invested is making no return.

Now, Sir, there is another thing I would mention. I wanted to hear from the Government what progress they were making on the great question which is agitating the Maritime Provinces—the question of reciprocity. I find them silent as the grave. The hon. gentleman repeated the statement—I suppose he spoke on the authority of the Minister of Finance—that the policy they were going to pursue was a do-nothing policy. Well, Sir, they are going to be flies on the wheel as regards reciprocity. But, he asks, why did the Maritime Provinces require it so much? I will tell him, Sir. Because, under reciprocity the commerce of the Maritime Provinces flourished as it never flourished since; because under that reciprocity treaty the Maritime Provinces grew comparatively rich; because they found a ready market for their produce; and because to-day they have not got such a market. And more than that, Sir: because the existence of these trade relations cemented the bonds of union, amity and good feeling which existed, and ought to exist, and which I hope will long continue to exist, between this country and our great neighbors to the south. We want it because it removed the causes of discord, because it put us in a position where we were reasonably assured there never would be any breach of the peace between us and our neighbors to the south. I will tell you another reason why we want this Government to act. We say it is treason to the people of the Maritime Provinces to remain inactive now, because at the present time, of all others, we have a better prospect of obtaining reciprocity; because the fishery treaty is about expiring, and because we know that complications must inevitably ensue unless some new treaty is negotiated. Do you tell me, Sir, that 100, or 200, or, as in old times I have seen myself, 300 American vessels can go down fishing upon the shores of the Maritime Provinces and that you are going to keep them beyond the three-mile limit? You may do it? You may do what the hon. member for Pictou asked you to do; you may carry out as vigorous a policy as you like, and spend as much money as you like, but you will only keep out the Americans from those fishing grounds by the expenditure of a great deal of money and after creating a great deal of discord and a great deal of ill-feeling and animosity. Sir, a vigorous policy will be necessary, I do not deny it, if you do not negotiate a new treaty. But we are willing to share with them and give them our waters, provided we can get proper commercial relations with them. That is what I believe nine-tenths of the intelligent men of the Maritime Provinces

want. We want a market for our fish ; we want a market for our natural productions, and we must have it, or we become poorer every year ; and, I am sorry to say, we are becoming poorer in the cities of the Maritime Provinces. The markets of the United States are our natural markets. We want those markets for our potatoes, our fish, our pelts, our timber, our produce, our animals, and for our coal too. For everything we grow and are prepared to sell, we find our natural markets in the United States, and we do not want to be told, in language which, I say, amounts to an insult to the people, that this Government are prepared to act as flies on the wheel, in regard to this vital question ; that they propose to do nothing at all, because, forsooth, they are afraid of their dignity. What nonsense. The people to the south of us in the United States are a commercial people, they are a sensible people. Why, such action is worthy of one of those petty German princes who will not go into a room until he has studied a certain amount of etiquette, lest he should make a mistake as to the number of bows he ought to make. The people of Canada are not afraid of their dignity. We can lose nothing of dignity if we go to the United States and say: The old commercial treaty was advantageous to you and to us ; the erection of barriers has been disadvantageous to both. Take down, as far as you reasonably can, those barriers ; let us trade with you and we will make a profit, and you trade with us, and the profit will be on your side, mutual profits will result from mutual trade and both sides will reap a benefit. Is there any loss of dignity in making that declaration? Do you suppose you will insult the hard headed business man of the United States by telling him that you want to trade with him. It is an insult to the people who feel that this reciprocal trade is mutually beneficial. I hope our people will repeat what I say, and will tell this Government that it is of the greatest importance to the Maritime Provinces that they should get reciprocal trade relations of some kind. It is no use mincing matters. The Americans know it, and we know it. We are not, of course, going to be ruined, but we shall be very much poorer if we do not secure them. Reciprocal trade made us much richer before, and it will do so again. The United States is our natural market, and we ought to have it, if it can be obtained by fair negotiation, for I should be sorry to surrender our honor and dignity ; but such will not be necessary to do, if we go like sensible business men and ask the Americans if they are prepared to negotiate a treaty. Have hon. gentlemen opposite secured anything in this direction? Nothing. If we attempt, and fail, to increase trade with the Americans, who are our neighbors and our natural commercial dealers, we will be thought more of than if we should sit still and do nothing. I charge upon this Government that they are not only neglecting the interests of the Maritime Provinces in regard to trade with the United States, but they are neglectful of the trade of those Provinces with other countries to which we export. It is only a day or two ago the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) called the attention of the House to the fact, that owing to the neglect and indifference of the Government,—and I charge it all upon them—we have lost advantages which would have accrued to us from the negotiation of a treaty on similar terms to those secured by the United States Government with Spain. We export largely to Cuba and Porto Rico, and to-day, as the hon. member for Digby said, we are placed at a disadvantage, because we were not in time in asking to be placed on the same footing as the United States. I suppose dignity stood in the way ; and, at all events, the result is, that the people of the Maritime Provinces are to sustain a loss of some thousands and thousands of dollars. Why, we were told that we should not say anything about it, that we should speak with bated breath, we should have such a strong feeling of the dignity of the country, of the greatness of the country, and a fear

Mr. DAVIES.

of injuring the country, that we should say nothing. In modern times, the interests of a country are not sacrificed by the truth being known. It is an age of telegraphs and newspapers, an age when what is known in one country one day is flashed over the wires thousands and thousands of miles, and will be read in another country next morning. So we find that on this very subject on which the First Minister said it was so essential to keep quiet the facts have been published in a circular, and the gentlemen issuing it want the world to know the particulars, and they want members of this House to know, and this Government to know. The Chamber of Commerce of Halifax have forwarded a circular in which all the facts stated by the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) are embodied and set out, even more strongly than the hon. member placed them before the House, and the chamber calls on this Government to do something. They call upon them not to be false to their trust, but to use their position and the trust which the people have placed in their hands to enable us, at least, to be placed on the same footing as our neighbors in the United States. I call the attention of the House to this resolution. It was passed by the Halifax Chamber of Commerce only nine days ago. It presents the facts, and I may be pardoned for reading a portion of it. The resolution passed on 4th March says :

“ Your committee learn that a treaty has lately been made between the United States and Spain, whereby the flag of the United States is placed on the same terms regarding Customs duties as that of the latter country. The conditions of this treaty do not apply to British shipping, and we are consequently placed at a great disadvantage in Cuba and Porto Rico, to which the treaty more particularly applies, the difference in favor of the American flag, so far as we can learn, being equal to an average of about 20 per cent. on the whole tariff. On our fish, which is our chief export to the islands, it amounts to considerable more. By calculations made on date received, it would appear Porto Rico fish by British flag pays about 12 cents per quintal more than by American vessels ; and that the tonnage duty for landing and loading cargoes is 100 per cent., or just double, on our vessels, to what is exacted from the Americans. In Cuba the differential duty in favor of the Americans is still larger, amounting to about 27 cents per quintal. Cuba and Porto Rico are among our best customers, shipments to the latter having some years reached nearly 150,000 quintals, while to Cuba the demand is steady and increasing. It will, therefore, be seen that if the Americans continue to enjoy those great advantages, and we excluded, that it will be a heavy blow to our trade, and calls for prompt and energetic remonstrance from our Government.”

Has that been made? Has there been a whisper, a word spoken in this House or out of it, to remedy the grievances under which the Halifax commercial men are laboring, and which they say are about to destroy their trade? Not a whisper, not a word. The resolution goes on to say :

“ The charges made by the Spanish Government through the consulates, of 10 cents per ton on securing Spanish clearances, is also very burdensome, and has been objected to by the United States, who claim that no foreign Government has a right to impose such a charge, which is equal to an import tax on the product of their country. We have reason to believe that this unfair tax will be abolished in the United States, and our Government should take immediate steps to place us in the same position.”

Then follows a copy of the resolution of 4th March :

“ Your committee regret to learn that discriminating duties in favor of American fish and other products still exist in the islands of Cuba and Porto Rico, and that representations of the chamber to the Dominion Government last year on the subject do not appear to have produced any effect.”

They are not sinning in ignorance. This subject a year ago was brought before them on the representations of these commercial men, just as we have brought it before them, urging the necessity of opening negotiations for a reciprocity treaty with the United States. They have done nothing in the matter. They are willing that the commerce of the country should suffer. The resolution goes on to say :

“ In the present depressed condition of the West India trade, these discriminating duties on our staple products is a very heavy burden, and calls for a prompt and energetic representation by the Dominion Government, who can alone deal with this matter.”

I have been asked in the circular, as others have been asked, to read it and reflect on the facts it contains. I have done

nothing more than my duty in bringing these facts before the House. What answer has the Government to make to these complaints, which are not confined to Halifax but are re-echoed in St. John and all the ports at which there are fishing interests in the Maritime Provinces? This is a very serious matter. Hon. gentlemen opposite promised the people when they came into power, that they would secure reciprocity with the United States. They have broken faith with them: they have not secured it. But the most serious charge I have to make is that, while they were asked and urged, and the importance of the action pointed out, to take preliminary steps last year with respect to negotiations, so far as we can learn they have not taken any steps, and they are deaf to the remonstrances of the maritime people; they are deaf to the remonstrances of the Chamber of Commerce at Halifax—as deaf as they are to the remonstrances of the Chamber of Commerce in St. John. Sir, these are matters which, from the maritime standpoint, I can tell hon. gentlemen are very serious, and instead of energetic and prompt action by the Government upon them, we have a report issued upon the manufacturing interests in the Maritime Provinces, and a precious report it is. We have heard from gentlemen here from Ontario how utterly wanting in credit that report is, as regards the manufacturers of their Province, and I say it is more so as regards the Maritime Provinces. Why, Sir, in order to show that there was an increase in the industries of the Province of Prince Edward Island he actually counts in the fishing industry of lobsters. What had the National Policy to do to bring about that industry? What did it do for it, except to cause some irritation in the minds of the lobster packers last year, by an order that stamps were to be put on the cans, and after the people had gone to the expense of getting the stamps, down came a notification from the Inland Revenue Department that they did not require stamps at all. Regulations were made one day and broken the next. The National Policy has done nothing for the lobster trade. It does not enable them to catch more lobsters; it does not regulate the market price in England, the only market where they are sold. But, Sir, I call the attention of hon. members to this fact, that in order to make out a case of apparent prosperity in the Maritime Provinces, not only do they bring in the lobster interest, but they drag in the ship-building interest. It is true only one great ship-owner in Summerside is mentioned, and not another man who builds ships, but then he is a great Tory and a supporter of the National Policy. In 1878 there was a large ship-building interest in the island, but nothing is said about it at all; and when they want to show the number of factories, as the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) pointed out last night, where an industry has changed hands, they give it as a new industry, and they show the amount of capital and the number of hands employed as a new industry. Why, Sir, there is a large manufactory of furniture in Charlottetown, and here it is given as a new industry, owned by Wright & Co. That factory was in existence almost before I was born. The late Mark Butcher, by whom it was carried on successfully during his life, employed almost as many hands as are employed in it now. Not a word is said about that. It is a new industry; and so on, all through the chapter. But when he wants to show how the National Policy is working, he goes to a few of the most double dyed Tories that can be produced in the Dominion, and he asks them their opinion. But when he goes to the starch manufacturers, most of whom are Grits, he says these poor people do not appear to appreciate the situation. It is the most laughable and, at the same time, the most lamentable report, I ever picked up. I want to know why this gentleman has steered clear of the places in which the commercial depression is deepest and the gloom is blackest. I want to know from the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) why no report is given of the state of manufactures in that place?

I remember when it boasted the largest tannery, turning out the largest quantity of leather, and employing the largest amount of capital in this Dominion. Where is it to-day? It has gone; its hum is where the woodbine twineth; the place that once knew it, knows it no more. No; it would not do to go through Pictou. Why did they keep clear of the town from which the hon. member for Sydney comes? Is there commercial prosperity there, I would ask him? I want to hear the hon. gentlemen representing those towns rising and saying that there is commercial prosperity in them. The country is not doing so badly, because we have been blessed with good harvests, and I do not think they will ask to share with Providence the credit for that, or if they do ask it, they will not get it. But I say that all those branches of industry that the National Policy was specially framed to improve are depressed; they are growing weaker and weaker, and depression and gloom exists throughout the commercial centres of the Maritime Provinces. I see the junior member for Pictou opposite me, and I hope he will enlighten the House as to whether Pictou is as prosperous, commercially, as it was in days of yore. I tell hon. gentlemen that it is not so, and the very fact that this commissioner shunned and avoided the places where the gloom was deepest and the depression greatest, is the best evidence of the truth of my statement. I agree that the situation, as pictured by leading gentlemen on this side of the House, is grave and serious; that it furnishes cause for serious thought on the part of members of this House and the people of this Dominion. I am proud to think that while years ago we could hardly catch their ears, to-day there is a willingness to listen to the truth; the truth is now being told and listened to, and I think, Sir, the wretched nostrum offered to the people a few years ago has been shown to be the invention of a quack; that we will soon have the people coming to their senses, and reverting to that policy of a revenue tariff, under which, alone I say, this country can become great, prosperous and happy.

Mr. WOODWORTH. I should not have occupied the time of the House but for a few moments, were it not that the speech of the hon. gentleman opposite teemed with statements that have been refuted in this House and in the country over and over again. I think, Sir, it is a waste of time that hon. gentlemen opposite, after the statements which have been made here, notably by the Finance Minister in the admirable Budget Speech which he delivered, and secondly by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), in answer to the ex-Minister of Finance, and after the exhaustive and able speech of my hon. friend this afternoon, the member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), should again rehash the old statements which have been exploded over and over again, and shown to be misstatements of fact in every word and line. I put down a few notes on a piece of paper, referring to what the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) has been saying. I have covered a sheet and a quarter of paper, and I venture to say that every statement made in his place to-night—and he has taken up nearly two hours, and has certainly spoken with great volubility—was refuted not three months ago in his own county, by the electorate of that county. He told these people that they had lost their senses; he has followed in the footsteps of the ex-Finance Minister, who told the people they were fools, who has told them over and over again that they had lost their senses. He says that people will come back to their senses by-and-bye. The hon. gentlemen tried to drive some sense into them in the county of Queen's, and he brought the hon. member for North Brant (Mr. Paterson) there, and other members from different parts of the Dominion, and the whole of them endeavored to enlighten the people of Queen's, and they did to them what the people will reply to the speech he has delivered to-night.

They will say to him: We have lived long enough, Sir, to know that every statement that you have been making on the hustings in regard to the National Policy, and every statement you have made in the House of Parliament, where we sent you to represent the people and not to misrepresent them, is untrue in fact, for we have the facts and know them. The hon. gentleman talked in a very loud voice, and he beat his desk frequently. I do not complain; it is his desk; if he breaks it in two, I will not complain; but I think he was ingenious in beating his desk every little while. In countries where they have battles—thank God, we do not have them here—the drum is beaten in order to drown the cries of the wounded and the dying; and I can fancy that the hon. gentleman, who has had his ideas, if they be his ideas, but at least his statements, refuted over and over again in this House, I can fancy him believing them to be fallacious, and beating his desk in order to make up in sound what he lacks in argument. He started out with the statement that the Liberal-Conservative party in this House had deceived the electorate of the Dominion of Canada, and had got power under false pretences—that they had promised the people a reciprocity treaty, and had failed to keep that promise. I asked him when the speech was made. He said in 1878. Well, Sir, the Liberal-Conservative party were returned to power in 1878: In the winter of 1878 that speech was made; and in 1879, as soon as they could do so, they caused to be placed upon the Statute Book of this country an Act whereby they took power to remove the duty on all products from the United States coming into Canada in proportion as the United States Government would remove the duties on products going there from Canada. That is what they did, and in doing that they kept their promise to the people. But they did not do what the hon. gentleman wants them to do. He said it would be no lack of dignity for the Government of Canada to go to Washington and to tell the American Government that they could not live without reciprocity. Sir, the people of this country are little understood by the hon. gentleman when he makes a statement like that. When the Premier stated in Toronto, a few months ago, that he would not go down on his knees, and that Canada would not go down on her knees, to ask for reciprocity, he struck a chord that vibrated in every manly Canadian heart. There is not a man in the Maritime Provinces or in the Upper Provinces who would not scorn the idea of any Canadian Government begging at the feet of a foreign people, stating that they were paupers, and could not live without their help. If they did that they would not gain reciprocity by doing so. Everybody knows that the American financier or the American statesman does not give away a dollar for only half a dollar in return; he never gives a dollar unless he expects a greater return; and when the American people find that we are working out our destiny, that we are not asking them any favor, that we believe that while reciprocity would be desirable on fair terms, yet finding that we had asked in vain, that we had knocked at their doors and they would not listen to us, that we are now depending upon our own resources, which the God of nature has given us in the half of this continent. We will get reciprocity in raw materials sooner in this manner than in any other way. Let the hon. member, or anyone, travel through the United States to-day and learn the feeling that has existed there since this Government has come into power and inaugurated our present fiscal policy. Let him talk to American merchants, and see how much greater respect they have for Canadians than they had while the late Government were in power. Let any hon. gentleman who has travelled in the United States contrast that feeling with the feeling that existed from 1874 to 1878, when our industries were in such a depressed condition, when we were sending the late and lamented George Brown to Washington in vain to

Mr. WOODWORTH.

get a reciprocity treaty, and when the Government in power had not the nerve, or the courage, or the patience, or the plodding industry, to place a fiscal policy on the Statute Book which would meet that of the United States, and then say if we have not taken a leaf out of their book to our own profit. Why, Sir, there is not an American, be he Democrat or Republican, or whatever he may be, and I have talked with hundreds of them—they do not know the relations of our parties; they do not know that there is one party here trying to uphold the country and another trying to pull it down—there is not one of them that I have known, and I believe this is the experience of every hon. gentleman who has been among them, but says he wonders that we did not take that leaf out of their book long before we did. One gentleman said to me: "I used to sell stoves in Montreal; I do not blame you; but you have taken the pattern from me and you undersell me." That is one case, and there are many others I could name. Therefore, I say the fiscal policy of the present Government has earned for us the respect of United States statesmen and merchants, on account of our pluck, our courage, and our industry. Now, I want to say one word in regard to that industry. The hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I., (Mr. Davies) spoke of this Government as flies on the wheel, and as derelict in their duty. Why, it was a very easy thing for the late Government to sit down and make a revenue tariff; they had nothing to do but draw their salaries and make the tariff. They did it something like this: We import \$100,000,000; one-fifth of \$100,000,000 is 20 per cent.; and that will give us \$20,000,000. That is something like the way they made up the revenue tariff. What did the present Government do? They went into the factories in the cities and towns of this country and shook the workingman by the hand, and asked him how they could help him—the employer and the workingman together. After going through this country and seeing all the industries they could see, they sat down and framed the tariff; and it will be a never-dying honor to the Finance Minister of this day, long after he has gone to his rest, that he worked as hard as he did, received the delegations and the number of persons interested in the industries of Canada that he did, and after that framed a tariff that departed from the old rut, and that would meet the United States on their own ground. That friction would ensue, that there would be complaint here and there, was to be expected, it was a herculean job to sit down and frame that tariff in order to foster the industries and to shut out foreign competition, and at the same time not increase prices to our people, and earn a revenue. It was the work of statesmen, the work of men, not only of great ideas, but also with the heart, the head, and the hand, to execute the work they had undertaken. I sat as a spectator in this House when the fiscal policy came down, and I never saw such black looks on the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite as I saw then. They did not believe it possible that any body of men could frame a tariff that would meet the position of the United States, and at the same time not unduly oppress our people. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), the late leader of the Government, said: Well, you have kept your promise after all; I did not believe you would dare to do it, or could do it. It was not a perfect tariff. It could not have been a perfect tariff, for it was then an untried experiment; it was framed with a view of meeting the United States tariff and the tariffs of other countries; it was framed to steer as closely to the wind as possible, without affecting injuriously a single interest in Canada, or oppress the people, while at the same time raising sufficient revenue and encouraging interprovincial trade. That there were mistakes in it we all know. No Government is, no laws are, perfect; mistakes there were; but we had a Government that were not all self-sufficient, that were not above listening to represen-

tations, and the tariff was altered occasionally, so as to suit, as far as possible, the circumstances of the country; and, on the whole, it was as perfect a tariff as any fourteen men, occupying the position of a Government, could frame in the same time. I say I believe there is no other Government that could be formed in Canada who in that time would have revolutionised the fiscal policy as this Government did and have kept its relations intact with other countries and created the beneficial results they did. Then came the general elections of 1882, and one would have thought, on listening to the speech of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), that there had been no elections since 1878, that we had none on the 20th June, 1882. I recollect, previous to those elections, sitting as a spectator in this House, hearing the hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) and the hon. member for West Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright), state that, let the people have an opportunity to decide on this barbarous, wretched policy, and they will scatter it to the winds; and as true as the sun rises, said the hon. member for Bothwell, pointing his finger at the Government, when the people pass upon this tariff, the Government will be swept away and the Opposition take their place. Well, the elections of 1882 took place; we had all these gentlemen and their press and everything they could circulate about the policy in force during the previous four years before the people, and what was the result? The people returned back to Parliament the men who inaugurated the National Policy, defeating the hon. member for West Huron, and the member from Bothwell, who made that declaration, defeating horse, foot and artillery, to use an old expression, the Opposition cohorts, all over Canada, and restoring back to power the men who had worked out this great question. It is labor lost for the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies), or any other gentleman—in the light of facts, in the light of the facts that the people of Canada, as intelligent a people as there is on the face of the globe to-day, who have had all these facts before them and who understand this question, who, having sent these men into office, returned them again to power—it is labor lost for hon. gentlemen opposite in 1885 to take up the tariff again and go over all the statements they went over before, making the same speeches they made before, and declaring again the people only wanted an opportunity to pass on the tariff and turn this Government out on that question. The hon. member for Queen's said: Look at the Maritime Provinces! He thinks he can sow a little disunion down there. But does not every elector who has passed upon this tariff understand the question as well as he? Have there not been bye-elections in Cumberland, Lunenburg, Cape Breton and York, since 1882, in which we have beaten our opponents and taken constituency after constituency. In his own county he made the speech he made to-night, but the people did not believe him. The moment there is a vacancy the Government appeal to the people. Hon. gentlemen opposite send their orators and their press to meet the Government, and the Government still wrests from them constituency after constituency. Why should we be called upon to listen for hours this Session to arguments that have been refuted over and over again, and on a question on which the people have decisively passed. He wanted the hon. member for Pictou to stand up, and he wanted the hon. member for Sydney to stand up, and say what about this National Policy. Why, they stood up. It was not long since the hon. gentleman stood up down at Sydney. One would think that we never had an election since the National Policy was introduced. One would think that the National Policy had no defenders in the country but a band of conspirators led by the veteran, the Premier. One would think that all the people wanted was an opportunity to drive the Government out of existence on account of

the National Policy. Is it not a little too bad that we should, for the sake of appearances, on this side of the House, have to get up and answer what had been ably answered over and over again throughout the length and breadth of Canada. With regard to Pictou and Cape Breton, let me give the hon. gentleman a comparative statement of the output of coal under the late régime and under the present one. In 1875, the output amounted to 706,795 tons; in 1876, it amounted to 634,207 tons; in 1877, to 697,065 tons; 1878, to 693,511; in 1879, 688,626. Then came in the National Policy and, in 1880—the National Policy then in full sway—it was 954,659 tons—a leap up like that—in 1881, it was 1,035,014 tons; in 1882, 1,250,179 tons; and in 1883 a similar amount. I have not got the figure for 1884, but I believe it is about the same. It was 1,300,000 in 1883 and about the same in 1884. That is the answer in regard to these two places. That output of coal means—what? It means bread and butter to the laboring men there, and it means 10 cents a ton royalty on every ton of coal put to the pit's mouth to the provincial exchequer of Nova Scotia. And again, Nova Scotia exported to the United States, in 1866, 404,252 tons of coal. In 1882, when the United States had a 75 cents tariff on every ton of our coal, it exported only 99,302 tons. Where did the balance of this vast output, of this increased output, go? It went to the Upper Provinces. Interprovincial trade was encouraged. Ah, but some of them say, there is the hated coal tax. I will undertake to say this, and I have looked into the question somewhat, that the tax on flour and the tax on coal have not raised to us, where we raise a surplus—to use the declaration of the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), in the drill shed at Halifax—the price by a farthing. It has not raised the price to the consumer here. It has encouraged interprovincial trade; it has employed workmen; it has made an industry where there would be idleness and stagnation; it has distributed money; it has given us a carrying power that we had not before; it has given us an opportunity of carriage that we had not before. Coal at Ogdensburg is \$6.50 a ton, at Montreal but \$6—American coal; at Watertown it is \$6.50 a ton; at Brockville it is only \$6.25 a ton—American coal; at Toronto it is \$6 a ton, at Chicago, \$8.50—American coal. And it is a curious fact that, in Boston, Pennsylvania coal is lower than it is in Pennsylvania itself. When you come to consider that the coal industry, these coal mines, are run by a ring generally of speculators—it is so in the United States—and they put the price of coal just as far as the market will bear every time, you will see that, if this duty on coal was not in existence, the price would be that much higher in Toronto, Kingston, and all these other places. But they said it will not get further than Kingston at any rate. I am happy to say that Nova Scotia coal is used as far west as Galt, which I understand is 120 miles west of Toronto, with our present facilities for carrying; and when the short line is constructed, I believe that they will carry it for about half the present rate. We used to get laughed at—we do not now—when we stood up and said—and I remember the Finance Minister was laughed at for saying it—that the consumer did not pay the duty. There was a howl of derision from the other side. Did you ever hear such a statement? The able and statesmanlike member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) was loudest in the shout of derision. Well, he raises potatoes on his island. The duty in Boston is 15 cents per bushel—it was 20 cents. Who paid the duty—the man who raised the potatoes in Prince Edward Island or the consumer in Boston? He knows—he almost admitted it to-night, for he asked for reciprocity to help the raisers of potatoes, and so forth—that the consumer did not pay the duty, but that the raiser paid it. When they got to Boston the price was 75 cents a bushel; a man from Malden, or some other place outside of Boston, would go into the market and get his 75 cents from the American con-

sumer; the other man from outside of the United States took his 55 cents, 20 cents less, and went away. Did the consumer pay it where there was a surplus? He knows he did not, and therefore the statement is correct, that the consumer does not pay the duty in all cases. Who has to pay the duty on the coal? Is it the Toronto or the Kingston man? No. The Pennsylvania ring put their coal up to meet the market, and, if the duty was not there, the price would be just as high, and the duty is not felt; I have stated the facts, which are incontrovertible. Now, that is international trade. He does not seem to understand it; they do not seem to understand it. These fools, as they call them, as the hon. member for South Huron called them, on his entrance into Parliament, in 1879, so chagrined and mortified was he that the people had sent into the cold shades of Opposition, after five years of power, and after deficit after deficit, and after a declaration by him that he wished he had an income tax, that he could not meet the expenses with the revenue he had, after having stood up, and, in his bitterness, writhing; in mortification at the people, after his declaring he would be twenty years in power, because they brought back the old guard and the old premier to take once more the helm of the ship of state which had been going on the rocks for five years—call the people fools—you would think they were all fools, to hear the member for Queen's and his friends talk, and yet, the moment a vacancy occurs, out goes the writ from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery down to the place or up to the place where the vacancy occurred, and comes back, as sure as the sun rises to-morrow, to use the metaphor of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), a Liberal-Conservative almost every time. And still this debased, this foolish, this ignorant people, keep on electing a Liberal Conservative to support a National Policy Government. It is useless to talk to these gentlemen. The only place to get them is before the electorate, and to talk to them there, and to see the faces of the old farmers, and to see the faces of the merchants, and to see the faces of the ship-builders, and to see the faces of the artisans, and to hear the plaudits they give to the Liberal-Conservative, and the votes they give afterwards. That is the only place to answer them. It seems to me time wasted in answering them here. Now, I want to draw attention for a moment to another statement of the hon. gentleman. The ship-building interest, he says, look at that; and he quoted the number of tons there are now less than we had when they were in power. He knew that the ship-building interest has been in a depressed state all the world over for years, everywhere—in the carrying trade—the iron ships superseding the wooden vessels for a time—I do not believe they will for all time, and our vessels could only make freight where the owners could afford to insure them themselves. They could not afford to pay 11 per cent. insurance, and send them to sea and make money; and that is the reason the ship-building interest has not been as large. Did he ever hear of a man named Pope in Prince Edward Island, one who occupied a distinguished place in the councils of his country? Did he hear of his fortune being dissipated to the winds, and two or three ships being allowed to rot on the stocks, while the hon. member for East York and his friends held office? He knows that the ship-building interest was depressed enough while they were in power, and what did they do to help it? I was a member of the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia at the time, and the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) will remember what a howl of execration went up from friend and foe against this Government who had placed upon ship's materials a duty that the ship-building interest could not bear; and, Sir, through the strenuous efforts of the Opposition of that day the duties were reduced and the ship-building interest was relieved and saved. Sir, this Government has put the ship-building interest in a much better

Mr. WOODWORTH.

position than it was under the late Government. I have the fact even from Grit sources. I went into a ship-yard not long ago, and I met a man opposed to me politically in my own county. I asked him what about shipbuilding? And he said: I must confess that your Government has dealt fairer with us than our own friends did. They have given us a bounty and a drawback, which has helped us more than the entire reduction of duties made by our Government while they were in power. So much for the ship-building interest. Yet the hon. member pounded his desk and was as voluble in his remarks as if he was making a great point in regard to shipbuilding. Well, then he spoke of the exodus—four times as many people, he said, had gone away from this country while we were in power as when they were in power. Well, Sir, once-and-a-while we get a little light from them through crevices—not through a window; a little light is let in by hon. members opposite. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), not very long ago had a little Bill in this House to provide for the representation of the North-West. I was delighted to hear him say that in Assiniboia there are 65,000 people, away up there towards the Rockies, and in Alberta there are 40,000—there he had 105,000 at once in those two provisional districts. But while they were in power there was nothing there but the wolverine, the badger and the bear. There was an Indian or two, it is true; we were sending them out blankets, pipes, a little tobacco and tea, once-and-a-while. But there was no white man there. And yet we had a statement from the hon. gentleman that we never would have had from him, only he wanted to get his Bill through the House. He wanted us to vote for the Bill, and then we had a little light thrown on the subject from a Grit source, and we had 105,000 people in two territories where there was not a soul before while they were in power. Yet the hon. gentleman who just spoke says, four times more of our people have gone out of Canada under the present Government than under the Mackenzie Government. He says the regulations of the North-West have been that harassing that you have driven them out. He uttered that with the same voice in which he uttered all the rest. Does he not read? Does he not know that the people of St. Vincent and the farmers around Pembina have been sending their grain to Emerson, Manitoba, to get better prices? And yet this hon. gentleman comes here, apparently without a knowledge of these facts, and declares to this House and the country that the harassing regulations of the Government in the North-West have driven the people out of it and into the United States. Well, Sir, we had a little more light upon the North-West from the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie). That trip that he took to the Rocky Mountains last summer did this country incalculable good. The old gentleman saw the North-West for himself. We were all glad that he went up. The leader of the party did not go up. He contented himself in making speeches at Bowmanville and other places about this wilderness that the Canadian Pacific road was running through. But the old leader went out himself, and although it is very hard to turn a Scotchman, of his years, from any beaten path he has long trodden, yet he had the manliness, and the patriotism, and the courage to say, in the face of the large audience in the Opera House at Winnipeg, that, like the Queen of Sheba, the half was not told him of the natural wealth of that country and its advantages. He gave a rebuke to the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Watson), who was applauded last winter when he spoke of the rigor of the climate, how cold it was, and the poor fellows going forty miles for wood. The hon. member for Leeds and Grenville (Mr. Ferguson) asked him: Where did they go 40 miles for wood? He said to Regina. And yet he knew at the time that coal was down to \$7 per ton at Regina, worth at least two cords of wood, and he was applauded to the echo because he did not state the fact.

We had also Sir Richard Temple in the Opera House, Winnipeg, speaking of the advantages of the North-West, and saying it had a splendid climate, and that the people of England, Scotland and Ireland would flock there, because that is just the kind of climate they would like. We had our own Marquis of Lorne here, who loved the climate, with his sturdy constitution and robust frame, and was sorry to leave our shores. Yet, Sir, in spite of all this testimony, in spite of the hon. member for East York making that statement—which the Opposition are sorry for now, no doubt—we have these men getting up in the House and through their press decrying this country, in order to throw odium upon the Government. What more, Sir? I was told, out in Brandon, by a man named Smith—and he told me I might use his name; I do not know whether he is John Smith or not, but I will particularise him a little farther and say he is the emigration agent at that place. He told me that he went to the United States last summer to see if he could not get some emigrants that were going out west to migrate to the Canadian North-West, and he went to the meeting, and the form of proceedings was something like this: The chairman would be given a newspaper marked in pencil. Mr. Chairman (an American) what paper is that? The *Globe* newspaper, Toronto, was the answer. Would you be kind enough to read the portions marked in pencil? And he did read. Well, Sir, he could not get any emigrants after that; he could not get one. This was told me by our emigration agent and he said I might use it wherever I liked. He said that the *Globe* was put into the hands of United States emigration agents, with the articles marked, and they circulated them in England to stop emigration to Canada. The United States people carefully preserved these papers and read them at their meetings; and this agent said he could not get a man to go into the North-West. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman says this tariff has been damaging to the interests of the people in the Maritime Provinces. Now, it is a little singular, if this were true, that every time a constituency is opened in those Provinces, as I have already said, the people return a Liberal Conservative. Well, they have got one year that they think is pretty hard—1884 has been a pretty hard year—not for Canada only, but all over the world there has been a depression of trade in 1884. I was curious to know how the country stood during the five years the Government was in power, and how we stood it during the five years the other Government were in power, and how the United States stood it, and so I took the failures. I know there were failures. But you can only argue this question relatively. It is not claimed that there is an absolute perfection on the part of any Government, or absolute wretchedness on the part of any other, but it is relatively that we have to judge them. Now, Sir, in the United States from 1875 to 1879, inclusive, the number of failures amounted to 42,840 and the liabilities \$915,378,000. From 1880 to 1884, inclusive, the liabilities of bankrupts in the United States amounted to \$647,672,000. In Canada, from 1875 to 1879, there were 9,103 failures, with liabilities of \$132,436,192; or they failed \$1 in Canada while they failed \$6 in the United States; or, more correctly, it was \$1 in Canada to only \$6.93 in the United States. While this Government has been in power, from 1879 to 1884, inclusive, Canada has had 5,029 failures, with liabilities amounting to \$57,146,568. The United States, during that time, had failures amounting to \$647,672,000, showing that when depression came over the face of the globe in 1884, the United States people had failed \$11.35, while we had failed \$1. What has held this country as a bower-anchor would hold a vessel from going on the shore? It has been the protective policy which the Government inaugurated and which it has so successfully carried out. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite to answer that question. They may say the electors are ignorant as to the

effect of a National Policy, and they will teach them. But how is it that when this wave of depression swept over the face of the globe, Canada fails only to the extent, proportionately, of \$1, as compared with over \$11 in the United States; and when hon. gentlemen opposite were in power our failures here stood as \$1 to \$6.93 in the United States? There is some cause for this discrepancy. I say it is the National Policy which has held our ship of state from going on the breakers. Let me say a word more in regard to the United States. The Rev. De Witt Talmage, speaking at at Brooklyn, New York, December last, said:

"To-day there are 1,000,000 people out of work in this country—10 per cent. of the laboring classes with nothing to do but suffer, and another 20 per cent. to-day on reduced wages."

If our neighbors have 1,000,000 workmen with nothing whatever to do, and 20 per cent. more toiling on reduced wages, we are entitled, with one-tenth of their population, to have 100,000 persons idle. Have we got them? Is there any country on the face of the globe that enjoys more prosperity than Canada, relatively speaking, does to-day? There is not one. And yet those hon. gentlemen tell us that this is a country which our people are leaving to go to the United States, where there are 1,000,000 people totally unemployed. If they go there, they go there to starve. I have followed some of our people who have gone to the United States; I have seen them in their homes in New York and Boston, and have asked them how they were getting along. If they could pay their butcher's and baker's bills on Saturday night they considered they were doing well, and that they were clad very poorly I know as a fact. Having started out for the States with prospects of success, having been told that they would get good wages there, and not thinking how far the wages would go, they are ashamed to come back to Canada, where they would earn more wages and work less time. But the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) the other night attempted, with the usual fairness which characterises him, to show that President Cleveland had been elected as supporting a revenue tariff. I read from *Debates*:

"Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear."

"Mr. CHARLTON. Yes, it is worth hearing. It is suggestive. It points to a moral that we would do well to heed."

"Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The language Mr. Cleveland used was just such language as would be used on our side of the House as to this policy."

"Mr. CHARLTON. The language he used, the language his party uses, the language his supporters use, is that the tariff of the United States is an unjust and an oppressive tariff, and that duties should be levied for revenue purposes only."

I happened to be in the United States during two weeks while the campaign was in progress. I was stopping at the Hoffman House, which was the headquarters of the Democratic party. I conversed with some of their leading men, and they assured me they were not going to adopt the plank of a revenue tariff; they were running the election on different issues, with which personal issues were largely mixed. Mr. Blaine, seeing the tide setting in in favor of protection, issued his manifesto; but it was too late to give him the victory, and many of his supporters had deserted him on account of his previous actions. Let me read from the New York *Herald*, which supported Mr. Cleveland, might and main, in order that we may see what his platform was. This was his platform:

"In making reduction in taxes, it is not proposed to injure any domestic industries, but rather to promote their healthy growth. From the foundation of this Government, taxes collected at the Custom house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be. Moreover, many industries have come to rely on legislation for a successful continuance, so that any change of law must be at every step regardful of the labor and capital thus involved. The process of reform must be subject in the execution to this plain dictate of justice. All taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government."

The same hon. gentleman (Mr. Charlton) stated with equal accuracy that the Government laid \$225,000,000 of debt upon the neck of Canada, knowing at the time, right well, that \$106,000,000 was given to the Provinces by relieving them of their debts, the amount involving no expenditure whatever. The same hon. gentleman who cheered that statement cheered the statement which I have read. Cleveland, in his platform, says:

"All taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. That is the reason we are elected. That is the reason why we support this Government, and if they did no act we would not support them. I am glad to hear those expressions; we would have hon. gentlemen opposite over on this side of the House, but there is not room for them. Mr. Cleveland's platform is also as follows:—

"The necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production."

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. WOODWORTH. Why are there no expressions of hear, hear, from hon. gentlemen opposite? It continues:

"Which may exist in consequence of the high rate of wages prevailing in this country."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. And his speeches are in the same way.

Mr. WOODWORTH. The New York *Herald*, after giving Mr. Cleveland's platform, says:

"It is one of Mr. Blaine's favorite tricks to cover up the real questions of the canvass. The trick has been thoroughly exposed by Republican protectionists of Pennsylvania, who mean to vote against Mr. Blaine, and who say in their address to fellow Republicans:

"With respect to the tariff, we in no way recognise that protection is at stake in the present canvass, in the sense in which the Republican managers would have us believe. Many of the members of this association are pronounced protectionists, whose interests are largely dependent, as they believe, on the continued prosperity of the manufactures fostered by the tariff, and they can recognise no danger to these interests from the success of the candidate of a party which, in the last Session of Congress, only showed in its efforts at tariff revision its own hopeless division on the subject, and was forced, at Chicago, to adopt an expression of policy so nearly akin to that of its rival."

And so on. Then I tell the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when he makes statements like these—statements which are unequivocal and positive in their character, and the rule is that a member of Parliament is supposed to state that which is strictly correct—when he made that statement he made a statement which is inconsistent with the fact, and he should have known it, as he reads the American papers, I believe, almost as much as the Canadian papers. I shall not go into the ridiculous figures he gave here, with regard to the progress of manufactures by percentage. He wants them to increase 100 per cent. continuously. If, for instance, a factory is started, and there are fifty hands, the first year, and the next year there are 100, he thinks that the next year again there should be 200, and so on, and in a few years there would be all hands and no factory—all hands and no place to put them. If we had been a parcel of school boys instead of men, who have lived for many years with eyes and ears open, he would have been laughed at if he had asked us to solve the problem, in arithmetic, which he gave us. Now I do not want to weary the House, but we have to treat these hon. gentlemen like Alexander treated his foes, as pictured by Dryden, where:

"Thrice he routed all his foes,
And thrice he slew the slain."

We have to kill them over and over again, like the Irishman's snake, which he killed once after breakfast and then about dinner time, and again just before sun down. They

Mr. WOODWORTH.

tell the same story this year, that they told last, and we will have it again next Session. No matter what the elections may declare or what the electorate may say, if we are in our places next year as I hope we will be every one of us, we will have the same old speeches, varied a little, perhaps, by the events of the year, but the same skeleton running through them all. I remember a story about a physician who was called to see a boy who was in a comatose condition. An epidemic of measles had been in the neighborhood, and the boy was in that comatose state, sleeping gently, when the doctor came up and felt his pulse and said to his mother: "Your boy is dead." The boy woke up and said: "I am not dead," but the mother replied, "You are dead; does not the doctor know better than you?" The boy Canada is not dead; he is only a little sleepy; the measles have been in the neighborhood, but he is not dead; he is only slightly touched, and no Act of Parliament can prevent the epidemic from going through the world. I have given figures to show that while the measles were bad over the United States, we did not have them one-fourth as bad here; I think the child Canada is able to say: I am not dead, but that I feel the pulse of life through my whole body yet. I have answered the hon. gentleman in regard to reciprocity. He knew that there was an Act on the Statute Book allowing us to reciprocate with the United States, when they have shown their willingness to do so; but he little knows the people of his own country. He little knows the people of Canada, if he thinks we should go untruthfully to the Americans on our bended knees, proclaim that we are in rags and poverty, and tell them that we cannot live without them. We have taken the manly course; we have earned their respect, and we will have them knocking at our doors, and when they do we will let them in on fair terms. That was what Sir Charles Tupper said over and over again; that was the whole tenor of his speech: we met them before, and we will meet them again, but it would be folly for us to go to them until they are ready to meet us fully. Now, I think I have answered the hon. member again fully. It was not necessary that I should rise and answer him, only that I suppose that some of my constituents and some of the people outside of this House would want to know why he was not answered, and perhaps forget that he had been answered over and over again. And when they come to read the speeches of the gentlemen I have referred to—the speech of the hon. Minister of Marine; the splendid speech of the hon. member who spoke this afternoon; the Budget Speech, so exhaustive and fair, so accurate—a speech upon which we can nail our colors every time; when they come to read the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) they will not have to read mine. I do not believe there is a man on this side of the House, supporting the Liberal-Conservative Government of this country, who, after being beaten at the polls, as they have been beaten, after being beaten at debate, as they have been beaten, would rise every Session and repeat the same speeches over and over again. I believe these hon. gentlemen are *sui generis*; they belong to a race of their own; there is nothing like them that I ever heard of. Where is the debating club in which, when one side was beaten, the same speeches would be made by them year after year on the same subject and renewed again with the greatest volubility, as if they were new speeches. But we have these hon. gentlemen doing this to the end of the chapter. Why could not they, for once in their lives, never mind about power—never mind about triumphing over their opponents temporarily, but take hold of subjects interesting to the people of this country. They should know how the pulse of the country beats—in what direction public opinion is; and why have not they enough political sagacity to watch the mistakes of the Government, when they make mistakes, but on the great questions upon which the people have pronounced—the Canadian Pacific Railway and

the National Policy—why do not they help to build up the country—help to build the road and bring immigrants here, and show that they are with the country of the country, and for the country. If they did this they would get power some day almost before they knew it. The Government may make mistakes. We, on this side, are not sent here—as was stated by an hon. gentleman opposite—and for which statement he was properly called to order—to register the decrees of the Government. We are sent here by independent constituencies, after careful canvass, after feeling the public pulse, and having its views on distinct questions, we come and debate those questions, and live those questions and fight those questions, and we assist the Government in carrying them out. But if we find that the Government are making mistakes on the great lines in which we were sent here to support them we have the right to remonstrate and we will do it. But up to this time what Liberal-Conservative can say, after having run his election for the people, and with the people, can say that the Government are not following out, and its supporters are not following out, the lines upon which we were sent here. The North-West is the very right arm of this Dominion. Every hon. member opposite is interested in upholding that country and populating it; and instead of having their speeches going over to Europe to show how bad a country this is, if they would only do as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) has done, after having seen it; or if they have not seen it, if they would take his experience and circulate the truth about the country, we would have enough immigrants going into Manitoba and the North-West to pay in ten years for the Canadian Pacific Railway twice over—if the people of the old world knew to-day what they will know in time—if they knew that that country in the North-West was as fertile a country as there is on the face of the globe, and that the climate was not too rigorous, as it is not. I passed two winters there, and I know it is not too rigorous, and it is especially healthy for persons with weak lungs. That country is one of the most healthy in the world; you can pass a whole winter there without a wet foot, and in the spring the snow goes off quickly, and ploughing is earlier than in most portions of the older Provinces. If people only knew that country as it exists with its great advantages, where they could obtain land on favorable terms, we should have thousands of settlers where we now have not hundreds. I lay it to the Opposition of this country and to their press that the North-West is not filling up more rapidly with settlers and happy homes. If they joined us patriotically, as the Americans do among themselves in order to build up that country, we should have millions of revenue from it where to-day we have thousands. I ask hon. members opposite if they should not cry halt, to use the words of the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies)—if they should not cry halt in using their press in the way they do for the purpose of getting power. I do not know but it would be a good thing to give them power if they would carry out the policy of this Government, and would stop complaining. But we have no reason to believe that they would carry out that policy; I believe they would not. I think we should get back to the old days of depression, of no hope, of flies on the wheel, of a depressed people and a depleted Treasury, and a country fast going to ruin and into the hands of the United States. I thank the House for listening to me; I did not know I was going to speak until six o'clock to-night. I had about made up my mind not to speak. It was not necessary for me to make these remarks, for the hon. gentleman has been answered again and again. I suppose there will be other speeches made; and if so, there is not a man on this side of the House who cannot answer the best arguments of their most eloquent speaker with the facts and figures as they exist. And when the time comes when we shall have to go back to the people for

an endorsement of our conduct, if we have nothing more to answer than we have now, hon. gentlemen opposite need not lay the flattering unction to their souls that they will be anywhere but in opposition, with even decimated numbers.

Mr. KING. I desire to say a few words on this subject before the debate closes, and I trust that I may be able to do so without resorting to abuse of those who differ from me in opinion. I see before me hon. members from my own Province, representing important constituencies, and I have no doubt, if the remarks I make or the figures I use during the course of this debate, are not in their opinion correct, that they will do me the honor to criticise them fairly. I know, Sir, that I am perhaps subjecting myself, by the course I intend to take, to the treatment which hon. members in this House generally receive at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. When they attempt to tell the truth with regard to their own Province, or any portion of this Dominion, they are told that they are unpatriotic and are decrying the country. I have very little regard for the opinion of hon. gentlemen opposite who meet me in this way. I was surprised at the statements made by the hon. member for King's, N. B. (Mr. Foster), who I see is not now in his place, in the course of the speech he delivered this afternoon. I took down some of the words he uttered at the close of that speech:

"People in New Brunswick raise more and get more, for their products are worth more than ever they have been at any previous time in the history of the Province."

I do not propose to say one word in reply to that statement. I am willing that it should go to the hon. gentleman's constituents and mine, and to the people of New Brunswick generally, and that they should be the judges whether it is true or not. Six years ago I was honored with a seat in this Parliament. I held views then similar to those I hold now, with reference to the trade policy of this Government. I took occasion, at the first meeting of Parliament, when that question was under discussion, to give expression to my views. Six years have elapsed since, a good deal has transpired, and to-night I feel that I am in a better position to pass judgment upon that policy than I was at that time. I might call the attention of the House, if it were necessary, to the statements which were put forth at that time by the gentlemen who now administer the affairs of this country, who were then in opposition and were claiming the support of the people from one end of Canada to the other. I know, Sir, that in my own Province strong inducements were held out and loud promises were made. The people of that Province were told that they were to become a great manufacturing people; that they were to manufacture not only for the Maritime Provinces, but for the whole of Canada, including the North-West—that the Province was to be, as it were, the Birmingham and the Manchester of this Dominion. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that the people of New Brunswick, notwithstanding that they sent a majority of gentlemen to this Parliament to oppose that policy, did, when it became the law of the land, go to work manfully to try if it were possible to avail themselves of the benefits which it was promised they were likely to derive from it. It is true, Sir, that almost immediately the people set to work to erect cotton manufactories, sugar refineries and other industries of a like character, in St. John and in other places throughout that Province. Considerable progress was made during the first three years. An election was sprung upon the people of this country, and there is no doubt in my mind that the feeling in the Province of New Brunswick at that time favored somewhat the National Policy. I am free to admit, Sir, that the faith of even of some of my supporters was shaken by what they saw going on around them. There was a boom. There is no doubt but the amount of

money that was put into circulation at that time by the erection of these factories assisted very materially in helping many of our people; but it is equally true that about the same time an improvement took place in the lumber industry, which is the staple industry in that Province. These two things occurring together promoted largely the prosperity of New Brunswick, and I dare say of the other Provinces by the sea. It is true that at that election a majority of gentlemen were elected in New Brunswick who favored the policy we are now discussing, but a change has taken place since then, and it is to that change I wish to allude more particularly to-night. It is true that a number of factories exist at present in New Brunswick; but I think he would be a bold man who would claim that, at present, the large majority of them are in any way beneficial to the people of New Brunswick. This policy has had a six years' trial. The Government have taken what appears to me to be a proper step in dealing with this matter. A couple of gentlemen, Messrs. Blackeby and Willis, were appointed to examine into the progress and working of the manufacturing industries of this Dominion, and I have the report which was laid upon the Table. I purpose calling the attention of the House to some statements contained in it. I propose to present the condition of affairs of New Brunswick, more especially that of St. John city and suburbs, to-day, with the condition of affairs that existed there prior to the introduction of the National Policy. I hold that, in all fairness, a year other than 1878 should have been selected to institute a comparison. Everybody knows that six months prior to 1878 two-thirds of the city of St. John was laid in ashes, and it must be admitted that, in the case of such a large and devastating fire as took place then, a large number of the manufacturing industries of St. John must have suffered in common with others. That was, therefore, not the proper time to choose. I think the comparison was altogether more favorable than the Government have a right to demand. In 1875 the manufacturers of St. John held what is known as the manufacturers' exhibition. A few weeks prior to that the secretary of the association was employed in preparing statistics of the manufacturing done in the city and county of St. John. I have not the pamphlet before me, but I have the statistics, as taken from a speech in *Hansard*, and I now propose to show the condition in which the manufacturing industries were, in 1875, as compared with the year 1884. I may say also that in making that report the secretary of that association, understanding better than the gentleman who is employed to prepare the statistics now before us, what was properly called a manufacturing industry, did not include other than manufacturing industries in his report. That report shows that in the year of 1875 there were, in the city and county of St. John—I leave out Musquash and St. Martin, outlying parishes—I find that in 1875, 9,418 hands were engaged in manufacturing industries in St. John and suburbs. These include 2,225 men engaged in working in the saw mills. Deducting that number we still find 7,193 men employed. It may be said that at that time the country was prosperous; that there was no depression in ship-building, or in lumbering; that money circulated very freely. Well, I have a recollection of the circumstances myself, but I do not ask the House to take my word. I submit an extract from an address which was presented on the occasion of the opening of that manufacturing exposition to the then Lieutenant-Governor of the Province, our present Finance Minister, which reads as follows:—

“The present is, for many reasons, a fitting time for this demonstration on the part of the manufacturers and mechanics of New Brunswick, and this display of the wide scope and great magnitude of the industries they have built up and are successfully conducting.

“When saw mills are idle, in consequence of the stagnation in the foreign markets, ships hardly paying expenses, on account of the low-

Mr. KING.

ness of the freight, and the commercial classes threatened with financial ruin, as the result of the dullness that affects every branch of business.”

This was the condition of affairs in St. John city and county at the time to which I allude, when 9,418 persons were carrying on manufacturing successfully. Before going further, I will read another extract. On the presentation of that address to the Lieutenant-Governor of New Brunswick, he, in his reply, states as follows:—

“In 1860 our manufactures only reached, in value, \$1,130,000, but according to the census of 1881, which was virtually a statement of our position in 1870, while our agricultural products had only advanced 25 per cent., our fisheries 60 per cent., and lumber 80 per cent., this branch of industry has increased 160 per cent., and I learn, that in the five years, from 1870 to 1875, it was nearly doubled. It is marvellous to me, our progress has been so rapid as it has been, that the value of this branch of industry has increased to \$8,000,000.”

That was not a bad showing for the Finance Minister in 1874-75. I wish I could point to a condition of affairs to-day which could at all compare with that period. I regret I cannot. I shall now examine the copy of the valuable document which is placed in our hands. I have gone carefully over the list, and I have placed besides, under the heading of each sort of industry, the number that was employed and the number to-day employed in the same industry. This statement refers to the city of St. John, Portland, Carleton, the parish of Simonds, Indiantown, which is part of Portland, and Lancaster:

	1875.	1884.
Boot and shoe makers, and operatives in shoe factory.....	1,071	383
Boat builders.....	28	22
Brush and broom manufacturers.....	50	42
Builders, carpenters and masons, including shipbuilders and masoncutters	1,320	743
Bakers and biscuit makers.....	160	105
Brass founders.....	50	54
Blacksmiths.....	100	45
Blockmakers.....	80	21
Brewers.....	20	8
Bookbinders.....	20	51
Tailors and clothiers.....	80	775
Confectioners.....	40	43
Carriage and sleigh makers.....	120	69
Cordage and rope makers.....	60	85
Carvers.....	72	3
Coopers.....	10	8
Coffee and spice.....	13	8
Cotton operatives.....	215	360
Engravers.....	60	9
Furniture manufacturers.....	150	79
File makers.....	5	6
Fishing tackle.....	2	7
Foundrymen.....	426	318
Harnessmakers.....	63	33
Hatters and furriers.....	70	39
Iron knee manufacturers.....	60	11
Last manufacturers.....	5	5
Milliners and dressmakers.....	750	180
Marble workers.....	70	17
Nail and tack manufacturers.....	272	119
Organ and piano manufacturers.....	24	9
Painters.....	100	93
Paint manufacturers.....	13	4
Printers.....	150	150
Potteries.....	15	38
Patent medicines.....	6	8
Paper bags.....	17	71
Riggers.....	70	37
Soapmakers.....	25	21
Shipsmiths.....	35	23
Saw factories.....	24	23
Sash, door and blind manufacturers.....	210	68
Sailmakers.....	60	7
Springs, axles and edge-tools.....	27	15
Steam hot water fitters.....	20	4
Tinsmiths and stove manufacturers.....	71	85
Trunks.....	20	19
Tanners and curriers.....	75	39
Undertakers.....	27	11
Watchmakers.....	42	47
	7,193	4,422
Add men working in saw mills.....	2,225	1,693
Total.....	9,418	6,115

With regard to the cotton operatives, I do not hesitate to say that, if things had been stated as they actually were, at the time the report was made, the account would not have been as favorable as it is; for one of the factories, I am satisfied, was shut down when that report was made, though it is true that it started up shortly after and is running now. Furniture manufacture was one of the trades which was to be specially benefitted by the National Policy, and perhaps there were no more ardent supporters of that policy than those who were engaged in that business. I know myself that one of them went out of his way to assist in defeating me in my county and came nearly 50 miles from St. John to attend a demonstration of the Liberal Conservative party, and to-day his factory is closed. He is still in the furniture business, but he is selling furniture made in the Province of Ontario, and has discovered that others know how to make a slaughter market of St. John as well as the manufacturers across the line. I may say that I will not vouch for the number of 750 milliners and dressmakers in 1875. I do not believe there ever were so many in St. John. I only give the figures as I have got them. I would call the attention of hon. gentlemen to the fact that this was not the year after the St. John fire, when so many persons were employed in the sash and door factories, but three years before the St. John fire. I am surprised that there is not an increase in the number of trunk manufacturers, because, if anything has been helped by the National Policy, it is that industry, for the exodus from that Province has to my knowledge created a great demand for trunks. In order to complete the list I add to the 4,422 shown in Mr. Willis' report, 1,693 persons employed in the saw mills, making 6,115. Still we have 1,816 hands to account for. It is true that this report furnishes us with the means of information which we require to find out where they are. One would naturally suppose that a considerable number of them would be found in industries created or fostered by the National Policy. We find in the blind factories, the rubber-stamp factory, soap powders, fish curers—I am not aware that fish curing is a new industry in St. John—cigar factories, hair workers, the nut and bolt factory—this is put down here as a new industry, though to my own knowledge it was there for years before the National Policy, though it is true that it is prospering to-day more than it was before the introduction of that policy—the vinegar factory—though it does not mention that since the introduction of the National Policy a larger vinegar factory has gone out—the woollen factory—I do not know where it is, but it is mentioned in the report—and then we have the increase in the cotton manufactures, making a total of about 300 hands, leaving 1,500 still lacking. We find 128 granite workers. I do not think anybody will contend that the granite workers of St. John owe anything to the National Policy. I believe their principal market is found in the United States. I know that a considerable quantity of granite is sold in Canada, but the largest portion manufactured in St. John finds a market in the United States. Therefore, I take it that the National Policy has nothing to do with that industry, or, at all events, in the quantity of granite exported to a foreign country. Then we have twenty-five wharf builders. This is an industry I do not think, in all fairness, can be characterised as a manufacturing industry. Then we have thirty-three brickmakers. Well, I cannot deny that making bricks might be called manufacturing; but I do say, in 1874, they were not called manufacturers in the list prepared at that time. Then we have ninety-nine lime burners. Nobody ever thought of classing lime burners with manufacturers. That gives 329. But there is something more ridiculous still. I believe Mr. Willis has acted honestly in the matter. He is taking everything, large or small, and so he has included the barbers. He includes the butchers, he includes the dentists, he includes the

florists, and the laundrymen, and the photographers, and the buck-saw filers, and the sausage makers, and the taxidermists, and the tobacconists, and the umbrella-repairers, and the chemists, and such like. But there is still a deficiency. Mr. Willis is equal to the occasion, and he adds 322 fishermen and some thirty odd ice dealers and ice cutters. I have looked carefully over the report, and I have noticed that in several cases Mr. Willis has pointed out to the manufacturers of cotton and the refiners of sugar the dangers of over-production, and I am only surprised that he did not point out to the ice cutters of St. John the danger of over-production also. We have a splendid country to manufacture ice in, and I think the warning applies as well to people in the ice business as to people in the cotton business. But, if the gentleman who had charge of this report had still required a few new industries, we have got half a dozen skating rinks in St. John, roller rinks and ice rinks. He might have gone into the skating industries. I do not know any new industries better patronised or better paying, and I am quite sure he would have found a great many people in those skating rinks, and he might, with just as much propriety, put them down as manufacturers as he did the fishermen of St. John. Of course, he knew it was a ridiculous thing to do, but the reason he includes the fishermen is, because they are engaged in fishing only a portion of the year and when they are not engaged in fishing, they are engaged in some other mechanical operation. Well, I think that would apply equally well to those patronising the skating rink; therefore, I think he ought to have given us the number of people in the skating rinks as well as the number of barbers, butchers, ice cutters, etc. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not yet done with this wonderful production. Let us see how much the workingmen of St. John have been benefitted by the operation of this tariff. In 1878, according to Mr. Willis' own showing, there were 8,555 hands, including all these I have given you as employed in the manufacturing industries of St. John; they received in weekly wages \$63,749. To-day, after six years, trial of the National Policy, how much of an increase do you think there has been? Why, Sir, seven hands, or one each year. But worse than all; although there is an increase of seven hands, there is a decrease of \$1,769 in weekly wages. Now, Sir, the workingmen of St. John were told that they were to get a fair day's pay for a fair day's work. They were getting it then if they are getting it now, because they were getting much more then, according to Mr. Willis himself, than they are getting now. But if we take the yearly aggregate of wages, we find they are receiving \$99,967 less than they received six years ago. Now, Sir, we leave St. John, to deal with the Province as a whole. Does it make a better showing? I am not sure that it does. On the face of the report it would appear to. Examined critically, it does not. I think I will be able to show, before I get through, that the report, even in that respect, is misleading. In 1878, according to Mr. Willis, we had 11,975 hands, receiving \$4,680,841. To-day, according to Mr. Willis, we have 14,036 hands, receiving \$5,299,754; or an increase of 2,061 hands, including all the barbers, ice men, butchers, dentists, florists and such like; and we have an increase in wages of \$619,113. Well, Sir, this would be a better showing if it were true; but I am going to show by this self-same report that it cannot be true. If the hon. gentlemen who have the report in their possession will turn to page 134, they will find that the National Policy has been productive of some benefit to one particular place in New Brunswick; they will find in the table under the heading, "New Industries Started Since 1878," the town of Woodstock credited with fourteen new industries, giving employment to 113 hands, and a yearly aggregate of weekly wages amounting to \$510,010. Will the hon. gentleman take the trouble to calculate how much these men are receiving per head in the town of Woodstock? I have gone into the

figures—I may not be right; if I am wrong, I hope someone will point it out; but it would appear that the new hands employed in the new industries in the town of Woodstock are receiving, on an average, according to this statement, \$4,513.36 per man. It cannot be said that the National Policy has done no good in New Brunswick. But it may be said this is a typographical error, that it is the fault of the printer or the proof-reader. I think, Sir, I am in a position to deny that. I do not think it is the business of the type-setter or the proof-reader to correct additions. I find the additions in this table are made correctly. If further proof were wanted, you have only to turn to another place in the same report and you find the same figures. Therefore, I think I may fairly claim that it is not a typographical error, but that it is—I will not say a wilful misrepresentation, I will not say a deliberate falsification, but I will say it is an unpardonable blunder, on the part of the gentleman employed, to force a report of this kind on the Government. This report shows that we have some \$600,000 more paid in yearly wages to the number of hands employed than we had in 1878. It seems to me that this Government report should not be allowed to go to the country. It is certainly misleading, and I hope its statements will be looked into, and if they are found to be incorrect, as I submit I have shown them to be, I trust that at least no more copies will be issued. No one has any right to expect such wages as those to which I have referred, and I know of only one new industry in which they would be likely to be paid, and that is in a Government factory for manufacturing statistics such as the present report. In six years the natural increase of our population, if the census be correct, would have called for nearly, if not quite as large, a number of hands employed in manufactories to meet the wants of our people. It would not be unreasonable to have expected 2,000. We have had some good times, and if the census returns be correct, we would have made a considerable increase without any stimulus being applied. But we have something to console us. The Finance Minister informed us the other day that the commissioners, not naming Mr. Willis particularly, had not time to visit all the places in which new manufactures had been started under the National Policy, and therefore he took the liberty of adding 50 per cent. to the number. I am pretty well acquainted with New Brunswick—I do not know much of the county of Gloucester and other northern counties, but I know something of the river counties, and I failed to see, on looking over this report where that gentleman could have gone to find anything to add. The report says:

“There are in Woodstock, and conducting business, besides the foregoing, some 10 milliners and dressmakers, 2 newspaper offices, 3 undertakers, 4 painters, 5 watchmakers, 1 edge-tool maker, 2 gold and silversmiths, 1 or 2 bakers, 6 blacksmiths and shoers, several (probably half a dozen) carpenters or builders, and 3 or 4 masons, whose weekly payroll would, at least, run up to \$650. In the county of Carleton there are, outside of Woodstock, doing business—54 blacksmiths who do general work, and most of them horseshoeing, 45 boot and shoemakers, 1 brick maker, 62 builders, 3 masons, 16 carriage or sleigh builders, 16 grist and carding mills, 9 harnessmakers, 16 tanners and curriers. These several occupations would very probably afford employment to some 360 men and say 60 boys. The wages of the men would sum up weekly, at a moderate estimate, \$2,500; and the boys might, at a low estimate, be expected to earn \$120 per week. The total weekly earnings of the several industrial occupations enumerated would reach \$2,620.”

I am satisfied the commissioner never visited all those persons, but most of them were taken from the census returns. I am not sure, however, but that they may have been there at the time the census was taken, yet were they there in 1874. I should not be surprised if there was one place in New Brunswick that had made some substantial progress under the National Policy, or during the period which the National Policy has been in existence. I refer to Moncton. But I might safely say that with the enterprise displayed by that town, with the capital at its command, with a rail-

Mr. KING.

way built by the Government, costing, according to returns submitted to this House, \$40,000,000, making Moncton the most central and best distributing point in New Brunswick, it is not much cause for wonder if new industries have thrived, for they would have thrived there without the National Policy. But it is true that in the county of York a very large cotton mill has been erected, and I believe it is nearly ready to commence operations. I do not believe it will become a subject for criticism in this House because a stock list was not opened for subscriptions, the establishment is built by one man. It will not be surprising if the factory is a success. The well known energy and perseverance which the owner has displayed throughout his career is sufficient to ensure the success of that factory. It is well known that those characteristics have served him in times past and enabled him to make a success in certain lines of business when other people had utterly failed. I hope he may have good success in this the same as he has enjoyed heretofore in the other lines of business in which he has been engaged. I might say it is a little remarkable that hon. gentlemen opposite hold Mr. Gibson in much higher estimation now than they did formerly, when he submitted a tender for building the Canadian Pacific Railway and offered half a million dollars deposit. He did not get the contract, but he has since built this cotton factory. I venture to say to-night that no harder task could be given to any person than to send him from Ottawa to St. John for the purpose of interesting capitalists in manufacturing enterprises. It is certain such a mission would fail. The people of New Brunswick have had a bitter experience. We have had Parks' cotton factory enlarged, agricultural implement works, worsted goods, patent leather, lock and brass works, knitting factory, St. Croix cotton factory, and a number of other important industries, which were not fairly started until they were compelled to succumb. If it were right to characterise any industries in New Brunswick as waning industries, it would be those industries started under the National Policy, and not the lumber business. We are told in the report that shipbuilding has been abandoned in St. John. Yet it is remarkable that, according to the report of the commissioner, \$500 more weekly wages are paid now in that business than in 1878. I do not understand how that agrees with the statement that the industry is depressed and is declining. I do not say that it is flourishing; I give the figures as I find them in this report. But, Sir, it is said that the hard times have been caused by the depression in the lumbering and shipbuilding which formerly flourished in St. John and the Province. It is true that at the present time the lumber business is depressed in New Brunswick, and I believe elsewhere. It would be folly for me or for any person knowing anything about the matter to deny it. But it is not true that in the last five years, as compared with the five previous years, the lumber industry has been a waning industry in New Brunswick. From 1874 to 1879 New Brunswick exported of the products of the forest \$22,319,214 worth; from 1874 to 1884, \$25,406,044, or an increase in the exports of the products of the forest, in those five years, as compared with the previous five years, of \$3,086,828. And coming down to deals, I find that the increase has been on that article alone, \$1,204,468. It has been stated here that the prices obtained in those five years were not so good as in previous years. I deny that; and I say that taking five years, from June, 1879, to June, 1884, and the price will compare favorably with the five years previous. Take the prices of saw-logs, the raw material, and I have no hesitation in saying that I can place saw-logs in St. John at an advance of 40 per cent. on the prices in 1878, for the reason that freights are lower than they were, so that our manufacturers are able to pay better prices than they were heretofore. Still, I do not say that

the lumber business is not depressed at the present time, but the remedy applied is not an efficient one. Sir, we are having a depression in New Brunswick; we are having harder times than we had a year or two ago, and that fact is not entirely due to the depression in the lumber business, or the decline in shipbuilding. I shall endeavor to show, as briefly as possible, what, in my opinion, has contributed to bring about the depression. In the five years, from 1874 to 1879—and I take those years because they were alluded to by the Finance Minister—the imports of New Brunswick amounted to \$36,706,037; in the five years, from 1879 to 1884, the imports had dwindled to \$30,571,204, or a decline of \$6,134,793; and yet, Sir, the hon. member for Kings (Mr. Foster) told us that the volume of our trade is rapidly increasing. He took the year 1878 and he compared it with 1874. He shows that there has been a great increase, but he took great pains not to compare, or, at all events, he carefully avoided comparing, the year 1874 with 1884, which he should have done if he really wanted to state the matter fairly. But the comparison which I understood him to make was an unfair comparison, and one which was unworthy of him. Well, Sir, in the first period of five years we paid of duties, including Excise, \$7,207,757; but I deduct from that \$400,000 paid on goods imported to supply the place of good lost in the St. John fire. I think it has always been conceded that those duties actually amounted to that sum; I think that has been stated here on good authority on the other side of the House. Deducting that amount, the balance is \$6,807,757, the net amount paid in the five years. The duties paid in the last five years, including Excise, amounted to \$7,877,173, or an increase, including Excise, of \$1,069,416, and that, Sir, with a decreased importation to the extent of some six or seven million dollars. That is one cause of the hard times—the increased taxation imposed on us during the last five years by this tariff. But there are other causes. There is the capital locked up, and the amount of that capital I put as follows—that is on the capital of factories either lost or unproductive. There is the St. Croix factory, which I estimate at \$200,000, and which my hon. friend from Charlotte will correct if I am wrong; the St. John Cotton Company, \$200,000; Parks & Company, \$150,000; Moncton lock works I estimate at \$60,000; and other smaller industries closed down, \$90,000. This gives us a sum of \$700,000 of New Brunswick capital, because I do not include in this the amount of American capital invested in the St. Croix factory. This is exclusively capital belonging to or invested by the people of New Brunswick, and a great deal of it by men who can ill-afford to spare it, and I am satisfied that in many cases if the stock of these enterprises were put on the market it would not realise 10 cents on the dollar. I propose now to consider the increased cost of goods we have been compelled to purchase in Ontario and Quebec. I use the word "compelled," because I believe it is the proper word to use, and I get my figures on this phase of the subject from a paper which was read before the St. John Board of Trade by a prominent supporter of hon. gentleman opposite, Mr. C. H. Fairweather, who states in that paper, which has got a good deal of publicity, having been referred to in the Address, as well as by the member for Pictou and other hon. Members in this House—that the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick purchase from Ontario and Quebec and Manitoba about \$12,000,000 annually. Our proportion of that, according to population, would be about \$5,000,000. I think I may fairly put down \$25,000,000 for the five years, but I will put it at \$20,000,000. It may be said that we are not paying any more for goods we purchase in Ontario and Quebec than we would have had to pay under the tariff which prevailed before the National Policy. That may be true to-day, but I am satisfied that for the first one or two, or three years after the introduction of this policy, we paid

largely in advance of the costs of goods as they could have been laid down under a revenue tariff, as it existed under the previous Government. I think I put it at a low figure when I estimate the increased cost in round numbers, on goods purchased, exclusive of flour, at \$200,000 a year, or in five years \$1,000,000. Then we have Mr. Fairweather's estimate for flour purchased in the Upper Provinces, amounting to something like 400,000 barrels a year, and we have the best authority for saying that the cost of that flour has increased to us under the operation of the tariff, by the amount of 10 cents per barrel. I will give you my authority. In *Hansard*, of 1881, at page 1024, the Minister of Finance is reported as saying:

"I know it is a vexed question, and hon. members on both sides of the House argue it from different standpoints; but it is clear that the effect of the tariff has been to increase the price of flour, wheat and other cereals; and, from the most careful enquiry that can be made, I have arrived at this estimate, that flour is increased to the consumer in Canada 10 cents per barrel."

Now, I add \$200,000 duty on the flour for the same period, and I get \$3,000,000 taken from us in five years under the operation of this tariff. This, I fancy, will account, in a large measure, for the depression that exists in New Brunswick to-day, quite as much, perhaps, as the depression in the shipping or the lumbering industries. I propose to refer briefly again to this paper of Mr. Fairweather's. We are told by hon. gentlemen opposite that we have something to offset this loss of foreign trade in the rapid growth of interprovincial trade. Well, let us examine into this for a moment. Mr. Fairweather has taken considerable pains to place this matter before the St. John Board of Trade. It is quite evident that either that gentleman has erred in his calculation, or a committee of this House, who were appointed about two years ago, expressly to enquire into this matter, were sadly astray; for I find, on referring to the report of the select committee in the Sessional Papers of that year, that we are put down as actually purchasing, including Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island, \$2,000,000. From that I deduct \$1,000,000 for Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, which would leave us \$1,000,000, or just 50 per cent. more than the amount given by Mr. Fairweather. Well, what are those exports, taking his figures? Flour, \$2,750,000; oatmeal, \$320,000; oats, \$75,000; bran, barley and peas, \$30,000; canned meats, \$25,000; preserved fruits, \$10,000; cheese, \$40,000; butter, \$30,000; malt, \$60,000; mill feed \$35,000; making a total of agricultural products exported from Ontario and Quebec to the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia of \$3,375,000, coming into direct competition with the products of our own farmers in their own markets. I would not object to that if there was any reciprocity of trade. But let us turn to the other side of the question, and what do we find? What are our farmers able to find a market for in Ontario? \$10,000 worth of wool is the only export of agricultural produce to Ontario from the Maritime Provinces. Divide that among the 100,000 farmers in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, and it just gives them 10 cents apiece. Of the remaining \$8,625,000 sold us as shown by Mr. Fairweather, over 85 per cent. is goods manufactured from materials produced in the country, and therefore it gives Ontario and Quebec an addition to their market to that extent. Now, let us for a moment examine the other side of the account, and do we find that New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are as favorably situated. In Mr. Fairweather's statement we find \$1,695,722 worth of sugar as the export from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to the Upper Provinces. Well, Sir, I have taken the trouble to get posted somewhat on this subject by a gentleman who is considered in this House a pretty good authority on the sugar question; and he tells me that that would represent about \$1,000,000 of actual cash expenditure on the part of the refineries for the raw sugar, and that about \$400,000 would

be required to pay the duty, leaving a balance of \$295,000 as the amount which would go into the pockets of the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for handling and refining that quantity of sugar. Then we have \$750,000 worth of cotton; but that, though it is a manufacture, is not wholly a product of the Lower Provinces. Deduct, for the raw material, \$100,000, and you have a balance of \$350,000 as the amount derived from the manufacture of that quantity of cotton. Then we have coal, a Nova Scotia product, valued at \$766,000; iron from Nova Scotia, \$474,221; and a sum total of all other articles, \$587,339; making, in the way I have stated, \$2,422,560, which, divided by our 800,000 population, gives us a market in the Upper Provinces for our own products, to the extent of \$3 a head, against a market in the Maritime Provinces for the Upper Provinces to the extent of \$15 a head. I think it may be fairly said that if there is an interprovincial trade, it is almost or entirely one-sided. In saying this, I may, perhaps, be putting an argument in the mouths of some hon. gentlemen from the Province of Ontario, in favor of continuing to impose upon us this policy. If I do, I cannot help it. But I now propose to show what this interprovincial trade is worth to New Brunswick. I am surprised that Mr. Fairweather, a representative of the Board of Trade of St. John, did not deal with the matter from that standpoint, but was so willing to group Nova Scotia and New Brunswick together. He must have had a purpose in doing so; for the feeling that exists between St. John and Halifax is not such as to induce him to deal with the question in that way. Take sugar, \$295,000; cotton, \$300,000; cars and car wheels, \$38,000; canned goods, \$35,000; wool, \$10,000; skates, tacks, nails, etc., \$30,000; fish, \$150,000; and leather, \$84,000; making a total of \$942,000, furnished partly by Nova Scotia and partly by New Brunswick. New Brunswick's proportion of this, according to population, would be \$400,000. Add to that \$53,899 for red granite, \$6,000 for grindstones, and \$10,000 for finnan haddies, wholly New Brunswick products, or \$82,899 for these three items, which gives \$482,899 as our proportion, or less than half a million dollars sold by New Brunswick to Ontario and Quebec, while our proportion of the \$12,000,000 amounts to over \$5,000,000. Now, I think I have proved conclusively that the lumber industry during the past five years, whatever it may be in the future, has not been a waning one; and if it were, the tariff has not supplied other industries to take its place. I think I have demonstrated, also, that manufacturing made greater and more permanent advances under a revenue tariff than under the National Policy. I think I have satisfied a good many gentlemen that the report of the factory commission is valueless and misleading. I have pointed out how taxation has been increased without giving us corresponding benefits, I have pointed out that depression does exist and that it is due, in a large measure, to the causes I have stated, and not to the causes assigned in the report. Before taking my seat, I would ask the Government to make a sacrifice, in order to secure for the people of New Brunswick what they demand. They wish to have a reciprocity treaty with the United States and the countries further south, if possible. As the hon. member for Queens (Mr. Davies) said, we do not ask the Government to go down on their knees to our American neighbors; we simply ask that the Government should approach, in a business-like manner, a practical business people, with whom we are trading continuously. If the Americans resent our approach, we will have no further reason to complain of the Government; but until some further attempt be made, you may rest assured, Sir, that the people of the Maritime Provinces will insist upon something being done. It is not too much to remind the Government there is an east as well as a west in this Dominion; it is not too much to remind them that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick we have undeveloped resources quite

Mr. KING.

as great as those in the North-West, and the day may not be long distant when the Government will discover that they have a better heritage in the east than they have in the west. The day may not be far off when the spell cast over the people of this country, with regard to the North-West, will be broken; and I hope, when it is, justice may be meted out to the older Provinces in the east.

Mr. BURNS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 16th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to refer to an article which appeared in Friday's *Free Press*, under the heading, "Dividing the Spoils." It states that a number of Conservative members of Parliament were interested in timber limits in the North-West, and, amongst others, mentions the name of P. S. Sproule, M.P., which, I presume, is intended for mine. Some time ago a list appeared in the *Globe*, called the "Black List," in which, amongst a number of names, I saw mine figuring. I only rise to say that I never have had, either directly or indirectly, any interest in timber lands, mining lands, agricultural lands, or any other lands in Manitoba or the North-West, with the exception of some few village lots which I bought at private sale and at auction. I have had to do as many other members of this House, I presume, have done. When parties have written to me asking me to put in applications for timber limits for them, I have, out of courtesy, done it. And that is how my name appeared in that list. I may say that seven out of the ten or twelve I have applied for are Reformers, who happened to live, previously, in my riding, or who were acquainted with me in some way or other. I have only applied in their behalf when they have written to me, and further than that I have had no interest at all.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to ask the Premier if he can give me any information as to the time I am likely to receive that list of stockholders of the Grand Trunk Railway, which was ordered last Session?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have explained to the hon. gentleman the unfortunate error by which the return for last year was not transmitted to the Grand Trunk Company. I understand, however, that it, as well as the return moved for by my hon. friend this year, have been transmitted to the board of the Grand Trunk Railway Company in England for the purpose of their obeying the command of my hon. friend and this House.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would my hon. friend state, if he can, at what time it is probable that these returns will come before the Session closes?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have not the most distant idea. I am told they will involve the copying of several volumes.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 51) for granting certain powers to the International Coal Company (Limited).—(Mr. Desjardins.)

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)

DAVIS DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell) Moved the second reading of Bill (No. 84) for the relief of Amanda Esther Davis—(From the Senate.)

Motion agreed to, on a division, and Bill read the second time.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(Mr. Cameron, Victoria.)

HOMESTEADS—CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. BLAKE asked, How many homesteads have been entered within the Canadian Pacific Railway belt up to 31st December last, between,—1. The first and second principal meridians; 2. The second and third; 3. The third and fourth; 4. The fourth and fifth.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The first and second principal meridians, 7,949; the second and third, 3,917; the third, fourth, *nil*; fourth and fifth, 23; total 11,889.

INCREASED SUBSIDY TO NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. KIRK asked, Has the Government yet decided on the claims of the Government of Nova Scotia for increased subsidy? If so has the Nova Scotia Government been notified of the decision? What was the decision?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The matter has been referred to a sub-committee of the Privy Council, who, I hope, will report in a day or two, and the whole question, I hope, may be settled by the end of the week.

ALLAN LINE—ASSISTED PASSAGES.

Mr. BLAKE (for Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT) asked, Total amount paid by Government to the Allan Line from 1st July, 1878, to 1st July, 1883, for assisted passages and for all other purposes, except sums paid on account of mail service.

Mr. POPE. I have not the information, but if the hon. gentleman will put a notice on the paper and move for a return I will bring it down. I would like him to move for a return since 1873.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH FRANCE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government have made with any steamship company a contract awarding to such company the annual subsidy of \$50,000 voted by Parliament for a line of steamers between France and Canada? If such contract exists, has Mr. J. X. Perrault, of Montreal, at present in France, been delegated by the Government to negotiate with the Government of France with a view to obtain for such Company a subsidy equivalent to the Canadian subsidy, or some other pecuniary advantage? Is Mr. Perrault accredited to the Canadian Government as the representative of the Company to which the contract has been awarded; and has he, in that capacity or otherwise, been entrusted with any mission whatever to the French Government or to the High Commissioner in London?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. 1st. The Government has passed an Order in Council authorising the execution of a contract with the Halifax Steamship Company. 2nd. The Government has not delegated Mr. J. X. Perrault, of Montreal, to the effect mentioned in the question or for any other purpose. 3rd. The company has not accredited Mr. Perrault to this Government, and therefore that gentleman could not be intrusted with any mission in that respect,

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

Mr. AMYOT asked, At whose request, and in virtue of what authority, order or statute, was the sum of \$7,200 paid and entered to the debit of the Province of Quebec, as on the "30th June, 1884, for one year's interest on Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures," as it appears on page 4 of part IV., of the Public Accounts of Canada for the year 1884?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. By the 3rd section of the award the arbitrators appointed to adjust the debts and assets of Ontario and Quebec, the Montreal Turnpike Trust was declared to be the property of Quebec. By the 4th section of the award the arbitrators adjudged that as the sum of \$188,000 (representing the Trust) was secured by debentures issued upon the credit of the Trust and guaranteed by the late Province of Canada, and the Trust had hitherto met the payments upon such debentures, and the payment thereof had therefore not been assumed by the Dominion of Canada, nor had the said sum of \$188,000 been charged by the Dominion in the debt of the late Province of Canada and the said arbitrators had assigned the Trust as an asset of the Province of Quebec, that Province should thereafter indemnify, protect and leave harmless the Dominion and the Province of Ontario against any charge upon, or payment by the Dominion in respect of the said debentures or the said guarantee or in respect in any way of the said Trust. Of this \$188,000 of debentures \$120,000 are in the hands of the public and interest thereon at 6 per cent. \$7,200 have for some years past been paid half-yearly by the Dominion, the Province of Quebec having for some time made periodical remittances to cover the amounts so paid. The whole matter is now being investigated and I trust will soon be closed.

CHINESE COMMISSION.

Mr. BLAKE asked, At what date, for what term, and at what rent were premises rented for the use of the Commission on the Chinese question? Is the Secretary still under pay? If not, when did his pay cease?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. Rooms were rented in the Senate until the beginning of the Session, when a room was rented outside for a few weeks. I have not the price of the rental at hand. The secretary was under pay until the Commission closed its labors on the 28th February.

THE BOUNDARY QUESTION.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Has the Government yet decided on any proposals to be made to Parliament with reference to the boundary question? When will such proposals be made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I thought it right to communicate first with the Government of Manitoba on the subject, and I have just received their answer. I find from it that they would desire Imperial legislation, so far as they are concerned. Therefore this matter will be dealt with without any delay.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. CASEY asked, When will the plans and reports of the engineers respecting the Short Line be laid on the Table of the House?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Soon.

STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH FRANCE.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Have the Government of Canada taken steps to inform the French Government that they have already treated with a Transatlantic Steamship Company between France and Canada? Are the Government

prepared to state what steps the said company have taken towards their undertaking, and how many steamships they will have at their disposal in the spring?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government has asked the High Commissioner to inform the French authorities that the subsidy of \$50,000 voted by Canada has been granted to the Halifax Steamship Company, represented in Europe by Mr. Wood. One of the members of the company is obliged to commence a fortnightly service next spring. The Government understand that the company are making satisfactory arrangements for placing their steamers on at that time.

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST ASIATIC CHOLERA.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether the Government has taken or intends to take any and what preventive measures against the attacks of Asiatic cholera, and other epidemic diseases? Has a special system for the inspection of vessels, coming up the River St. Lawrence been established for this purpose? Will the rags imported for the manufacture of paper be specially inspected?

Mr. POPE. A proclamation containing regulations was issued on the 28th June, 1884, and was sent to quarantine officers and Customs officers. The Customs officers at the several ports where there are no quarantine officers are the quarantine officers for those places. A proclamation dealing with vessels coming up the St. Lawrence was issued on the 9th August, 1884, and sent to quarantine officers and Customs officers. Every vessel coming into the St. Lawrence to Quebec, excepting steamers, which are examined at Rimouski, is examined at Grosse Isle. The proclamation of the 9th August deals with rags from infected ports. They are entirely prohibited now.

NEW BRUNSWICK JUDGES.

Mr. DAVIES asked, Has the attention of the Government been called to the fact that the appointment of judges for the year's circuit in New Brunswick has not been made in Hilary term past as usual? Has the vacancy on the bench of the Supreme Court of that Province been filled up? If not, when will the appointment be made?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The attention of the Government was not called till the other day. The appointment will be made within a few days.

CANADIAN CONTINGENT FOR THE SOUDAN.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether any offer has been made by the Government of Canada, or whether any offer has been made by any individuals through the Government of Canada, to equip and send a military contingent to the Soudan at the cost of Canada or of individual Canadians? Whether any offer of military assistance at the cost of the British Government has been made by the Government or by individuals? Whether any reply has been received to any such offers? And whether the correspondence will be laid on the Table?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No offer has been made by the Government of Canada to equip and send a military contingent to the Soudan at the cost of Canada or of individual Canadians. It is understood that some offers have been made by individuals. Some were sent directly to England, I believe; some were sent to the Governor General as an Imperial officer; and some came to the Department of Militia—these were sent to the Governor General for his information. I am not aware that any offer of military assistance at the cost of the British Government has been made by the Government or by individuals.

Mr. AMYOT,

INDIAN SCHOOLS IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. KIRK rose to ask:

- (1.) How many Industrial schools for the instruction of Indian youth have been established in the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories respectively, under the authority and by permission of the Government of Canada, and where are they located?
- (2.) At what places have lands been surveyed and set apart for Indian schools in 1884, and what quantity at each place?
- (3.) Through whose representations and recommendations are these schools established from time to time? Is any request from the Indians themselves required for the establishment of a school?
- (4.) What subjects of instruction are provided for these schools in regard to industrial pursuits, moral and religious? Are both sexes included in the general school provisions?
- (5.) Are any of the Indian schools placed under the care or supervision of any religious body or denomination? If so, what are the conditions upon which control is granted, and what is the extent of the denominational control, and is it to the extent granted, a temporary or permanent control? If there are denominational schools, what is the number belonging to each denomination, where are they located, and what quantity of land is owned or controlled by each, and what is the number of pupils?
- (6.) When the moral and religious instruction of an Indian school is placed under the supervision or control of any denomination, does it give to the denomination the control of the land and buildings of such school?
- (7.) At whose cost are the Indian school buildings erected and furnished and under whose directions are the text books selected or compiled? By whom are they paid for?
- (8.) What standing of attainment is required of teachers in these schools? How and from whom do they receive certificates of qualification? Is there a system of governmental inspection of these Indian schools?
- (9.) Are the teachers and trustees or managers of these schools required to make any periodical returns to the Government of the attendance, general condition, progress and expenditure of each?
- (10.) Have any of the religious denominations obtained lands for church or school purposes from the Government or from any Indian reservation by treaty or otherwise?
- (11.) Have any of the religious bodies on their own responsibility established schools among the Indians, and if they have did they receive any assistance directly or indirectly by land grants or otherwise for the support of such schools, from the Government?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman must give notice of that and move in the ordinary way. It is not a question.

DISTRIBUTION OF THE STATUTES.

Mr. TROW asked, Is it the intention of the Government to send the statutes of Canada to Coroners?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, it is not the intention.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY BELT.

Mr. BLAKE asked, How many acres of their land grant have been finally accepted and taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company within the Canadian Pacific Railway belt: 1, between the first and second principal meridians; 2, between the second and third; 3, between the third and fourth; 4, between the fourth and fifth; 5, in Southern Manitoba outside the railway belt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am very sorry I cannot give an answer at present, but I hope to be able to furnish the hon. gentleman with that return in a few days.

ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE—MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. McISAAC asked, Is the contract for carrying the mails between Antigonish and Sherbrooke given? If so, to whom, and for what amount? Were tenders asked, if not, why not?

Mr. CARLING. The contract has been renewed with Mr. McGrath, the former contractor; for \$1,092, that being the price at which Mr. McGrath performed the work prior to 1885.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY — CONNECTION WITH THE ONTARIO SYSTEM.

Mr. MULLOCK asked, What is the lowest price per mile by way of bonus from the Dominion Government at which any person or corporation offered to construct a railway connecting the Canadian Pacific Railway with the Ontario railway system at or near Gravenhurst?

Mr. POPE. I would ask the hon. gentleman to move that in the usual way by an address.

ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RAILWAY EXTENSION CO.

Mr. WELDON asked, What amount has been advanced by the Government to the St. John Bridge and Railway Extension Company, on account of work done by them to February 1st, 1885? What is the estimated value of the work done by the company to that date?

Mr. POPE. The chief engineer's estimate of 8th January, 1885, was \$338,567; the first payment made thereon, on February 1st, 1885, was \$270,800.

REFUND OF RAILWAY BONUSES TO ONTARIO.

Mr. COOK moved for:

Copy of the memorial presented to the Government by the County Council of the County of Simcoe, Ontario, praying for a refund of bonuses granted by the different municipalities of that county to railways that have been declared by this Parliament to be works for the general advantage of Canada, together with copies of all correspondence and other papers relating thereto.

He said: After Confederation the railway era of the Province of Ontario began. The Government of the day passed an Act by which railways were to be granted a certain amount of money, I think \$1,500,000, for their construction in the Province of Ontario. That stimulated municipalities, who had the power under a general Act to grant bonuses to roads that were being constructed in their midst. The people, smarting under the monopolies of the different railways then in existence, endeavored to relieve themselves by the construction of rival roads which were promoted by individuals and bonused by the Provincial Government and the municipalities. The county of Simcoe formed no exception to this rule. The Northern Railway, it is well known, was constructed years ago from Collingwood, on the Georgian Bay, to the city of Toronto. That railway had no competition, and therefore it charged whatever rates it saw fit. The people of the county of Simcoe, desiring to break the monopoly, decided to assist a number of gentlemen to construct a road from the village of Allandale, near the town of Barrie, to the city of Hamilton, connecting there with the Great Western Railway and the water communication of Lake Ontario. On that occasion the county of Simcoe, or the municipalities in the south riding of it, contributed very largely to the line, their object being to do away with the monopoly of the Northern Railway. The county solicitor was called upon by the different municipalities to draw up an agreement between them and the gentlemen who were to construct the road, but it appears that the document was so loosely drawn that a coach and four could have been driven through it. The Hamilton and North-Western, of which I am now speaking, received from the municipalities altogether in the way of bonuses \$719,000, and it also received Government aid to the extent of \$428,852.22. It is not necessary for me to mention the amounts each municipality contributed to the fund, but I have gone through the figures and can give them in detail if necessary. Well, Sir, as I said before, owing to the looseness with which the agreement had been drawn, soon as this road was constructed, it amalgamated with the Northern Railway, and the consequence was that, instead of weakening the monop-

oly, it was intensified and rendered more burdensome. The result is that last summer the company charged eight cents a bushel for carrying wheat from the village of Allandale, or the town of Barrie, to the city of Toronto, a distance of sixty miles, while they carried wheat for two cents a bushel from the town of Collingwood over the whole road, some thirty-five miles farther than from the town of Barrie. You will, therefore, see at a glance how unfairly the people of that county are being treated by this great monopoly. Well, Sir, then the Midland Railway was constructed, it was constructed largely by loans from the Government and from the municipalities through which it runs. The municipalities gave the Midland Railway \$142,500, and the Government gave them \$155,798.14, enabling the company to build their line. Towards the portion running through the county of Simcoe the municipalities of that county contributed \$46,370.85. But that did not do away with the difficulties the people of that section of the country were laboring under. Then, Sir, we had the Northern Extension, costing a large amount of money. This road ran through the county of Simcoe tapping the district of Muskoka, where the people of this section got the advantage of it. I must not overlook the North Simcoe Railway, to which the municipalities rendered assistance to the amount of \$75,000, and the Government gave \$46,874.52. Now, Sir, we find in the whole Province of Ontario, that the amount of money granted in bonuses by the Provincial Government amounted to \$6,520,240.80, while the municipalities gave \$6,385,980. Municipalities of the Province and the Provincial Government have contributed a total amount of \$12,806,220.80. You will see therefore, Mr. Speaker, that a large sum of money has been expended by Ontario on the construction of railways from which no doubt benefit has been derived. But those roads have been taken from the Province by the Dominion Act of 1883, by which they were declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. Neither the Provincial Government nor the municipalities have any control over these railways—although they put their money into them—because of the action of the Dominion Government which has taken them without leave or license. I may say that the memorial presented to the Government was from the County Council of the county of Simcoe, a memorial passed unanimously by that body, which is one of the largest of the kind in Ontario, about two-thirds of the members of which are Conservatives. It cannot, therefore, be said that this is a party question or a party movement. I am sure, moreover, that there are as zealous Tories in that Municipal Council as can be found on the other side of the House. I beg the First Minister's pardon, for I remember that at the last convention held in Toronto by his friends the name of the party was changed; they are no longer called Tories or Conservatives, because the First Minister said they were Conservative-Liberals. I remember during my campaign in 1872 holding a meeting in a part of the country where the people were largely Highland Scotch. My opponent, Mr. McCarthy, did not happen to be there, but he sent a Highland Scotchman from Collingwood, Mr. Dudgeon, at present mayor of that town. Knowing that the place in question was one of my strongholds he commenced very mildly, and after he had spoken about twenty minutes, one of the electors asked him: On which side are you? what are your politics? you have been speaking twenty minutes and have not indicated what your politics are? Well, said the speaker, I belong to the party which was once called the Tory party; we then changed our name to the Conservative party, but we are now called the party of union and progress. While making that statement an elector rose and said: Thieves like to change their names. On looking at Webster I find that Tory is said to be an Irish word meaning robbers and savages. The party has changed the name, but the members of it appear not to have abandoned their predatory instincts. I notice that

in a speech made by the hon. Premier to a deputation that waited on him some time ago he stated :

"The words of the Act of 1883, declaring certain roads for the general advantage of Canada, are of no consequence. They are put into every railway Bill granted by the Dominion Parliament in cases where a railway or railways affected are considered within one Province, in order to show that the Federal Parliament had a right to deal with the subject. The words 'for the general advantage of Canada' are merely a phrase."

That phrase, to my mind, means that the railways taken from the Government and the municipalities are now in the hands of the Dominion Government, and there are precedents by which they can refund the cost of their construction not only to the Provincial Government but also to the municipalities. We have a precedent in the refund given to the town of Pembroke. In 1882 a bonus had been given by that town to the extent of \$75,000, and at the time the election campaign was going on, the present member (Mr. White) received a telegram from the leader of the Government saying that the Dominion Government would recoup the town the amount of that bonus, which, together with the interest added, say \$10,000, would make the sum of \$85,000. We have, therefore, a precedent in Ontario itself. If we go to the Province of Quebec we find another precedent in the case of the North Shore Railway. I am confident that if an attempt were made to deprive the Province of Quebec of their railways, as has been done in the case of Ontario, there is not a *Blue* in this House who would not rise with indignation. I call on the Conservatives or the Liberal-Conservatives or the Conservative-Liberals, if they prefer the last name, to insist on the Government handing back to the municipalities and the Provincial Government that which rightly belongs to them. There is not, I repeat, a Conservative member from Quebec who would allow the Government to do anything of this kind. We have had instances in which the Quebec Conservatives have shown how they make the Government accede to their wishes. Not long since you heard a speech from the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Ouimet) in which he stated that last Session they drove the Government to do certain things in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway vote. On that occasion, I understand—I was not present, but I read the report—the Secretary of State also made statements to the effect that they, the Quebec Conservatives, in their *Maison Bleue* last Session in No. 8 had driven the Government into doing that which they wanted them to do. I call on Conservative members from Ontario—and I believe there are some honest ones among them—to stand up for the rights of their Province, and not allow the Dominion Government to take that which rightly belongs to the Provincial Government. I consider this act of the Federal Government a gross breach of faith to the municipalities and Provinces, and not conducive to the well being of the autonomy of the Provinces forming this Confederation. They should not now hesitate to pay the small sum of \$12,806,000—it is nothing to hon. gentlemen opposite to pay—when even on a single corporation coming to them and asking for \$30,000,000, they immediately put their hands into the Treasury and hand in the money. They should not, therefore, I repeat, hesitate to pay the small sum of \$12,806,000 to the Provincial Government and those municipalities who form part of the Province of Ontario.

Mr. McCALLUM. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Cook) in discussing this question said that it was not a political one, but I know very well that when this question of railway aid came up in another place, in the Province of Ontario, it was a very strong political question; and as a member coming from the Province of Ontario I do not like the threat which has been thrown across the floor of this House that if we do not help the Province of Ontario in this matter we shall not come back to this House. As one

Mr. Cook,

who has the honor of representing a constituency in Ontario, I desire to do my duty by my county and by my Province, but at the same time I wish to do my duty by the whole Dominion. There are over 100 municipalities in the Province of Ontario, and out of this number there are 162 which have granted aid to railways, and these hon. gentlemen come here and they wish to tax the balance of the people of Ontario to enrich them—to enrich the municipalities who gave the aid to the railways and thereby improved their property. As a representative from the Province of Ontario I strongly object to that. It is stated that we should re-imburse the Province because certain grants have been made on account of railways in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman forgets to look at the advantage which the Province of Ontario has gained by the construction of the Pacific Railway through large portions of that Province—the Canada Central, the line from Gravenhurst to Callander. Will they say that these roads have not been of great benefit to the Province of Ontario? They say they do not want to make this a political question, but it certainly looks very much as if they did; but at any rate I repeat that when I held a seat in another place in the Province of Ontario it was made a political question, and a very extravagant political question. I know that in that Legislature every man who supported the Government of that day, if he had a railway to build, could obtain the help of that Government, and the Province of Ontario was so much embarrassed that if they had not the money in the treasury they mortgaged the Province to the extent of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year for twenty years, making two millions of dollars for that purpose, and to-day the Province of Ontario is borrowing money, or it did last year, because of these grants to railways. I will not be allowed to refer to a previous debate, but I may have something more to say when this question comes up again. I may have something to say about the city of St. Thomas, which wishes to fasten on this House the amount which was given by the people of that city and the county of Elgin in aid of the Canada Southern Railway to provide them with railway accommodation. I would ask them if they are any worse off now than they were before? They say that that road was made part of the Pacific Railway, but I would point out that that very fact makes the road of far more service than it was before, and they would be willing to pay double the bonus they have paid rather than the road should not be part of the Canadian Pacific Railway system.

Mr. MILLS. There are some features of this question which the hon. gentleman has left out of consideration altogether. The various railway corporations created by the Local Legislature were under the control of that Legislature and the municipalities created by that Local Legislature had their interests protected by the Local Legislature. Now the hon. gentleman was one of the persons who voted to declare these various roads for the general advantage of Canada. They were taken from under the control of the Local Legislature and placed under the control of the Parliament of Canada. The interests which the Local Legislature had at their creation has been taken away, and it has no longer the power to protect provincial interests as it had before. Here we have representatives from the Province of Quebec, the Maritime Provinces, Manitoba and British Columbia, who are wholly beyond the control of the people and the Legislature of the Province of Ontario. The hon. gentleman has changed the right of property. He has taken what was a valuable interest that the Province of Ontario had.

Mr. McCALLUM. Not at all.

Mr. MILLS. I say he has, I say the Local Legislature has no longer the power to control these corporations which they created; they have no longer the special power of

protecting the interests of their Province. The hon. gentleman voted to take away those roads from the control of the Local Legislature and place them under the control of the Parliament of Canada, and he is bound to compensate the Province for the interest he has destroyed. Why, Sir, it is not many Sessions since the First Minister charged—

Mr. McCALLUM. The hon. gentleman speaks of property being destroyed. I would ask him where is the destruction?

Mr. MILLS. The Local Legislature thought they had a public interest in these roads, or these grants would not have been made. They have aided the institutions they created, which were under their control, which were governed by provincial policy, and the hon. gentleman has taken those roads away from their control and placed them under the control of another body. What is the difference between doing this and the cession of territory? If the hon. gentleman, if he had such a power, were to take a portion of the Province of Ontario and hand it over to the United States, would not the Province demand some compensation? Yet he has ceded or taken violent possession of provincial property—~~for~~ all property is the creation of law, the creature of some legislative body or other—he has taken this property away which owes its existence to the Legislature of Ontario, and placed it under the control of the Government of the Dominion. The Legislature is no longer capable of protecting those interests for which it paid; it has been deprived of them without compensation.

Mr. McCALLUM. Why the hon. gentleman does the very thing he accuses this Government of doing. By the Act of 1874, passed by the Mackenzie Administration, when the hon. gentleman for East York was Prime Minister, it was declared that the Canada Southern Railway, one of the very roads which has been brought up in this House, was for the general advantage of Canada, and now the hon. member for Elgin the other day claimed that this was done by the act of this Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. My hon. friend will remember that the Canada Southern was placed in that position on account of its crossing the two boundaries; that was the sole reason. The hon. gentleman will look in vain for any statute passed during my administration of the kind which has recently been passed in this House.

Mr. O'BRIEN. As this question will come up again it is hardly worth while to discuss it at any length at this moment. I would simply remark in reply to the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Cook) that the great injury really done to the county of Simcoe by the amalgamation of the Hamilton and North-Western Railway with the Northern Railway, in the road which is now called the Northern and North-Western, was a result which, if the Legislature of Ontario had chosen to interfere, they might have prevented, if any legislative power could have prevented it. It is absurd to charge that upon the Dominion Government, for the thing was done before this legislation at all, and it might have been prevented by the Provincial Legislature, and not by any possibility by the Dominion Government.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Could not they have done it?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I say that it was under the control of the Legislature of Ontario, which might undoubtedly have passed an Act as effectually as this Parliament, or any other Government, with reference to railways which were wholly under its control. If anybody had the right to interfere to prevent the injury it would be the Legislature of the Province of Ontario, and not the Dominion Government. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) will have to argue for a very long time before he will convince the people of Ontario that they have been really, in any degree or any respect, injured by the legislation which took place in this House to

which he refers. I know that the county of Simcoe has been very largely benefited by the fact that the Northern Railway has become virtually a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway; because it is now part of a great through line by which the whole country will be supplied with better railway service in every respect. Therefore, I think that the mere theoretical value which is attached to this matter by hon. gentlemen who are raising this sectional cry is one which the people at large will not pay the slightest attention to. The County Councils, who have been stirred up for sectional and political purposes, by hon. gentlemen opposite and by their friends in Ontario, when they come to reflect seriously on the question, will see that they have been brought down here on a fool's errand, to ask things which no Government would grant them, and which I think they have no equitable right to ask. I say that, because the county of Simcoe is deeply interested in this question; but the hon. member should remember that the principal interest which the county of Simcoe has in this matter arose long years ago—even before Confederation. To bring up matters of this kind, and to seek to make the whole Dominion answerable, is to ask that which the country will never assent to. However, as this matter is to come up again, it is not necessary to discuss it now, more than to say that hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have no standing except on sectional issues, and so long as they cannot rise above sectional issues—

An hon. MEMBER. Sectional issues?

Mr. O'BRIEN. Yes, it is a sectional issue, because it is an endeavor to raise a prejudice in the Province of Ontario against the Province of Quebec—so long as they continue to pursue a sectional policy, so long will they remain as they are—a helpless, hopeless minority.

Mr. COOK. Is the hon. gentleman aware that the memorial was passed by the unanimous vote of the County Council of the county of Simcoe?

Mr. O'BRIEN. What difference does that make?

Mr. COOK. And will he say that all these men were fools who came here, or that they came on a fool's errand?

Mr. O'BRIEN. I did not say they were fools. I say that they were sent here on a fool's errand.

Mr. MULLOCK. I rise to correct a remark that fell from the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien). He stated that the amalgamation of the Hamilton and North-Western and the Northern Railways could have been prevented by the Legislature of Ontario, and that therefore one might properly argue that the Legislature of Ontario is responsible for any evil consequences that flow from that amalgamation. The amalgamation in question was consummated under the provisions of the Consolidated Railway Act of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. FLEMING. The county which I have the honor to represent is largely interested in the subject of this memorial. The council of that county have also adopted a memorial and forwarded it to the proper authorities somewhat similar in terms to the one forwarded from the county of Simcoe. The county of Peel bonused the Credit Valley Railway to the amount of \$70,000, the town of Brampton to the amount of \$20,000, and the village of Streetsville to the amount of \$20,000; that small county and these municipalities together giving \$110,000 to that railway. The township of Albion gave \$38,000 and the township of Caledon \$45,000 to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway. Portions of Albion, Caledon and Chingacousy gave \$30,000 to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway. The total sum granted by way of bonus by that county was \$223,000. Now, all these railways have by the Act of this Parliament been declared to be for the general interest of Canada, and have passed out of the control of

the Local Legislature. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the railways are there—that they have not destroyed the property or taken away any of the rights of the people; but they have taken from the people the rights of the Statute under which these railway bonuses were granted. The Legislature of Ontario in its Railway Aid Act provided:

“The Lieut.-Governor in Council may require any railway company so aided to enter into an agreement or agreements with any other railway company or companies containing such terms and details as the Lieut.-Governor in Council may approve of, in order to secure running powers or rights of user to such company or companies over the line or portion of line of railway of the company aided under this Act, or under former Acts, in the discretion of the Lieut.-Governor in Council, for the haulage thereover of the cars and traffic of such other company or companies upon such terms as, in default of agreement between the respective companies, may be settled by the Lieut.-Governor in Council.”

The powers of the Local Government under that section have been taken away, and these powers are now assumed by the Governor-in-Council of Canada. The Governor-in-Council of Canada is not amenable to the people of Ontario; he does not answer directly to the people of Ontario. This Government answers to the people of Canada, and the municipalities that have aided the railways have by their memorials and their deputations urged upon the Government the necessity of placing these municipalities in the position they were in before—either giving back the control of the railways, or giving back the money that the municipalities have advanced for the purpose of securing the construction of these railways. The Government of Ontario, under the conditions which I have read, granted aid to these railways. It not only granted them direct aid, but as the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) says, it mortgaged the country for 20 years at the rate of \$100,000 a year to aid these railways, and the aid is being paid by the Province of Ontario to the very railways which are now taken out of its control. What right has this Government to take away the control of these railways from the Provincial Government which is still paying them its aid? The hon. member for Monck seems to think that the people of Ontario have no rights at all in this matter. He and the hon. gentlemen who agree with him, seem to think that the giving over to the people of Canada of the control of these railways and of this money which has been advanced by the Province and the municipalities to them, is in the interest of the people of Ontario. The people of Ontario fail to see it; the county councils of Ontario fail to see it; and although the hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says that the county councils were stimulated by the advice of persons hostile to this Government to make their claim to reimbursement, it is not possible to conceive that any intelligent man, knowing the intelligence of the members of the county councils of the Province of Ontario, will say for a moment that these men came down here not knowing what they were doing. And the hon. leader of the Government recognised their intelligence, for he told the delegation that they could not expect the aid they sought. He told the delegation also, I believe, from the report of the interview in the *Mail* newspaper, that rather than put the municipalities in a false position he would advise the House to repeal the Act of 1883, and give back to the control of the Provincial Governments these railways and refuse to charter any local railways in future. I do not think he has put that last resolve into force, because I observe several local railway Bills have been passed by this House. Had the hon. gentleman repealed the Act of 1883 and given back to the Provinces the control of their railways and refused to aid local railways, he would have adopted the principle that was the correct principle from the first. He should never have interfered with the local railways at all. The moment this paternal Government assumed control over the affairs of the municipalities and the provinces, that moment it departed from its true position and sapped the foundations of

Mr. FLEMING.

Confederation. The true basis of Confederation, as I understand it, is that the Provinces are to have complete control over purely local affairs, and so long as the Provincial Governments are allowed to exercise full control within their own sphere the foundations of Confederation will remain secure. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) says that this motion is an endeavor to set the Province of Ontario against the Province of Quebec. It is nothing of the kind. The hon. gentlemen from Quebec who are supporters of the Government have my entire sympathy and admiration, because they stand up true to the interests of their Province, and neither in this House or out of it have I ever endeavored to cast any stigma on the efforts of members from the Province of Quebec to obtain what they think to be their just rights under Confederation. I am not surprised to see some hon. members from Ontario becoming restive under a motion of this kind. I am not surprised to hear some hon. gentlemen from Ontario, supporters of the Government, say that they have no interest in the matter at all, nor am I surprised that an hon. member should say as the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has just said, that although he would stand up for the rights of his county and the rights of the Provinces, yet the rights of the Dominion are to be taken care of. The rights of the Dominion are to be served by a conservation of the rights of the Provinces, and so long as the rights of the Provinces are observed the interests of the Dominion will be satisfied. Confederation came into effect in 1867 upon a purely financial basis. There were fixed financial arrangements among the different Provinces of the Dominion, and this Parliament has no right, without the consent of the different Provinces, to alter that contract. This is nothing more than a side wind; it is nothing more than by a side wind attempting to make an alteration in the financial terms of Confederation itself. But we are told the Province of Ontario has no right to ask that these moneys be returned; and we are told the Province of Quebec has this right, because the railway in respect of which aid was granted last Session is one of Dominion interest, that it has become a part of the great Canadian Pacific Railway, part of the all-rail route from ocean to ocean. To show the position of affairs I would state that the Canadian Pacific Railway control the North Shore Railway as far as Montreal, but beyond Montreal the Canadian Pacific Railway have no lines running over the North Shore at all. The railway from Montreal to Quebec, to which \$6,000 a mile was granted is not a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway at all. Now the Credit Valley Railway is a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway; the Credit Valley Railway and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway will always be a portion of the main line; for notwithstanding the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway on the north shore of Lake Superior, a large part of the traffic of the Canadian Pacific Railway will pass by means of water communication from Port Arthur to Owen Sound or over the Credit Valley Railway. There is no doubt that during a large period of the year this railway will continue to be the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway for all its traffic, notwithstanding the construction of the line is said to be for the benefit of Ontario. Hon. gentleman say \$30,000,000 have been spent in Ontario for the benefit of Ontario in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the Canadian Pacific Railway is an undertaking for purely national purposes; it is not for local purposes or for local benefit. The Canadian Pacific Railway is a purely national undertaking, and as a national undertaking the Government of Canada undertook to build it from Callander to the Pacific Ocean. As an advantage to the Province of Quebec, for the purpose of connecting the Province of Quebec with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the railway was constructed from Renfrew to Callander. That was for the purpose of connecting the Quebec system of railways with the Canadian

Pacific Railway in the interests of the people of the Province of Quebec. As an offset to that, it was agreed by the Minister of Railways that the people of Ontario had the right to have communication by means of Government aid with the Canadian Pacific Railway between Callander and Gravenhurst, and the bonus given by this Parliament for the construction of a railway from Gravenhurst to Callander is an offset for the aid given to the Province of Quebec for the construction of the railway east of Callander; and it is no answer to the demands of the Ontario Government and the Ontario municipalities to say that this undertaking ran through a large portion of their territory. If it is an answer we are entitled to consideration for the construction of the Intercolonial Railway which was largely built with the money of the people of Ontario and which runs largely through the Province of Quebec and the Eastern Provinces. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) says the Government of Ontario had to borrow money last year for the purpose of giving the aid to railways voted by that Legislature. If the hon. gentleman be true to the interests of his Province he will see that the Ontario Government is reimbursed to a certain extent for its outlay. What is the condition of the Province of Quebec? They had sold their railway, their finances were in a condition that demanded some assistance from the Government, it was necessary in order to the carrying out of the Government of Quebec that in some way further aid should be granted to them, and in that view this Parliament did grant further aid. Now, if that is the position in Ontario, too, the hon. member for Monck will be recreant to his duty, as a true patriot, as one thoroughly interested in Ontario, if he does not urge upon the Government to relieve that Province from the necessity of borrowing money to bonus these railways. But the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Government, I understand, told a delegation from the counties of Ontario that these railways were taken over simply for the purpose of protecting life and property; that the words "in the general interest of Canada" were merely a phrase, and it was simply for the purpose of protecting life and property at crossings that this Government assumed the control. Why, if that were the purpose, then the Act taking over the control is *ultra vires*, because it is not in the province of this Parliament to take any work over simply for the purpose of protecting life and property. The declaration that a work is for the general interest of Canada must be a substantial declaration and not a phrase, otherwise the hon. gentleman has been assuming control of these railways without the right, without having the pretence of a right, without even the pretence of declaring that they are for the general advantage of Canada. If these words, as they are used in that Act, are only a phrase, then that phrase has been adopted for the very purpose of depriving the Province of Ontario of the control of the railways she has so largely aided. The Province of Ontario has never knocked at the door of this Parliament for aid. The Province of Ontario has never asked that the terms of Confederation either in letter or in spirit should be altered. The people of that province have been able out of the funds that belong to themselves to develop the Province to a very large extent, they have been enabled to spend large sums of money for the purpose of opening up the new country, granting aid to railways, establishing local works of interest to the Province, and they have never asked that in any way the financial terms of the Confederation should be altered. They have resisted the alteration of those terms. The municipalities of the Province of Ontario have not asked aid from this Parliament, the municipalities of the Province of Ontario, by their delegations and by their memorials which are now before Parliament, simply ask that, if the funds of the Dominion, if the moneys to which they contribute the largest proportion, are to be expended in local works and local railways,

and if municipalities and provinces are to be reimbursed for the construction of local railways, that general principle being adopted, they too shall be recognised and a portion of the money contributed by them shall be refunded to them, because they have constructed their own local works. If this Government had taken the position in 1867 that they are taking now of interfering with local works, the provinces would not have granted their money to these local works, but would have reserved it for other purposes. But the Province of Ontario having so largely expended its money in this way, the municipalities of that Province having so nobly voted money for these local railways, they now find that after having developed their country, after having spread over their Province a network of railways such as no other portion of the world can boast of, they are to be taxed in order that other local railways in the Dominion may be aided. That is why the municipalities are before the Government to-day, and, if no other result flows from the deputation, I hope the result indicated by the First Minister will come about—that the Act of 1883 will be repealed, and the control of these railways given back to the Provincial Government, which is amenable and answerable to the Province whose money has so largely gone into the construction of them.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The particular motion upon which this debate has arisen illustrates to my mind how utterly without warrant have been the general statements made from the Opposition benches and promoted by hon. gentlemen of the Opposition in the country in relation to this question. The complaint made by the hon. member who introduced this motion was that, in the county of Simcoe, great injustice had been done because that county and the municipalities in that county had given bonuses to the Hamilton and North-Western Railway, and that that railway, thus constructed and thus aided in order that it might become an opposition line to the Northern Railway, had been absorbed by the Northern Railway Company immediately after its construction, and so the people lost the advantage which they had expected to gain. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman has correctly stated the case. There is no doubt that the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company was aided by the municipalities on the distinct understanding that it was to be an opposition road to the Northern Railway; that, when the gentlemen went out in the interest of that railway from Hamilton, principally, if I do not mistake, friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite, such men as Mr. John Stuart and Mr. John Proctor, of Hamilton, they made the most distinct promises that this was to be an opposition railway, and upon that ground they got the assistance of those municipalities. There were what purported to be bonds between the municipalities and the Hamilton and North-Western Railway Company which it was supposed would ensure the opposition of that railway company to the Northern for all time; but the extraordinary thing is that it was found, before the railway was practically opened—locomotives were running over it, but it was before it was practically open for traffic—an arrangement was made by which the late Mr. Cumberland, then the manager of the Northern Railway, became the manager of the North-Western as well, and the two railways practically became one. That was long before there was any question of declaring in this Parliament that the Hamilton and North-Western Railway was a road for the general benefit of Canada; but the curious point is that this was done under a clause in the Act incorporating the company passed by the Provincial Legislature which gave to the company the power to do the very thing which they subsequently did. If anyone, therefore, was responsible for the power which existed for the amalgamation of these two companies and under which these two companies became amalgamated, it was the Provincial Legislature of Ontario which failed to protect in any way what-

ever the municipalities which had granted large and liberal bonuses for the construction of this railway. All the injury that resulted to the municipalities in consequence of that amalgamation had resulted to them long before there was any question whatever of the Act passed by this Parliament about which so much is now made. That is not the only case in which this occurred. I notice, for instance, that, in the petitions presented to the First Minister by that deputation which was here the other day—a very large and influential deputation, a thoroughly representative deputation of the different parts of the Province of Ontario—one of the counties that asked for assistance on the ground that their road had ceased to be a purely local road in consequence of the Act of this Parliament, was the county of Bruce. It happens that I personally know as much about the railway history of the county of Bruce as perhaps any other gentleman in the country. I had a great deal to do with getting the bonuses for the Wellington, Grey and Bruce Railway Company, for which a demand for return of bonuses was made, and the remarkable thing is this, that so far from that being a local road, the special ground upon which the company made their appeal to the people of the county was, that it was not a local road but that it was going to be leased by the Great Western Railway of Canada and would become one of the great thoroughfares of the country, and that in direct opposition to our opponents from the city of Toronto who were in favor of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway Company, and who insisted that their railway, being a narrow gauge railway, must be, in the very nature of things, a local railway, and therefore of greater advantage to the locality. We beat them, Sir. Nowhere in the country where the two railways came into competition at all, did the Toronto, Grey and Bruce succeed in getting bonuses; but on the contrary the Wellington, Grey and Bruce obtained its bonuses mainly upon the ground that it was not to be a purely local railway, but that, falling into the hands of the Great Western Company, it would be a public railway and practically for the advantage of Canada, inasmuch as it would form part of one of the great thoroughfares of the country. Now because an Act has been passed here declaring all railways which are through lines to be for the advantage of Canada, they ask that the bonuses may be returned to them. Why, Sir, the very ground upon which they gave the bonuses in the first instance was the ground which I have stated. Then, Mr. Speaker, take the whole Midland system, the Toronto and Nipissing Railway, the Toronto and Port Perry Railway, the Victoria Railway, those railways which have since fallen into the Grand Trunk Railway; after having been in the first instance started as local railways, built as local railways, built under the idea that they were to furnish a competition with existing lines of railways, we find that they were all amalgamated or absorbed by the Grand Trunk Railway, under the powers of two Acts of Parliament, one passed by the Local Legislature, which ignored altogether the interests of the municipalities in connection with the matter, and practically handed over the whole of them to the Grand Trunk Railway, and the other by an Act passed in 1878, which gave to the Grand Trunk Railway great powers of absorption and amalgamation of any other railway that might wish to be united with it. Now, Sir, that was what was done in connection with that system of local railways. No one that I ever heard of contended that the municipalities were going to be injured so far as railway facilities were concerned, although they were, I believe, seriously injured in connection with the Midland system, seriously injured by the Local Legislature at Toronto under Mr. Mowat's control, which handed over that system of railways to the Dominion. Now, Sir, a great deal has been said by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, in relation to the Province of Quebec having obtained a large remission of moneys which they had paid for the building of these railways; and the compliment has been paid to the members

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

from that Province upon the ground that whenever they want anything for their Province they unite and succeed in getting it. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one of the gentlemen of the deputation who addressed the First Minister the other day in the Railway Committee room, made a statement there showing the lack of correct information that prevails in the country in regard to this matter, saying that the municipalities in the Province of Quebec had obtained a return of the moneys which they had voted as aid to their railways. As a matter of fact they got nothing of the kind. The city of Montreal voted \$1,000,000, the city of Quebec voted \$1,000,000, and the city of Three Rivers voted \$200,000 to railways which were local railways at the time they gave the money. One was the North Shore Railway and the other the Northern Colonisation Railway, both chartered by the Province of Quebec as provincial railways. Afterwards, when it was felt that these roads were to be part of a great through system, the companies came of their own motion to this House and got amendments to their charters, and in order to get these amendments they had the railways declared to be for the benefit of Canada, and from that time they came within the jurisdiction of the laws passed by the Parliament of Canada. Did the people of Montreal, or of Quebec, or of Three Rivers, or of the county of Ottawa, or of St. Jerome and St. Therèse, or of any other municipality that voted bonuses—did any of them ever come to the Government saying: You have taken our railway away, you have declared it to be for the advantage of Canada, although it was a local railway when it was assisted by us, and now we want our money back? Not at all, Sir. The city of Montreal gave \$700,000 of the million; they were relieved from paying \$300,000, not because of any action of this Parliament, but because the line from Montreal to Quebec was built by a northern route instead of a river route. The city of Quebec, by arrangement with the company, also were relieved of part of their bonus, paying only \$700,000 or \$800,000; the city of Three Rivers paid \$100,000 instead of \$200,000; but after these municipalities had paid their money no one ever dreamed that because these railways had been declared to be for the benefit of Canada they were therefore entitled to get their money back; although when they voted and gave their money these railways were local railways, chartered by the Legislature of the Province of Quebec. Even the Province of Quebec has not got back the money which it spent upon these roads. The great railway from Quebec to Ottawa cost the Provincial Government somewhere about \$14,000,000 or \$15,000,000. What they got back was this: When the whole policy with relation to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was changed; when that policy which originally contemplated that the Canadian Pacific Railway should start from Callander and go westward as a great public work; other railways desiring to secure the advantage of traffic being required to meet the Canadian Pacific Railway at Callander, by extending the railway to that point by their own resources, aided by such provincial and municipal assistance as they could get—when that policy was changed, and when the Government of which the hon. member for East York was leader, granted \$12,000 a mile for the line from Renfrew to Callander, he upset the whole arrangement made at that time. Then, Sir, when this Government, two years ago, gave \$12,000 a mile for the railway from Gravenhurst to Callander, in order to bring the traffic of the Pacific Railway down to Toronto, they altered the conditions altogether. So that what was asked for in the Province of Quebec, and what alone was given to the Province of Quebec, was this. They said: We have, in good faith, under a policy which contemplated that there should be no assistance from the public Treasury to any railways reaching the Pacific Railway at Callander, expended our money in the construction of this railway, and we are entitled to the same treat-

ment to the extent at least of \$12,000 a mile that the other parts of the country have obtained; and they got \$12,000 a mile—not what they had spent on the railway; because, as it stands to-day, they have actually given more money to these local railways which have become part of the Canadian Pacific Railway than the Province of Ontario has given to their local railways. That fact is concealed when this question is discussed in the country. The people are told that the Province of Quebec, because the members from the Province of Quebec have united upon the subject and made a formal demand upon the Government in relation to it, have got back from this Government the money they have spent on these railways. Sir, they got nothing of the kind; they got back simply an equivalent for the amounts granted to railways which finally became part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and which were constructed outside the original charter of that railway, to enable the lines to go down to Renfrew on the one side and down to Gravenhurst on the other. Then the hon. gentleman says that great injury has resulted, that a right has been taken away from the municipalities by the Act which declared these railways to be for the advantage of Canada. In what way has any property been taken? What did these municipalities give their money for? To get a railway. Now let me illustrate by the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, which the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) has just referred to. That railway, as he knows, was a local railway; when it was constructed it was a narrow gauge railway; and as he knows, when it was a narrow gauge railway, such as the municipalities had contributed to, it was so wretched a road that, instead of being an advantage to the country through which it passed, it was almost—if one may say that of any railway at all—a disadvantage, with but little rolling stock, a bad roadway, and the whole system practically in a condition which indicated ruin and decay. I remember myself when a deputation came from Owen Sound to the city of Montreal for the purpose of getting the Grand Trunk Railway, if possible, to take possession of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, so as to put it in a condition that would make it of value to the country through which it passed. Will that hon. gentleman pretend to tell me that as regards the Toronto, Grey and Bruce the country served by that railway is not infinitely better off under the railway as it exists at present, with a magnificent service upon that road, with the number of trains passing over it, with the accommodation afforded to the people along the line, than it was when the road was a narrow gauge local railway, to which, in the first instance, in their anxiety to get a railway at all, the people had consented to contribute. They have to-day a railway which they never dreamed of getting when that money was given. It may be, and I am told it is, with respect to the town of Orangeville, that the effect of this law, in the opinion of some lawyer—at least that is the representation made by the municipal council of that town—is to destroy some agreement in regard to station accommodation between the Credit Valley and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce in that town. All I can say is this: If any such interpretation can possibly be placed on that Act it is desirable there should be an amending Act, for the purpose of declaring that nothing in this Act should interfere in any way with arrangements entered into between municipalities and railway companies. But I cannot see how any such result can follow; and we know, in the case of the Hamilton and North-Western—because we have it from the lips of the hon. gentleman who brought up this motion—that the agreements which they made of a similar kind, those particular bonds which they entered into, were found to be so loosely drawn when the time came, that, to use the hon. gentleman's own expressive words, you might drive a coach-and-four through them, and so practically they were of no value whatever. To say that

injury is done is to say that which—I cannot say hon. gentlemen do not believe it, because they state they do, and by courtesy we assume they believe it; but I am quite certain that people outside, who seriously consider this matter, cannot for a single moment believe. What has been done by this Act? Simply this: that one condition with respect to contracts should obtain on the railway. For instance, a man puts goods on a railway at Orangerville, on the Toronto, Grey and Bruce or the Credit Valley, to be sent to Montreal; the Act provides that the whole line shall be under the same jurisdiction, under the same laws and open to the same arrangements. In cases where a railway crosses another railway—and it is only in such cases that these railways have been declared to be for the advantage of Canada, inasmuch as the provincial law cannot possibly control the Dominion lines, inasmuch as by the constitution it is provided that the Dominion may, under certain conditions, if the Government think fit, control provincial lines, we therefore placed them under the same jurisdiction in regard to matters connected with crossings, high or low level crossings, so that they may be placed under one jurisdiction and dealt with by one competent authority. That is all there is in the Act—neither more nor less than simply a provision that those railways which, in their practical operation, are parts of great through lines, whether they are united by terms of amalgamation or otherwise, shall be under one common law, and that a man living near any part of them shall know that the law which regulates the railway at different parts of it is precisely the same. We have made two or three amendments to the Consolidated Railway Act—one a rather remarkable one, that in relation to line fencing. The amendment was brought up by the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) because under an old judgment of the court it was found that where a railway passed through a farm and did damage to some cattle, there being no fences, the court held that the farmer should have given notice to the railway company in order to get the benefit of a right of action against the company. We passed an amendment to declare that the railway company is bound to keep up the fences, and that no such notice is required to be given by a farmer. We have simply applied that law to provincial as well as Dominion lines. That is one of the effects of the adoption of this Act. In the Consolidated Railway Act, which we are improving from year to year, in the direction of affording better protection to life and property and for the advantage of the people served by such railways, improvements which have been accepted by Ministers at the suggestion of independent members, with a view to rendering the Act as perfect as possible, we have simply declared that those particular provisions shall apply to local railways, or what hitherto have been local railways, as well as to Dominion railways.

Mr. FLEMING. The Ontario Act contains such provisions.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The Ontario Act may or may not contain such provisions—and we have no control over provincial legislation—and we had therefore no uniform law controlling these railways. I venture to say there is not a farmer living upon the line of one of those railways which has been declared to be for the advantage of Canada, on one of those lateral roads taken possession of by a great through trunk line, and worked by it, and in that way affording far greater accommodation and advantage to those localities than they were having under an independent and necessarily more impoverished local railway company, who will not realise, when the matter is fairly discussed, that the Act declaring those railways to be for the advantage of Canada has not destroyed any property in them, has not in the slightest degree interfered with what the municipalities wanted when they gave bonuses to the railway; but that

the Government have secured for them a very much better railway, a much more thorough and efficiently equipped railway, and a better worked and operated railway than they could possibly have had so long as the lines were merely local works. The particular case which has given rise to this debate, and which occurred before there was any clause placed in our Consolidated Railway Act declaring those local railways to be for the advantage of Canada, proves to us how utterly, I was going to say dishonest, but how utterly unworthy is the whole agitation attempted to be raised in Ontario with a view, if possible, of giving hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are bankrupt in everything else, some local cry to enable them to get hold of the sympathies of the people, which they have so utterly lost.

Mr. CASEY. We have evidently made a mistake as regards some of our ideas with respect to coming Cabinet changes. We have had the idea that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat was the "man on deck," if I may use a somewhat slang phrase, for the position of Minister of Finance when the present occupant of that position shall be promoted to a higher sphere. But now it seems that the hon. member for Cardwell must be the coming Minister of Railways. The hon. gentleman who is Acting Minister of Railways has been sitting there evidently wearied with the discussion, with his head on his hand, as if the whole matter did not concern him but belonged to some other Department, or as if it was a little squabble between Ontario members—at all event, as if it was a matter of no interest to the hon. gentleman, while the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), has made the official defence of the Government, although hon. members had, of course, expected to have heard from the Acting Minister of Railways on the question under discussion.

Mr. POPE. You will, if you give me a chance.

Mr. CASEY. I have been sitting here in my seat for two hours waiting for the hon. gentleman to speak. Half a dozen other members have spoken, but the Acting Minister of Railways seemed to be asleep, and I therefore felt compelled to do something to awaken him. I, therefore, call on him to awake, arise, speak on this subject, and not leave the whole matter to be explained by the prospective Minister of Railways. The prospective Minister of Railways—there are three or four Ministers for that department—goes off on the old tack, that the only ground on which we asked to have these bonuses recouped was the grasping action of the Dominion in taking control of the local roads. Well, Sir, it must be repeated, because we have got a little away from it to-day, that although that is a ground for asking such a recompense, it is not the only, it is not the first ground for asking such aid. The special ground for asking this repayment is, that the Government have instituted a general policy of railway aid through the Dominion, not only to through lines but to local lines; and it will be admitted by all to be a just and fair principle that when they take taxes from one part of the country to build roads in other parts of the country, some consideration should be given to the people of those localities who have put their hands in their pockets and built their own local roads. The act of injustice to which I have referred, the taking of those roads under the control of the Dominion Government, an act which it has been hinted is *ultra vires* and may be found to be so, like many of the Acts of this Government, aggravates the injustice and intensifies the claim; but if that Act had not been passed, still less, if it were now repealed, would it destroy the claim held by the municipalities which have assisted these roads. Now, Sir, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) has recited to us a short history of a railway campaign in which he took part on behalf of the Wellington, Grey and Bruce. I believe that road

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell).

was bonused by parts of some townships forming part of his present constituency. I believe that parts of Chingacousy and Caledon and Albion together gave \$30,000 to the Wellington, Grey and Bruce, at the instance of the hon. gentleman and the others who went from the city of Hamilton to carry on the campaign for that road, and to-day he tells his constituents, those who were urged by himself and by others to grant a bonus to that road, that they have no right to be reimbursed.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). The hon. gentleman is mistaken. No township in my county gave a bonus to the Wellington, Grey and Bruce.

Mr. CASEY. I said parts of three townships grouped together did.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No; they did not.

Mr. CASEY. I was informed so, but if not it was to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce. The township of Caledon gave \$45,000; Albion, \$38,000; and Chingacousy, \$30,000; and I think those townships are in the hon. gentleman's constituency. Together, they gave \$133,000 to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, and the hon. gentleman comes here and he tells the people of those townships that "he was going to say it was dishonest" to assert that they had any claim, but he says he cannot say that because he is in the House. But that is his thought; and it will go to his constituents and to the people along the line of the Wellington, Grey and Bruce, who were induced to bonus that road by his representation, that it is his opinion that it is "almost dishonest" to ask that they shall be recouped for these moneys. He says the municipalities who bonused roads in Quebec do not complain, because the control of those roads was taken by the Dominion Government. Why should they complain? Nearly every one of those roads which was thus assumed was assisted by this Government. Grants were given to the Gatineau Valley Railway, to the Lake St. John Railway, and half a dozen others, which I need not mention now. They received grants when they were taken under the control of the Dominion Government. Why should these municipalities grumble when they were getting money in consideration of the Government taking over the roads? It is we in western Ontario who have paid out our own money for building roads, and who have had the control of them taken from a Government which was directly responsible to us, and put in the hands of a Government which is responsible to all parts of the Dominion as well as to Ontario; it is we who have reason to grumble. I can assure the hon. gentleman that the complaint will not only be found in his own constituency, and along the line of road for which he assisted in getting bonuses, but that it will be widespread throughout the Province of Ontario. We have seldom seen—I think few members have often seen—a larger, more respectable or more earnest delegation than the one which met the First Minister and the first Acting Minister of Railways in the Railway Committee room the other day on this question; and the very composition of that delegation and the names of the gentlemen who were its spokesmen is sufficient to show that it was not a political demonstration. Who was the first to speak on that memorial? It was Mayor Smith, of Kingston; is he a Grit? The next was Mr. Cowan, of Galt; is he an Oppositionist? He is the man who has been exhibited through the country as the special trophy of the National Policy—the captive of its bow and spear—the man who was taken away from the Grits on account of the National Policy. Then we had Mr. Joseph Gibson, of Ingersoll, who certainly is not an Oppositionist, who has been a Conservative candidate on several occasions. I do not think anybody will pretend that this visit to Ottawa was a political act on the part of these gentlemen. They came no doubt against their will,

feeling that probably this was a matter which would embarrass the Government more or less, that they would not be welcome to the Government, perhaps, but because they felt it to be their duty as reeves and deputy reeves and delegates, they came down and risked embarrassment to the Government, and risked everything to fulfil their duty to their municipalities and the people. They did their duty nobly and manfully, and what reception did they meet with? I do not know that they might have expected a great deal of taffy from the Minister of Railways, but I believe they did expect a courteous reception, a full hearing and a pleasant reply from the First Minister. But I am afraid they were disappointed in that respect. If the hon. gentleman is correctly reported in his own newspapers—I was not present myself when he made his reply—he told them very bluntly that the thing could not be taken into consideration, that there was no precedent for it, that no municipality in Quebec had been recouped for bonuses given to railway companies, and that, on the whole, the thing was to be pooh-poohed and treated with contempt. That was the impression to be derived from his remarks. In fact, one of the members of that delegation, a leading Conservative, was heard to say, in a public place, and without any pretence of speaking privately, that he had been on a large number of delegations and had been refused many a time, but that heretofore they had always “been slid out on a greased plank,” but that on this occasion the plank was in such a condition that he did not enjoy that kind of tobogganing at all. Sir, the right hon. gentleman and his colleagues will find that this is a cry which cannot be pooh-poohed. They may treat leading Conservatives who come to them with this sort of discourtesy, and give them short answers, but there are at the back of those gentlemen those who cannot be treated in that way. At the back of them are the farmers of Ontario, who, together, form a body which even the present Government, with their tremendous majority, cannot afford to pooh-pooh, to treat with contempt, or to “slide out on a rough plank.” In that case I think it would be the Government themselves who will be slid out in that way, rather than the farmers. The hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has told us that we in St. Thomas, in particular, are a very grasping and greedy lot of people; that we in the county of Elgin, wanted the other parts of Canada to subscribe to make us rich. That does sound to me rich, coming from an hon. member who represents the neighborhood watered or drained, I do not know which I should say, by the Welland Canal. To what extent has the rest of the country subscribed for the benefit conferred on the constituency of Monck and the rest of the district through which the Welland Canal passes? Many millions have been expended on it. We are not asking to be recouped for the expenditure; but it does seem to us rich that that hon. gentleman representing that district should raise such an objection to this claim. Perhaps he will say that is a work for the general benefit of Canada. Well, that is the ground on which aid was given to it, and for that reason we do not ask to be recouped for it, although it does confer benefit on the district through which it runs. But will any one contend that the Napanee and Tamworth Railway, the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway, and Gatineau Valley Railway, are works for the general advantage of Canada in the same way as the Welland Canal? The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) also affected to pooh-pooh this whole affair. He thought that delegation had been sent down here on a fool's errand. He explained that he did not say they were fools, but were made to look foolish by the errand on which they were sent. I do not think, Sir, that that was the right language to use with regard to a body of men delegated by their county councils to come on this mission. I believe

the hon. gentleman, knowing him as I do, had not the slightest intention to speak discourteously of these men; but he had the intention to speak discourteously of the errand on which they were sent, and to make the whole affair look as ridiculous as possible. Probably he will find that these gentlemen do not think the matter a ridiculous or foolish one; and any irritation they may feel in connection with it may possibly be on account of the reception they had from the authorities here when they came down. He said his own constituents were satisfied. Well, his own constituents are, to some extent, interested in the Gravenhurst and Callander Railway. They may have reason to be contented; but there are other municipalities in Canada which have given bonuses to railways, which have no Gravenhurst and Callander Railway passing through them, and which have as much right to the railway aid which is being scattered about as the constituents of the hon. member for Muskoka. I think it is hardly fair for those gentlemen whose counties happen to have received aid under this general railway policy to oppose the demand of other municipalities who have not received any such aid. I think, too, that there are in this House some Conservative members, representing constituencies through which bonused railways run, who have not yet been heard from, and who ought to be heard from before this debate closes. I believe the constituents of the hon. members for North and South Essex (Mr. Patterson and Mr. Wigle) have some interest in this matter, and will require some account from their representatives when they return home. I believe the constituents of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Smyth) will require some account from him, in regard to his action on this matter, when he goes home. I have special ground for my expectation in the latter case, because I see by the proceedings of the council of the county of Kent that it was proposed to petition the Government on this matter; but the majority, who were good Conservatives, I suppose, declared that they had perfect confidence in their member, that he would do what he could, and that they would leave the matter in his hands, without troubling him with a memorial or asking him officially to act. He will, no doubt, therefore, show them that he has done his utmost to obtain justice for the county of Kent in that respect. The other gentlemen, who will, no doubt, be heard in the debate, I need not particularise; but I think every member whose constituents have bonused railways will feel it his duty to stand up and give a deliverance on this question. Of course, we hardly expected the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) to take the Ontario view of the matter, with regard to recouping either the Government or the municipalities. But I think he ought not to have raised the sectional cry, that this was an attempt to arouse Province against Province. We have never done anything of the kind, and justice has been done to us in this respect by the French Canadian newspapers. It will be remembered that when this question was up last Session our contention was, if you give Quebec what she claims to be just you should do for Ontario as you have done for Quebec. We did not say, you are swindling Ontario for the benefit of Quebec. We said, if this be the established policy of the country, you must do justice all around. The deputation were told the other day by the two Ministers who met them that no municipalities in Ontario had ever been recouped for bonuses. Now, we have a precedent, and I am thankful to the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) for having called it to mind. One Ontario municipality at least was recouped, and at a time when the recouping was likely to have the best effect, namely, on the eve of an election. Perhaps before the next election we shall hear of more of such recouping. Perhaps it will be necessary, in order to secure the reelection of some hon. members to this House, and I throw out this hint to them, that to have bonuses recouped to them, as the bonus was

granted to the municipality of Pembroke. If I wanted to make political capital I would not make this suggestion, but I hope they will carry it out, and so have justice done to Ontario.

Mr. WALLACE (York). I have listened attentively to the remarks of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and to those of the preceding speakers on both sides of the House, and I have failed to hear of one injury which has been inflicted on any municipality or any railway by the Dominion Government declaring these lines to be for the general advantage of Canada; but I can see many benefits which have resulted from the policy of the Government in so doing. I will give one instance. In the West Riding of York, which adjoins the city of Toronto, there are four lines of railway crossing two important streets. For a long time they created great difficulty, and it was felt that a sub-way or overhead bridge should be constructed at that point. Well, we called on the Ministry for several years in the endeavor to have this matter remedied. But two of the lines, the Credit Valley and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, were under the control of the Local Legislature, while the two others, the Grand Trunk and the Northern, were under the control of the Dominion Parliament. It was felt that one sub-way should be made to answer for the whole four lines. Until the Dominion Government assumed all these lines, and declared them to be for the general advantage of Canada, we were helpless, and the lives of people were endangered at that point; but as soon as that policy was adopted we had no difficulty. The Dominion Government at once made an order, by which the companies controlling those four lines built a sub-way, which has been found an enormous benefit to the citizens of Toronto and all who travel at that point. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) has told us what a great injury has been done to the town of Brampton, which gave \$20,000 to the Credit Valley Railway, the control of which was taken away from the Local Government and handed over to the Dominion Government. In my opinion, Orangeville never made a better investment than when they gave \$20,000 towards the construction of the Credit Valley Railway. They gave that \$20,000 bonus in order to have a competing line; they have that competing line and a more advantageous market to-day than has any other town in that part of the country, outside of Toronto. Their \$20,000 is being returned to them many times over, and that is principally due to the fact, not that they have the Credit Valley only, but that it became part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, by which means they have connections eastward and westward, and have thus facilities for shipping grain eastward to Montreal or westward to Chicago. We have been told what the Province of Quebec received bonuses, last year, and that therefore the Province of Ontario should receive bonuses also. If we received our money back, if the municipalities in Ontario were returned the bonuses they gave, what argument could be used in that case which would not apply to all the other Provinces? Why would not every municipality in every Province of the Dominion be entitled to receive back any bonus it may have granted to railways? Why even stop there? Why not return all the bonuses given by the different Local Parliaments of the Dominion? Because, if the argument is correct, that you must hand back the moneys voted by the municipalities, you must also return the moneys voted by the Legislatures. What is the amount we would have to pay back, and would it be a fair tax upon the people? I say it would be a most unjust tax upon the people. We were told the other day, and have again been told to-day, by hon. gentlemen opposite, that any member of this side who would dare to vote against this motion would not dare to go back to his constituents. I will dare to give my vote against it, I will have great pleasure in giving my vote

Mr. CASEY.

against it; and I will have still more pleasure in going back to my constituents and justifying to them my vote. But I have not found out that hon. gentlemen opposite have had the courage to move a resolution. All that they do is to ask for the papers, correspondence and memorials, but they have not yet formulated a resolution. They are trying to make a little capital in some localities, but they will find their course to be a boomerang that will hurt most, on the rebound, the men who hurled it.

Mr. McMULLEN. I wish to correct a statement or two made by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), with regard to the history of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway. He said that at the time this Act was passed the Toronto, Grey and Bruce was a narrow-gauge railway, and when the Canadian Pacific Railway was leased and became, virtually, owners of that line, it was converted into a wide gauge road.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). I made no such statement. I said that when the bonuses were voted by the municipalities it was a narrow gauge railway, but that it was changed before the Canadian Pacific Railway got it.

Mr. McMULLEN. Then it was a broad gauge road in full operation at the time the Canadian Pacific Railway became the owners of it. With regard to the unfortunate position in which the town of Orangeville stands, and that portion of the county which the hon. gentleman has the honor to represent, I wish to call the attention of the House to a few facts. The town of Orangeville contributed money towards the construction of the Credit Valley Railway for the purpose of securing competing roads. The Credit Valley Railway Company built their line in accordance with the terms of the agreement, one of which was that they were under no circumstances to amalgamate or enter into running powers with any other line without the consent of the corporation and of the Ontario Government. The Ontario Government was to be called on before any agreement that might be contemplated could be concluded; consequently, the Credit Valley Railway Company had not the power to enter into any running arrangements with the Ontario and Quebec Railway Company or the Canadian Pacific Railway without the consent of the Ontario Government. But by the Act of this House the Government declared the Credit Valley line to be one for the general interest of Canada. The company took advantage of the change in its position and entered into a permanent agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway, thus bringing both lines under the one control; and the result was, the people of Orangeville were deprived of the competition they anticipated when they gave a bonus towards the construction of the Credit Valley road. I was rather struck with the remarks of the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace). He said that he did not know of any instance of injustice along the line of that road, but let any man who has any doubt with regard to the feeling of that particular section, in and around the town of Orangeville, make enquiries, and he will find that a very strong feeling of opposition exists against the continuation of matters as they now stand. It matters not what action the Government or the House may take with regard to putting these roads in the position they occupied before the Government assumed control, they cannot possibly be placed in the position in which the people would obtain all the advantages that they would be now enjoying, had the Government not interfered; because to-day the contract between the two companies is signed and sealed, the two roads are, beyond doubt, one, and I cannot see by what action the Government or this House can undo that arrangement. The people of that section have an undoubted claim for compensation. Of course it is said not a mile of road has been taken from them. The hon. member for

Cardwell (Mr. White) says they have been deprived of none of the privileges they anticipated enjoying through the construction of this road; he says they gave their money for the purpose of securing railway accommodation, and they have got the railway accommodation they desired. That may be very well in a sense, but I contend that there is another side to the story. Suppose the hon. member for Cardwell arranged to build a commodious dwelling house for himself, and after it was erected another gentleman were to step in and say: I will occupy it along with you; it is plenty large enough for you and me; I will not take away a stone of the building or deprive you of any accommodation you would otherwise enjoy; I am willing you should have all the advantages you anticipated from the erection of the House, but I am going to enjoy possession with you. I rather fancy the hon. gentleman would say: If you wish to enjoy the advantages you must contribute towards the cost." I say that this Government, by their acts, have virtually declared the Toronto, Grey and Bruce to be a road for the general advantages of Canada, and the townships which bonused the road are perfectly entitled to be recouped their money; I hold that the municipalities along the route of that line have a special claim for compensation, because the line is virtually a link of the Canadian Pacific Railway. You leave Toronto, go to Owen Sound, take the steamer to Port Arthur and proceed on your journey over the Canadian Pacific Railway. It would be, therefore, impossible for the Canadian Pacific Railway, without this line, to carry on the extensive trade now carried on by them in supplies and in many other ways. The county of Dufferin granted towards the construction of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce something like \$211,000. But, we find that, after giving this money and getting these roads for themselves, in the first place one railway and afterwards another, the Act of the Government places them in such a position that they are completely robbed of the advantages they anticipated from competing roads. To-day these people are paying from the town of Orangeville in excess of the amount paid from thirty miles west of that. I ask if they have not the right to complain of that state of things? I say they have, and that they have a right to some compensation from the Government and the people of this country. I hope this will not be made a party question. I do not desire to see it made a party question. I was surprised to hear it stated by an hon. gentleman opposite that it had been got up by members on this side of the House for party purposes. Nine-tenths of the men who came and represented that constituency were Conservatives. In one township, where they have an entire Conservative council, they moved in the matter themselves. They have strong views, and I am satisfied they feel sincere and think they have a right to be heard and to have some recoupment of the money they have advanced. It is very well to talk about their not being deprived of the advantages they anticipated. I know that the statement that they have not the railway accommodation taken from them appears to have considerable force, but when you pry into the matter there is not so much in it. You may say that before Confederation these buildings stood here in the Province of Ontario. The Confederacy has not taken away anything from the Province, and the people in the Maritime Provinces might say: We shall not allow you anything for these buildings; you are going to enjoy them, and we are going to enjoy them along with you. Was that the answer the Maritime Provinces gave? No; they contributed their share towards the expense connected with these buildings, and they have a perfect right to all the benefits, comforts and privileges connected with them.

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

After Recess.

Mr. McMULLEN. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated that he did not think those townships would undo what had been done if they had the opportunity. If he enquired carefully into the feelings of the people in the immediate vicinity of Orangeville, or of that section which he has the honor to represent, he would form a different opinion, and would come to the conclusion that they are honestly sincere in the approach they have made to the Government and are making to this House in the matter of these bonuses. I do not know that every other section of the Dominion can present as strong a case as the county of Dufferin can present. I do not know of any other place, even in the Province of Ontario, that has dropped into the same unfortunate position that that section has dropped into, in consequence of the Government declaring these roads to be for the general advantage of Canada. If those two roads had remained independent, and they had got the benefits of competition that they then enjoyed, I do not know that they would have very much to complain of, further than this, that they undoubtedly feel that, since the roads have been used so extensively in the interest of the entire Dominion, since they are now being used by the Canada Pacific as one of its main connecting lines from east to west, some reasonable justice should be done to them by the Dominion contributing to the service they are undoubtedly reaping by the construction of these roads some years ago. If they had not been built some other road would have had to be built, and these people feel very seriously the responsibilities they have undertaken in regard to this matter. There has been something said with regard to the petitions which have been presented. I might be permitted to read one clause of the petition presented to the House by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton)—and I am sorry he is not in his place—to show the feeling of these people in regard to this matter. I do not think that any gentleman who had the privilege of talking to those men who appeared here would come to the conclusion that it was a political movement on the part of those delegates or on the part of anyone residing in the county. I am satisfied that they feel honestly and anxiously sincere in this matter and have no desire to harrass or annoy or bother the Government. They feel they have a claim and they are anxious that it should be considered. This is the paragraph of the petition:

"Your petitioner would call your attention to the changed circumstances of the above mentioned railroads, as also of the country, since the above grants were made. The roads were chartered and aided as local roads, to serve local purposes, and so long as they continued amenable to the provincial legislation, and maintained inviolate all agreements entered into with municipalities, your petitioner did not complain. But, under the changed circumstances, your petitioner feels it a great hardship, that townships, towns and villages which comprise its county should be compelled to contribute so largely to railways, of equal benefit to other municipalities which have in nowise contributed to their construction. Your petitioner would most respectfully submit that the municipalities that now form the county of Dufferin can, with every justice, ask your honorable body to assume their debenture issued in respect of the railways mentioned, and place the burden upon the Dominion, in whose interests your legislation has declared that the several lines of road exist."

I think that fully sets out the claim those people make to a refund of the money they have invested in those roads. There was something said with regard to the money that was granted to the Province of Quebec, and we were told that it was to recoup that Province for the money they had spent on lines that became a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think that any person who heard that question discussed in this House came to the conclusion that one of the strongest arguments in favor of the refund of that money was the fact that the financial position of that Province was such that it was necessary that some relief should be extended to it. The Province of Quebec

pressed their claim from that standpoint. Now, I contend that the people of the section of the county I have the honor to represent are suffering severely from the burdens they have been compelled to undertake in order to get railway accomodation. When they went into that section of the country they built gravel roads which they had to pay for out of their own municipal treasury, and these roads rendered them important service for a number of years. When the project of the construction of a broad gauge road was first presented to them, they felt that if it was as fully equipped and built as the Grand Trunk Railway or Great Western is built, they were not able to give a sufficient sum of money to build a road of that kind. In their struggling efforts they accepted, from the city of Toronto, a narrow gauge line, and they granted bonuses towards its construction. After that road had been in operation for some time, they found it did not give that connection with the wide gauge roads which was necessary, and in order to help themselves out of the difficulty they went to work, and in some cases contributed second bonuses, in order to enable the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Company, to widen their gauge and make an efficient line. After doing all that they felt, in this particular section of the country I represent, that the rates that were charged were somewhat excessive, and that they must have competition. In order to accomplish that they submitted further bonuses and granted further aid to the Credit Valley Railway, and the town I have the honor to represent got a branch of the Grand Trunk Railway. We got these roads for the purposes of securing the advantages of competition. Now the county of Dufferin is once more, unfortunately, placed, as I said before, in the position where they were before they granted a dollar towards the construction of a second road. It is very well for the Government to say that this House might give back to the Ontario Legislature the power that we took from them by the action of this House, by giving to them the right to deal with these roads. I must say I do not think it is a becoming action on the part of this House to take control of a road one year and the next year pitchfork it back again to the Ontario Legislature. I do not think it is right, after the Government have assumed the responsibility of the control of these lines, rather than meet the question fairly by compromising with the localities and making a refund, for them to say: We will give back the roads, seeing that we have got into a difficulty by the action we have taken. If we are not entitled to a refund of all the money we have invested, I think at least the Government should enter into some arrangement whereby a reasonable sum should be refunded. I think they should compromise the case, and if they are not disposed to pay back the full amount let them pay back a certain percentage of the money the municipalities have contributed towards the construction of these roads. When the Government declared that these roads were for the general advantage of Canada they surely meant that they were really so. Well, if they are really for the general advantage of Canada ought not Canada to pay for the general advantage? I think this position cannot be denied. The member for York made, some remark with regard to all the other Provinces asking a refund for the lines of railway they had built. Now I do not think that is a fair argument, under the present circumstances. The fact is that none of the other Provinces have been placed in the position in which Ontario has been placed. There is no other Province in which the Government have virtually declared all their lines to be for the general advantage of Canada but the Province of Ontario, so far as I know. If the other Provinces have lines that are declared to be for the general advantage of Canada, so far as I am concerned I do not object to justice being done to them, and to their being refunded the money that they spent on roads that are

Mr. McMULLEN.

declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. I believe, Sir, if the First Minister would make it his duty to go through that section of the country, and if he saw the hardships and the struggles of these people to get along in life, I believe he would have some sympathy with them. I believe, if he had been disposed to take into consideration the question that these people have pressed upon him, he would consider it his duty to propose a scheme whereby some reasonable relief should be granted to them. Now, I was present at the time that the railway deputation met the First Minister and the Minister of Railways; I was amongst that deputation. I must say that I do not think any discourtesy was shown to them by the First Minister. I heard some remark of that kind, but I cannot agree with it. I must say that the First Minister properly explained to the deputation that the House was in Session and their time was very limited, and if his remarks were short he explained why they were short. I do not think that he intended to offer any insult; I am quite sure he did not. But I believe if more time had been given in which to talk this whole question over, if the thing had been fully gone into and he had come to realise fully the extent of the feeling that these people have on this question, I believe he would consider, and that the House would consider, that no section of country in this Dominion can present a stronger claim, a claim backed by so many strong and reasonable arguments, as the section of country from which I come. Now, we all admit that the Intercolonial Railway was built at the expense of this entire Dominion. It has, undoubtedly, been of great advantage to these Provinces through which it runs. But they did not contribute anything in the way of municipal aid; they were not asked, as Provinces, to contribute specially to the construction of that road. It would hardly be fair to say to them that we should charge them with the entire cost involved in that line, because it was built through that part of the country, when it is really used for Dominion purposes. On the same ground I contend that the roads to which I have referred are in the interest of the entire Dominion. Suppose the Government should decide to have the Short Line Railway carried through the State of Maine, would it be right and proper for them to go to the State of Maine and ask it to contribute towards the construction of the road. That State would not consider such an application. It is obviously for the accommodation of the whole Dominion, and for the Canadian Pacific Railway, that these lines have been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada. It has been argued that Parliament should not aid the municipalities, because the Dominion is spending a very large amount of money, in aiding the Canadian Pacific Railway to build a line along the north shore of Lake Superior. Of course, the building of that road may possibly be of some advantage to the immediate section through which it runs, but it will not be of any direct advantage to the people for whom I am speaking. It is on the other side of a great inland sea, and not 10 per cent. of the people will ever have the pleasure of seeing it. The Callander branch may possibly be of some advantage to Toronto, and we are all glad to see Toronto grow and prosper; and it may be also some advantage to other portions of the Province. This does not apply to the line on the north shore of Lake Superior, which was built largely in the interest of the through trade, more in the interest of Quebec than of Ontario. It will give the cities of Montreal and Quebec special trade advantages that will not be enjoyed by other cities. In fact, Montreal will be virtually the commercial terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railway. We in Ontario are not going to derive such great advantages from the road. If the money spent is charged to Ontario, simply because the road is carried through the Province, you might as well charge the cost of the Short Line, if it should run through Maine, to that State. I repeat that the Canadian Pacific Railway will

be of no particular advantage to some parts of Ontario. If anything, it will tend to reduce the price of produce, and will rather militate against the interests of people in the southern portion of the Province than advance them. I do not think it is becoming on the part of this House to say that it will give the people back what has been taken from them. This cannot be done; the people cannot be placed in the position in which they were. Arrangements have been entered into between the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and the Credit Valley, and they cannot be revoked, and the companies placed in the same position which they formerly occupied. You may as well say that a man who made a mistake in conveying away his property to another individual who, in turn, made it subject to certain encumbrances; and when the man found out his mistake, the second said he would convey the property back to him. But he conveyed it back with the encumbrance created whilst it was in his possession. This is the way in which you could re-convey the railways; they would be subject to certain agreements which would not otherwise have been ratified. That is the difficulty which these sections of country for which I speak have to face. I cannot see how they can be got over. Perhaps the Government may devise some method; but the proper thing to be done is to refund to the municipalities a portion of the bonuses they granted. If the Government say they cannot give all, let them give half. Perhaps, at the present time, the Finance Minister does not feel himself in a position to permit any extra drain on the Dominion Treasury. I do not know, but I believe the Government should acknowledge their indebtedness, and in justice they should admit, frankly and fully, that the municipalities were entitled to this refund; that the road in question was of great advantage to Canada, through the Canadian Pacific Railway, and especially by the large amount of freight sent over it to secure the construction of the national road. Last year the volume of trade was so great that the people along the line were not able to secure all the accommodation they required. The road is filled with through trade from Toronto to Port Arthur by the line of steamers. It has been said that twenty-one trains a day, day and night, were run, carrying supplies in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. If this is not a link of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and a Dominion line, I do not understand what conditions would make a railway a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I am very sorry that any hon. member opposite should have permitted himself to make the insinuation that this discussion was raised for political purposes. I have no desire whatever to make a political issue of it, and I tell the First Minister that if he wants the constituents I represent to send a man here of a different political stripe from myself, the best way he can accomplish that object is to deal fairly and honestly with the municipalities in this matter, and I have very grave doubts as to whether he will be troubled with my presence in the next Parliament. In such an event I am satisfied the people will say that the hon. gentleman, notwithstanding the representations made, is prepared to deal justly with Ontario and the section of country in which I reside, and that the people will grant the hon. gentleman their confidence. If he wants to accomplish any such object it can be best achieved by refunding this money to the municipalities. I am very sorry the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), is not in his place, for I am sure he would have deemed it his duty to have said something in support of this proposition, and to have frankly acknowledged that something should be done. I do not put forward the claims of any other section except that which I represent. We waited long for the construction of railways. Our taxes are now up to 3 cents on the dollar, and our people find it a great strain to meet the liabilities of our corporation. If the First Minister would

take a trip over the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, he would be satisfied that that line is a link of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that our argument had great force. With respect to the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite, as to precedents, it appears that Pembroke is a case in point. I understand that when the First Minister and the Minister of Railways received a deputation, one of them stated that there was no precedent in Canada for any such action as this on the part of the Government. It appears, however, that Pembroke has been refunded money. There is a precedent—there is a case in point; the case of the town of Pembroke. Owing, I presume, to the fact that they contributed money to the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, or to a line connecting with that road, or that the Government look upon it as a part of that line, they granted a refund to the town. Now if the town of Pembroke was entitled to a refund I ask the Government fairly to consider the claims of the section I represent. I believe that if they go into the whole question they will find that that section has just the same claim that Pembroke has; it is a simple matter of justice, and something should be done. I do not want to take up too much time, but I feel strongly on this question; I have expressed myself frankly, and I hope and trust that the Government will either see it to be their duty to refund the money or to appoint one arbitrator on their behalf and let the municipalities appoint another. The hon. the First Minister has a large number of friends there—more friends than I would personally like to see; they are all admirers of his, and I would say, let him appoint one arbitrator, let the townships or county appoint another, and let them sit in judgment on the claims, and after having fully considered the whole matter, if that arbitration comes back and says that the people are entitled to nothing, I will be satisfied and I think they will be satisfied. But I do not believe that any two honest men appointed to perform that duty, who will consider the whole matter, will come back and say that these townships are not entitled to some consideration.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I desire to say a few words with reference to this matter before the debate closes. The hon. gentleman who has just sat down has decried the introduction of politics into this question; but if there is no political question at issue I should like to know why these hon. gentlemen are raising this matter at the present moment? The ground upon which they assert their claims for a refund from the Dominion Government, of the bonuses contributed by the Local Government of Ontario and the different municipalities of that Province, is based upon the legislation of 1883, by which the Dominion Parliament assumed control over certain roads to which charters have been granted by the Local Legislature. As I understand their contention, that is the ground upon which they apply to the Dominion Government for a refund of the bonuses about which they are making so much clamor. Now, what are the facts? Did the Local Legislature of Ontario confine the bonuses they granted solely to roads which were chartered by the Local Legislature? Did the municipalities, in granting those bonuses, consider the question as to whether the roads to which they granted bonuses were chartered by the Local Legislature or the Dominion Government? I hold in my hand the railway aid resolutions passed in the Local Legislature of Ontario in 1872, and I find that at that time there were several roads to which aid was granted which were chartered by this Parliament. There was the Kingston and Pembroke, to which a considerable amount of aid was granted, and of which you yourself, Mr. Speaker, know something, I dare say. That is an enterprise the charter for which was obtained from this Parliament in 1871. There was also the Canada Central Railway Company, chartered by the Dominion Parliament, and to which a considerable amount of aid was granted by the Local

Legislature in those resolutions which they submitted for granting aid to railways. There was also the Grand Junction Railway, and the Montreal and City of Ottawa Junction Company, which has since taken the name of the Canada Atlantic. But at that time aid was granted to those roads—roads which were chartered by the Dominion Parliament. And so, Sir, I say the contention these gentlemen make, that because this Parliament has assumed control over certain roads having connection with the great leading line of railway through the whole Dominion, they are entitled to receive back from this Parliament the bonuses granted by the Local Legislature or by the municipalities, is a contention which falls to the ground; because that distinction was not considered either by the Local Legislature or the municipalities when they granted these bonuses to the several roads so aided. Before I pass from this point, let me say that I have no sympathy with those hon. members of this House who are disposed to repeal the legislation of 1883. Circumstances I think justified the Government in adopting that legislation—the circumstance of having a railway system in the Dominion of Canada such that, there being a great net-work of roads through the whole Dominion, having connection with each other, having the same gauge, having communication with each other, being a system over the whole of which the cars of any one road may pass—in their very nature it is desirable that each road should be under one control and jurisdiction. Therefore, I repeat, I have no sympathy with the hon. members of this House who desire to see the legislation of 1883, in regard to the Dominion control over these roads, repealed. I do not think it would place these roads in a better position than they are in to day. Is there any hon. gentleman present (who takes the ground which is taken on the other side of the House) who will say that these roads are less efficiently worked at the present moment than they were when under the control of the Local Legislature, before the legislation of 1883 had been passed? Is there any hon. gentleman present who will say that the rates have been increased; or, if they have been so increased, that it has been done in violation of the agreements made between the municipalities granting the aid and the roads themselves. I take it, if any agreement were entered into between the municipalities granting aid and the railways of the Province of Ontario to whom such aid was granted, this agreement would be incorporated in the by-laws which were submitted to the ratepayers, and upon which the bonuses or aid was granted; and I would like to ask those hon. gentlemen opposite whether the legislation of 1883 deprives them of their remedy against the roads which have violated, or do violate, the contracts entered into by the municipalities with those roads. Another ground upon which those hon. gentlemen base their claims for a refund of the aid granted to those railways, is the aid which was granted to the Province of Quebec by the legislation of last Session. The amount which was granted to the Province of Quebec was made in return for expenditures made on a portion of the great national line—the Canadian Pacific Railway. I should like to ask my hon. friend, the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who knows a good deal about the disputed territory, whether he considers that the fact of the Government of which he was a member having granted aid to the extent of \$1,440,000 to a railway running through the Province of Ontario, to form a connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway at its eastern terminus, did not justify, to some extent, the claim which was made by the Province of Quebec upon the Dominion Parliament for a refund of a portion of the money expended by them on the North Shore Railway? I should like to ask him also whether the fact that the Dominion has largely contributed—I think hon. gentlemen opposite will say contributed the whole amount of money that was expended—to the construction

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew).

of nearly a thousand miles of railway from Callander to Rat Portage, in the Province of Ontario, does not to some extent justify the ground taken by the Province of Quebec in making application to the Dominion Government for a refund of the moneys which were expended on the North Shore Railway. I have heard hon. gentlemen on the other side contend that the expenditure of the large amount of money which was expended on the Canadian Pacific Railway proper and on its connections in the Province of Ontario has resulted in no benefit to that Province. I should like to ask my hon. friend, the member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who understands this question very well, whether that magnificent territory which he has described as containing such a large amount of wealth, extending from Port Arthur to Rat Portage, has not been benefitted by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. MILLS. Your leader says it all belongs to the Dominion.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Then the hon. member for Bothwell does not agree with him.

Mr. MILLS. No; I do not.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). It is within my own knowledge that in that part of the Province of Ontario about which no dispute arose—the district lying between Callander and Port Arthur—large areas of timber land have been opened up and developed by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which, but for the construction of that road, would have been a sealed book; and the Province of Ontario is at this moment deriving, by way of timber dues, a very large amount of revenue from that district. I contend, Sir, that, inasmuch as these are indisputable facts, which I believe the hon. member for Bothwell himself will not dispute, the Province of Quebec was justified in applying to this Government last Session for a refund of a portion of the money expended on the North Shore Railway. Now, Sir, I have a word or two to say with reference to a personal matter which has been referred to by more than one hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. It has been suggested by several speakers that a precedent had been created for the return of those bonuses, by the action of the Government in refunding the bonus granted by the town of Pembroke to the Canada Central Railway Company.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I hope the hon. member who says hear, hear, will, when I get through, give his opinion on the action of the Government on this matter, which I urged upon their consideration with all the power I could command. The hon. member who referred to this matter had not, I presume, read the return which was brought down to Parliament upon a motion made by his leader, or he would have learned that the application of the town of Pembroke was not based upon a statement of the case parallel with that presented by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in reference to the particular localities whose interests they are advocating. The hon. member for Bothwell, who says "hear, hear," must know (having been a member of the Government at the time) that his own leader came down to Parliament, in 1875, with a proposition to aid the Canada Central Railway Company to build a line from the vicinity of Renfrew to a point in the vicinity of Lake Nipissing. He must know that this House voted the sum of \$12,000 a mile for 120 miles of road, going westward from Renfrew and following the valley of the Bonnechere. He must know that some three years afterwards the leader of the Government of which he was a member, came down to Parliament with another proposition—a proposition to make the portion of the road which he proposed to subsidise commence, not at Renfrew, but at Pembroke, a point some thirty miles westward, to which place

the people of Pembroke had induced the Canada Central Railway Company to bring the road, by granting it a bonus in the interim. And what did the leader of the Government state to the House as one of the reasons to induce them to authorise his Government to make the change? It was that by adopting Pembroke as the starting point of the subsidised portion of the road, instead of Renfrew, they would bring the road to a point twenty miles farther west than would be reached for the same subsidy that was proposed to be granted in 1875, and that they would thus—according to Mr. Mackenzie's own words, contained in the Order in Council submitted to Parliament in 1878—save to the country the construction of twenty miles of road. That, Sir, was the ground upon which I based the application of the town of Pembroke to the Government of this country. It was upon the ground that by the action of the people of Pembroke we had saved to the country, according to the statement of the hon. gentleman's own leader, a sum equal to the cost of twenty miles of railway, which, I think, I am not very much astray in putting at \$20,000 a mile, that we applied to the Government. And I hold that if there is any municipality in the same position in which the town of Pembroke stood at that time, it is justly entitled to receive aid at the hands of the Government. Sir, I have been told that an hon. member on the other side of the House—I think the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook)—took occasion, in the course of his speech, to say that the action of the Government in that matter was taken for a political purpose. He took occasion to say, if I am correctly informed—and if I am not I hope he will correct me, as I was not in the House when he was speaking—that the leader of the Government had sent a telegram, either to me or to some person in my constituency, during the progress of the election in 1882, to the effect that aid asked for would be granted. I have to say that that statement is not correct. I had no communication from the leader of the Government on this subject at all. It is true a communication was made to me by the Minister of Railways, whom I had been pressing for some time to obtain an answer of some kind to the request that had been proffered to grant aid to this particular municipality; and, Sir, I might, if I chose—but I do not want to repeat it here—retort upon the hon. gentleman and tell him that his own leader was not at all chary in sending telegrams at a more critical juncture than that to which the hon. gentleman refers. I think the statement was made—at all events it was hinted broadly—that but for the action of the Government in relation to that matter I should not have a seat in this House during this Parliament. I have not the returns of the election of 1882 by me, but I think I am not astray in saying that the hon. member for Simcoe will find, if he examines the returns, that I was able to secure a larger majority outside of the town of Pembroke altogether, where that communication could have no effect, than the hon. gentleman was able to obtain in his whole constituency, although he is, no doubt, a very strong and very popular gentleman in his locality. I have referred to these matters because they have been introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite. But to return to the main question—I say it does not lie in the mouths of these hon. gentlemen to say that because the Government, by the legislation of 1883, have taken control of certain roads connected with the great leading lines through the Provinces of Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, therefore they have a just claim on behalf of these municipalities. The hon. gentleman who spoke last was mistaken in saying that the roads which were affected by that legislation were in Ontario alone. He could not have read the Act of 1883 or he would have found that he was mistaken in that assertion, because the Act applies to other roads as well as to those in Ontario. In view of the fact that neither the municipalities nor the Local Legislature of Ontario took into

consideration the question as to whether these roads were chartered by the Local Legislature or the Dominion Parliament, they have no ground for the application that they now make. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very solicitous for the welfare of hon. members on this side. They have warned us that if we do not support the applications which have been made by certain of their municipalities to the Government for aid, in regard to this matter, we shall, after another election, be relegated to private life. No doubt it would be very pleasing to hon. gentlemen opposite to see us occupying positions on the other side of the House; but let me tell them that if they expect by a side wind such as this to obtain power, if they expect to get into office by appealing to the prejudices of the people of Ontario, they will find themselves very greatly mistaken. I, for one, have no fear to appeal to the constituency I have the honor to represent upon the policy of the Government, and I venture to express the opinion that hon. gentlemen opposite will find their solicitude for us entirely uncalled for.

Mr. SPROULE. Representing a constituency that is served by some of these railways to which reference has been made, I may be permitted to say something on this question. If it were reasonable and possible that the municipalities and the Provincial Government could get back the money given in aid of these railways, it would be very desirable to have it returned. I am sure all my constituents would be pleased to get their money back, but the reasons given for making this demand seem to me to be extremely inconsistent. What are the reasons? The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Cook) said great injustice was done to the people of Simcoe by the amalgamation of the Hamilton and North-Western with the Northern Railway. I am aware that a great amount of money was given by the municipalities to have competition between those two roads, but I would like to know what the Act passed by this House last Session, declaring them to be roads in the general interest of Canada, had to do with any injustice committed through this amalgamation. That great injustice was consummated long before this Act was passed, and the municipalities were suffering under it without being able to obtain redress or remedy. They appealed to the Parliament at Toronto, to which they thought they had the right to appeal, for redress, and the only answer they got was that nothing could be done. In the charter which was obtained in the Local Parliament there was a clause giving power to amalgamate, and when the municipalities supposed that they had so drawn up their agreement as to prevent the possibility of an amalgamation, they found the agreement was so lax in this respect that they could not prevent it nor obtain redress; and to say that this House is in any way responsible for that is nothing else than the sheresst nonsense. Reference has been made to the Toronto, Grey and Bruce, and the Credit Valley Railways, and made by whom? By a gentleman who is now condemning the very principle he strove for years to carry out himself. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who was president of the Palmerston and Durham road, now a part of the Grand Trunk Railway, did all he could to bring about the amalgamation of these two companies. When municipal aid was given to build that road, even before it was ready for the rails, deputations waited upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to induce it to take over the Palmerston and Durham line and make it a part of the great Dominion line, believing that that would be in the interest of the people; yet this hon. gentleman condemns the Government for declaring the Toronto, Grey and Bruce line to be in the general interest of Canada, and therefore a Dominion line. If there is an hon. gentleman in this House whose acts appear to be entirely inconsistent with the interests of his constituents, in regard to this question, it is the hon. member for North Wellington. That hon. gentleman stands in a

peculiar position. When the Palmerston and Durham road was built he wanted competition with the Toronto, Grey and Bruce; he appealed to the Grand Trunk Railway for assistance. The Grand Trunk Railway came to his aid, and the result was competition between the Palmerston and Durham road and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce. What great injustice has been done by the amalgamation of the latter with the Canadian Pacific Railway? The great injustice he complains of is in the fact that there are as many as seventeen trains a day over the Toronto Grey and Bruce now, while previous to the amalgamation during one winter it had not a train over for six weeks; and I remember one of the hon. gentleman's constituents in Mount Forest then stating that they were out of almost everything in the groceries line for want of railway accommodation, even out of whiskey. I only give this as evidence that the people of that county are much better served to-day that they ever were before. If you travel through that country and ask the people along the line of the Toronto, Grey and Bruce whether they are better off to-day than they were previous to the time it became linked with the Canadian Pacific Railway, they will tell you they are a hundred times better off, because they have an all-rail through route to Montreal, when previously they had to ship to Toronto and then tranship; and they can also ship their goods by Lake Superior to Manitoba and the North-West at rates much lower than ever before, and without the additional trouble they formerly experienced, of having to ship their goods, first to Owen Sound, where they had to remain a considerable time before they could be transhipped by the boats. Now the goods are sent right through without any trouble. The hon. gentleman made reference to the condition of things around Orangeville, and he says the result of this Act has been to destroy the competition between the Credit Valley Railway—the branch which extended to Orangeville—and the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway. He seems to know very little of the matter or to hide the information which will lay it fairly before the country. He should know that that was caused by Mr. Stephen buying up the stock of the Credit Valley Railway and running the two roads under the same management, before this Act was passed; so there has been no change of circumstances since the passing of this Act. If you take any part of the country supplied by the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, with which I am acquainted, the people will admit that it was a most desirable change, for this reason, we have the Grand Trunk to the west and the Northern and Hamilton and North-Western to the east. We are between these two roads, and as long as they remain as they are to-day, we have a competition between three different lines; and as long as that exists, the greatest benefits must result to the country. The argument of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) seemed to me to be extremely shallow as a whole. He started out with the contention that a great injustice was done to the people by proclaiming these roads to be for the interest of Canada, or, as he was pleased to call it, taking over these roads; and afterwards, when it was intimated that this Act might be repealed and the roads given back, he said that would be no benefit at all. If there is reason in his first contention, why would it not be a benefit if the roads were given back? What injustice could be done? He says that would only be a half way measure; that it would not satisfy them. It seems to me that it is like the old story of the wolf and the lamb—it is impossible to satisfy them. It is not for the purpose of satisfaction that they bring this up, but in order to make political capital. He says, in a very calm voice, that he hopes this will be kept out of the political arena, and he knows that his friends have no desire to introduce politics into the question at all. Either he must have a short memory, or he must read very few papers, or he would recognise the

Mr. SPOULX.

fact that the papers which support him and his party have almost invariably, since this question was introduced by the member for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), been attacking the Government in reference to it. Why do we find these gentlemen—the hon. members for South Grey (Mr. Landerkin), North Grey (Mr. Allen), Lambton (Mr. Lisgar), two of the members for Elgin (Mr. Casey and Mr. Wilson), the member for Peel (Mr. Fleming), the member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen)—getting up, one after the other, and making an attack on the Government in reference to this question? Why do we find the papers which support them also attacking the Government? Simply because they believe it would be good political capital to use when the next general election comes around. The sincerity of the hon. gentleman is evidenced by the fact that he is pleading to get the Government to give back this money, contending that a great injustice had been done by this Act, and yet the same man, who is the president of the short branch of the Grand Trunk Railway, from Palmerston to Durham, used the most strenuous efforts to get the Grand Trunk to take over that line, the Grand Trunk being one of the great Dominion lines. He believed that in that way he was securing a great good to his constituents in that part of the country, and I believe he was. But if he is sincere to-night, was he working in the interest of the people then? If he was sincere in believing that it was a great injustice to the people that the Toronto, Grey and Bruce line should be attached to the Canadian Pacific Railway, it seems to me a strange kind of logic. When he says that politics should be kept out, and adopts the course which all these hon. gentlemen have adopted, I think it will not go down with the country, I think they will not be inclined to believe that they are speaking in the way they profess to be, purely in the interests of their constituents. Our condition in the county of Grey is especially pleasurable, in consequence of the chance which has been made. We have much better railway facilities than we had before. Before this line was taken over, when the Toronto, Grey and Bruce was so run down that it did not serve the wants of the country, we endeavored to get the municipalities to give additional aid to put it in proper repair. What were the advantages we represented to the people that they would derive from that? The very advantages we enjoy to-day; those were, that we would have a line that would enable us to take our stuff past Toronto to Montreal, to the east or to the United States, or to any other part of the country, that produce could be taken to any place in or outside the country without transshipment and break of bulk. We wanted to have a line of the same gauge as all the other lines, and not be handicapped as we were by shipping our goods to Toronto, changing to other cars there, and making fresh arrangements with other roads; or, if we went to Owen Sound, with the steamship lines which carried them to their destination. We are much better off to-day, because we can ship from any station on the line to the east or west, or to any part of the country we like. We can have the advantage of a through road, and can ship with much less trouble. In addition to that, we have some sixteen or seventeen trains passing over the road each day, and I deny that there is any want of accommodation for the requirements of the local trade along the line. I believe it is claimed that the rates are raised. I think there is nothing at all in the declaration of this Act which empowers either the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other road which is declared to be for the interest of Canada, that gives them power to impose additional rates over what was stipulated and agreed with the municipalities in the first place. I can only say, as I did in the first instance, that if this money is to be given back, we would like very much to get it. I am sure the people in my constituency would be pleased to receive it. But another question is involved. It means the opening of a door, it means

the establishment of a precedent that may be commenced here but ended—where? Is it not reasonable for hon. members to suppose that if the Dominion of Canada comes to the aid of the municipalities which ask not only the money given by the municipalities, but also that given by the Provincial Government in aid of railways, other Provinces would follow suit and ask for the same thing? Provided they did, what would be the result? I find that the money given to railways by the Provincial Governments and municipalities amounts, in the aggregate, to something like \$35,850,000. Would the hon. gentlemen, who advocate giving back this money, be prepared to support a measure to raise that amount to distribute to the various Provinces of this country? I think not; but, again, I apprehend there is an injustice or an unfairness in this; the papers which are advocating the giving back of this money, said, when we voted money for the Canadian Pacific Railway last year, that Ontario had to bear the greatest share of the burden; that it had to raise at least three-fifths of the money given to that railway. If that is correct, and the money has to be raised by the Dominion, we, as a Province, would be taxing ourselves to raise three-fifths of this amount of \$35,850,000, which would amount to \$21,310,000. We could not claim that we should get \$21,000,000, because the highest amount their own papers say we are entitled to is about \$15,000,000; if, in the aggregate, it would require \$35,000,000, and Ontario had to raise three-fifths of that, as is contended, which would be \$21,000,000, we should be doing no justice to Ontario by asking the Dominion Government to raise this money and pay \$21,310,000 in order to get \$15,000,000. We should, in effect, be giving \$5,310,000 to the other Provinces. Provided that were done, what would be the result? Why, Sir, the hon. gentlemen who are supporting that motion in the House to-night would go back to the country and hold it up as an evidence that we were increasing the debt; that we were raising the taxes. How would these taxes be raised? Would it not be by Customs and Inland Revenue? Then, if these additional duties were imposed, it would be used as an argument in their favor. But I claim their action is only in harmony with that on the boundary question; it is for the purpose of raising a political cry, that may be used, and used effectively, by these parties when they go back to the country again. The hon. member for Peel (Mr. Fleming) said that the Province of Ontario never appealed to the Dominion for anything before. I think he forgot that the Minister of Education, in the Legislature of Ontario, a short time ago, declared that he had secured between two and three millions to the Province of Ontario by applying to the Dominion Government for additional aid. Well, I can only say that he was not in harmony with his political friends in the House at Toronto. The hon. gentleman who said there is no political significance in this question seems to forget the fact that the Hon. Attorney-General Mowat, a few days ago, in the Provincial Legislature, when application was made to him for additional aid to some local road, made this reply: "Your friends at Ottawa and Quebec have taken these lines over, therefore I am not disposed to give them any aid." Was not that of political significance? I say distinctly it was used for the purpose of creating mistrust and prejudicing the people of Ontario against the Dominion Government. He endeavored to make them believe that because these roads had been declared to be for the general advantage of Canada—because they are not taken away from the Province—he endeavored to make the people believe that a great injustice is being done them, and that some benefits they would otherwise receive are withheld on account of these roads having been declared to be in the interests of the Dominion. Now, for myself, if I could see that the country was less or worse served by these roads being declared to be in the interest of

Canada, that the people had less railway facilities, that they had not as low traffic rates, or that they were being deprived of any right, I say I, for one, would be prepared at any time to stand up and oppose any Government, no matter what Government might be in power here, if I thought such a policy was prejudicial to the interests of the people. But I believe that if we raised this money, it would be raising the duties which the people of Ontario would have to pay, and I do not believe they want us to raise any more money than what is essentially necessary. I think, however, we are entitled to ask the Dominion Government to repeal this Act. I do not say that it can do any good; I do not know that it can do any harm; but if it is repealed, and there was any injustice done by enacting it, then that injustice is done away with. But the same complaint mentioned by the hon. member for North Wellington will still exist, and the repeal will not satisfy the hon. gentlemen of the Opposition. Then, when we go back to the country again, the question will be used on every platform in the Province of Ontario against the supporters of the present Government, used effectively, used in the same way the boundary award was used, as the Streams Bill was used, by being held up as taking away provincial rights, and doing a great injustice to the people. It is for that purpose I believe this motion was made in the House to-day, and for that purpose it is so strongly supported by the large numbers of the members of the Opposition who have spoken so forcibly on this question.

Mr. LISTER. It is certainly very refreshing to see hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House so zealous in opposing the Province of Ontario getting the same measure of justice that was accorded to the Province of Quebec last Session. I can only say that if the members from the Province of Quebec had acted as the Ministerial members from the Province of Ontario act, Quebec would not have received at the last Session of Parliament \$3,500,000. Now, Sir, I can easily understand the excitable condition of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule). I can easily understand how he anticipates trouble at the next election. He feels to-day that he is false to his county; he appreciates the difficulty he will have at the next election to explain the conduct he is guilty of to-day. Now, Sir, the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this question from the other side of the House have travelled out of the record. They have not taken into consideration the real question at issue. The point is, not whether these railways were better worked before they were taken control of by this Government, or whether the people were better satisfied than they are now; but the question is, have this Government or Parliament the right to take away from the Province railways which belong to the Province? These hon. gentlemen can stand up here to-day and say that the Government are justified in doing what they did do; but they give a different reason from the reason given by the Government. The Government said it was in the interests of the whole Dominion that these roads should become Dominion roads, not that they were not giving satisfaction to the people, or that they were not being properly worked, or that the rights of the people of Ontario were not being properly protected; but because it was in the interests of this whole Dominion that these roads should be Dominion roads. That is the question, and looking at that question we have to consider the facts as they were before the passage of that Act. It is admitted that these roads were, at all events, aided by the Province, that they were aided by the municipalities through which they ran. They received their charters from the Provincial Government of Ontario, and under that charter the people of Ontario have certain rights under the statutes of Ontario. The aid was given under a certain state of facts, under certain rights which were secured to the people of Ontario by the laws of their own Legislature, a Legislature answerable to the

people of Ontario, a Legislature that could be controlled by the people of Ontario, and whose behests the representatives in the Local Parliament were bound to obey. This Parliament, without rhyme or reason, without any excuse in the world, but the excuse, to my mind, of enabling these roads to be absorbed by the large roads running through this country, passed this Act into law. They took away from the people of Ontario the rights which those people had to control these roads. They deprived the people of Ontario of the rights which the statute law of that Province gave to them; and does it lie in the mouth of any hon. gentleman to come here to-day and say that Ontario, having spent \$6,000,000, and the municipalities \$8,000,000, in building these roads, in building the roads controlled by the Local Legislature, and controlled by themselves, these roads should be taken possession of by this Parliament, and the power the people have over them should be swept away? I say it is nonsense. I can understand the hon. member for North Renfrew and the hon. member for East Grey anticipating difficulties at the next election. Now, then, hon. gentlemen may say what they like as to the service of these roads; the service of some roads may be better than the others; but, certainly, the service of the St. Lawrence and Ottawa road is not as good as it was some years ago.

Mr. BOWELL. When was that taken over? Was it taken over under the present Act?

Mr. LISTER. Every road touching or crossing a through line, and it touches the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not the question I asked the hon. gentleman. That road was taken over years ago, long before the passage of this Act, and made a Dominion road.

Mr. LISTER. Well, it was wrong then, and that is no justification for the present Act. Two wrongs do not make one right—perhaps they do in the mind of the hon. Minister of Customs.

Mr. BOWELL. You did not object to it; it was your party that did it.

Mr. LISTER. Now, let us see what the rights of the people of Ontario were. As I said, the Provincial Government is responsible directly to the people of Ontario. Under that statute which they have, hon. gentlemen say these roads have amalgamated with other roads, and they deplore that, perhaps. But whether they amalgamated or not under the laws of Ontario, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council had a right to regulate the tolls so that if the people were suffering from excessive or exorbitant railway charges the Lieutenant-Governor had a right to reduce these charges. You have taken that right away from the Provincial Government and the people, and I say that depriving them of that right is depriving them of a very great advantage indeed. Yet hon. gentlemen venture to say they have been deprived of nothing. Our law also gave the Lieutenant-Governor in Council power to grant running powers over other railways. That has been taken away from the Provincial Government; it may be vested in this Government. But I say this Parliament is not so amenable to the people of Ontario as is the Ontario Legislature. This Parliament consists of members from different Provinces of the Dominion, and it cannot be made to respond to the wishes of any one Province, as the Legislature of each Province can be made to respond. The speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) was very amusing if it was not logical. He justified the taking away of those railways because, forsooth, the Province of Quebec or the city of Montreal or some other place had asked the Government to pass this Act; because Montreal had asked the Government to take over these roads that is held to be a justification for a violent

Mr. LISTER.

seizure of roads in Ontario. That is the argument of the hon. gentleman. All we, on this side of the House say, is, that our Province should be placed in the same position as Quebec. This Government has taken our railways without the consent of the people. The people have protested as strongly as it is possible to protest; the Local Government have protested; delegations consisting of the most respectable and leading men of the different municipalities which these roads traverse have gone to Ottawa and protested. They have told this Government that these were provincial roads; they have urged upon the Government to do an act of justice, by recouping the people the money which they have expended on those roads. If it is in the interest of the Dominion that these roads should be Dominion roads, then the Dominion should pay to the Province and the municipalities the money which they expended on their construction. It is not fair that one Province should expend money for the benefit of the whole country and not be recouped. I was surprised to hear the language used by the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum). No doubt that hon. member, like the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White), would like to see Local Governments abolished, and have one grand central Government here. The hon. gentleman never loses an opportunity of rising in the House and denouncing the Government of Ontario. But if there is one Government in this whole vast Dominion which is entitled to the admiration of the people it is the Ontario Government. There are no men from one end of the country to the other who have stood up so manfully for provincial rights as the Government of Mr. Mowat and his colleagues. They have fought the Dominion Government during seven or eight years, and have defeated them in every fray, and the reputation which the First Minister possessed as a great constitutional lawyer has been driven to the four winds. So far as the Government of this country is concerned, there is no Government that is entitled to the credit, yes, the admiration of the people, from one end of the Dominion to the other, as is the Ontario Government, which has steadfastly defended provincial rights and resisted the encroachments of this Government and this Parliament on each and every occasion. If it had not been for the Ontario Government the federal system would be a myth to-day, form without substance; but owing to the defence of provincial rights made by that Government, we are bringing our country into some shape, we are bringing the people to realise the fact, that unless we stand up for those rights first, last, and every time, our present system of government stands the chance of being swept out of existence. I was going on to say that the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) takes advantage of every opportunity to attack the Ontario Government. I desire to tell him that the Local Government, notwithstanding the fact that they have spent vast sums of money in building railways and in constructing public institutions, in different parts of the Province, at an expense of millions, they have millions in the Treasury to-day; and when the hon. gentleman says they have to borrow money to meet their railway liabilities, he utters a slander on the Local Government. They are not obliged to borrow money, but they were obliged to sell securities which are bearing a large interest, and when the debt became due there would be a saving to the Province of \$50,000. It does not redound to the credit of the hon. gentleman that he should decry his native Province. Perhaps, if hon. gentlemen opposite were in power in Toronto, he would not be so ready to make such an attack. I am sorry to see it. I like to see a man loyal to his Province; but I am afraid he is more loyal to the leader of the Government than he is to the good old Province of Ontario. I repeat again that this Act is a confiscation; it is unjustifiable in every way you look at it; it cannot be defended, and when hon. gentlemen opposite

come to defend this Act before the Province they will be told by the people: Why have you opposed the rights of the Province, and stood up in the House, not for the purpose of offering a word in its favor, but of refusing that which is justly due. I believe the honest, sincere and true people of the Province will say that hon. gentlemen opposite who oppose this motion are not worthy of occupying seats in this House.

Mr. DAWSON. It seems to me rather singular that when hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House rise to speak about these great railways, they cannot avoid having a fling at the constituency which I have the honor to represent. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) said that the line running along the north shore would be of no use to Ontario. We have heard too much of such language in this House. The hon. member for North Renfrew stated very properly that the Ontario Government is deriving a large revenue from timber dues and the sale of timber berths in the new territory; and I may say they will, in the future, derive a larger revenue, owing to the opening up of that railway. I believe our section of the country, all in all, is quite equal, as a revenue yielding district, to any other section of Ontario. Moreover, the opening of this line from Gravenhurst northward, to connect with the Canadian Pacific Railway, may make Toronto the commercial capital of the Dominion in the place of Montreal. But it appears to me that it is a rather poor argument to bring forward to say that, because the railways, which are in fact extensions of the Pacific Railway in Quebec, have been bought up or have been granted a certain amount of money from the Dominion Treasury, Ontario should get just as much. The Canadian Pacific Railway and its branches within Ontario extend to at least a length of 1,480 miles. That is, if you take the Canada Central line, the line from Callander to Rat Portage and as far west as the disputed territory runs, you will have a distance of 1,250 miles within this Province. You have with this the Algoma Mills branch, and the Callander and Gravenhurst branch, making in all close on 1,500 miles which have certainly cost more than \$30,000,000, expended in Ontario by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. But the expenditure of a few millions for a road which is actually, from its geographical position, a portion of the Canadian Pacific Railway—on the north shore of the St. Lawrence—is regarded as a decided error by these hon. gentlemen. But let us take another view of the matter. I have listened very carefully to all the speeches made on this subject, and I have endeavored to ascertain what was the real grievance in declaring these roads to be for the general advantage of Canada. It seems to me, so far as hon. gentlemen have explained it themselves, to be a sentimental rather than a real grievance. The roads are still there; they are still as useful as ever they were; they have not been removed from their places, and they are all doing the traffic, as they formerly did, and many of them are much improved. I was in the Legislature of Ontario when the grants to some of these roads were made. I was there when the grant was made to the Credit Valley, and whether I was right or wrong, I opposed the grant to that road, because it seemed to me to be at that time a somewhat useless line, running, as it did, parallel to and between two great lines of road. I may have changed my opinion now, to a certain extent; but at any rate, it was urged in favor of that road that it would be to the general advantage, that it would eventually be a leading line of road instead of being a local line, and it was on that ground that it received the grant. Then there was the Hamilton and North-Western Railway. I was there when aid was given to that road. It was urged that it would be of great use, that it would be a competing line to the Northern, on which it was represented that the charges

were too high. But it was no sooner completed than the two roads amalgamated, to form what is now called the Northern and North-Western Railway; they pooled their earnings, and are run as one road, so that the object which the Legislature had in building and giving a grant to that road was completely frustrated. Well, Sir, the Toronto, Grey and Bruce is certainly as useful now as ever, and I have not heard that the rates are higher on that road than they were. There is no doubt that Ontario deserves a great deal of credit for her enterprise, courage and spirit in aiding the construction of these roads; but I think a great deal more credit would have been due to Ontario if she had gone hand in hand with the Dominion Government in assisting to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Why, Sir, in the time of the Reform Government an application was made to Ontario to grant land in aid of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the Government of Ontario, at that time, in rather a memorable letter, written by a member of that Government, objected to granting land to aid the Canadian Pacific Railway. As to the political aspect of the matter, the gentlemen on the Opposition benches have expressed great fears that the result of a refusal on the part of the Dominion Government will be to render hon. members on the Government side unpopular. I am sure these hon. gentlemen will be exceedingly alarmed; I dare say it would grieve them greatly, if such were to be the result. That, however, is the manner in which they express themselves; but I think that they will meet with disappointment in that respect, and that it will not have the tendency of rendering the Government unpopular; because, when the matter comes to be understood in the country, it will be seen and known that the grievance is more imaginary than real; that the roads are still there and are being maintained; that many of them are better than they were, and that the country has not suffered loss by the action of the Dominion Government, in declaring them to be roads for the general advantage of the country.

Mr. DESJARDINS. The prominence which has been given to the Province of Quebec and to the Conservative members coming from that Province will explain why I think it convenient to interfere at this stage of the debate. I would have expected some of my friends from that Province, on the Liberal side of the House, to have come to the rescue, and express what they think of the position which the Conservative members from the Province of Quebec have taken with regard to the grants made to railways during last Session, and to what they have obtained from Parliament to the benefit of their Province. They have listened to the eulogies passed on them by their own allies from the Province of Ontario, but I have vainly expected from them an expression of opinion either in approving those eulogies or protesting against them on their part, so I think I am justified in speaking a little, if not for them still from them. The great object of the debate, so far, has been to establish an invidious comparison between what they pretend to be the indifference of our friends from Ontario, as compared with the greedy demands, the persistent claims, coming from the Conservatives of the Province of Quebec on behalf of that Province. As I have already said, we have, so far, not heard our friends from the Province of Quebec express their opinion of that matter; but if they do not speak here their papers in the Province of Quebec speak for them, and we can easily understand that it would be really difficult for them to interfere, and show how they can agree together and work if not only towards defeating the Government, if they were able to do so. But we see they are resorting to the same kind of warfare. They want to arouse the prejudices of one Province against another, making people believe that one Province is not as fairly treated as another, and *vice versa*, so as to raise public opinion against the Government, and if they could destroy

or ruin the Government at the expense of the harmony or peace of the Confederation, they would only be too glad to do so. I happen to have in my hand a paper published during this month, and it is considered to be the Quebec organ of the Liberal party. If the House will allow me I shall quote and translate some extracts from an editorial of that paper—*L'Electeur*. It is entitled "The Justice of our Claims:"

"We publish elsewhere figures, which give the evidence in what an odious manner we are robbed and spoliated by the Federal Government."

Of course this speaks of the Province of Quebec—

"These figures which have been transmitted to us by Mr. J. C. Langelier"—

If I mistake not this is the brother of the hon. member for Megantic—

"will prove that the Province of Quebec has thrown into the treasury of the Confederation, during the first sixteen years, nearly \$20,000,000 more than it has received, whilst the other Provinces have received several millions more than they have expended towards the Confederation.

"After having made so many sacrifices, after having furnished, without any compensation whatever, the greatest part of the millions, which the Government have expended lavishly in the other Provinces, we should have the right to ask something in return, especially when we have an incontestable right to obtain it."

This is quite different from what has been said by our friends from Ontario, who pretend that all we have exacted, all we have obtained, was not because it was just to receive it, but because the Government was afraid to refuse what we were asking. We find the men who are taking common action with the Opposition from Ontario denouncing us for not obtaining from the Government what they say the Province of Quebec is justly entitled to. They publish tables of figures to show that while the Province of Ontario has received some \$6,000,000 more than she has contributed towards the revenue of the Confederation, the Province of Quebec has paid something like \$19,000,000 in excess of the expenditure; and continuing, they show, by figures which, of course, they claim to be correct, having been taken from the Public Accounts, that the Province of Nova Scotia has received \$18,000,000 more than she has expended, the Province of New Brunswick \$21,000,000 more, and so on. So that you see there is a wide divergence between what is said here, with regard to what the Province of Quebec has received, and what it is publicly claimed by the same party in our Province we are entitled to receive at the hands of the Government. But I think it will be interesting to continue these quotations. *L'Electeur*, which is speaking for the party, says:

"The French Conservative members from Lower Canada, who give their help to such an abominable policy, cannot profess to be in ignorance of the figures we have been publishing in another column, which show too clearly that in the absence of any other reason the sacrifices the Province of Quebec has made give us an incontestable right to what we are asking. They could easily obtain it had they heart and dignity enough to lay aside their own personal interest and to be satisfied only with what the interest of the Province demands."

How such denunciations can be reconciled with what we have heard during this debate it is not for me to say. And it proceeds to threaten that if the Province of Quebec does not receive the justice which she has a right to expect, and if the Conservative members from the Province of Quebec are not courageous enough to claim and exact that from the Government, we shall very soon see the end of the Confederation. So, we have before us a party united to defeat the Government, and taking such divergent views of what the Government has been doing in the way of rendering justice to the different members of the Confederation. The conclusion evidently to be drawn is this, that the Opposition in raising this debate, are not so anxious to obtain anything from the Government as to raise prejudices in the different parts of the Confederation, and to build up their own popularity at the expense of peace and harmony in the country; and it is well that the public should know it.

Mr. DESJARDINS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. At this late period of the debate I have no intention of making anything like a speech. I simply wish to notice two or three of the arguments which have been brought forward against the contention of this side of the House. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) commenced his speech with the argument that because Ontario had made a grant in aid of a road chartered by the Dominion Government, therefore the Dominion Government was right in seizing the rest of the railways.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I said it did not lie in the mouths of hon. gentlemen opposite now to say that because these roads were taken under the control of the Dominion Government, therefore they had a claim, inasmuch as the Local Government did not discriminate in making their grants between roads chartered by the Local Legislature and those chartered by this Government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand the full force of the argument; and I ask, if one man out of the kindness of his heart shares his goods with a needy neighbor, is that any reason why that neighbor should turn round and seize upon the whole of the other man's property? In the same way, if the Province of Ontario, of its own free will and accord, seeing that is going to be a partial benefit to the Province, saw fit to give a grant to a road chartered by the Dominion Government, is that any reason why the Dominion Government should turn round and seize the whole of the railways? Again, the hon. member for North Renfrew advanced the argument that this action is perfectly justifiable, because the Dominion Government is taking as good care of the roads, and is serving the country as well with them, as the Local Government was doing. I ask this hon. House if that argument is any stronger than the other. If one neighbor, by force of fraud, seizes on the farm of another neighbor, will any man in his senses plead in a court of law that he was perfectly justified in doing so because he was taking as good care of the farm as the other did. The same hon. gentleman, as well as the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), brought up the case of the North Shore Railway as a case in point. Now, I am not very well acquainted with the transactions relating to that railway; and in any statements I make I speak subject to correction. But if I understand the matter rightly, there is no parallel between the two cases. The North Shore Railway was built by the Province of Quebec, and the Province of Quebec sold it and got the money for it. It may be said for that Province that they did not get all that the road cost them. That is a matter entirely beside the question; that is their own lookout. If they made a bad bargain there is no reason why the other Provinces should be called upon to make it good to them. But I ask, is that any reason why the roads in the other Provinces should be seized upon? How stands the matter with them? Not a single dollar has been paid for a road in any one of the Provinces, that I know of, except for that North Shore Railway. I do not know what the other Provinces have done, but I know that the Government of the Province of Ontario has granted at least \$8,000,000 to aid in the construction of railways, and the municipalities throughout the Province have supplemented that grant by \$14,000,000 or \$16,000,000, and to my knowledge the municipalities have never been refunded one dollar of that money.

An hon. MEMBER. Pembroke.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Oh, yes; I beg pardon; there was one, in a critical moment. Well, I think one of the strongest arguments used to-night was used by my friend the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum). He said that there was only a certain portion of the municipalities where these roads had been built that had taxed themselves for building these roads, and that there would be a larger number of these municipalities who would receive nothing back and

who would have to pay their share of the sum refunded. At first sight that seemed a very strong argument; but if you examine it closely you will find it is no argument at all. If there is one principle more firmly fixed than another in the commercial mind it is that every man is bound by the action of his regularly appointed agent. The action of the agent is the action of the principal, and the same idea holds good with regard to the Government. For what are Governments and Parliaments? They are simply the agents of the people, responsible directly to the people, and when the people elect a certain set of men to conduct their business they are bound by the actions of these men. It makes no difference, in this respect, whether the municipalities have contributed anything or are going to receive anything. They are bound by the action of the men they have sent to represent them in Parliament. It seems to me that this action of the Dominion Government is a direct breach of one of the fundamental principles of Confederation, one of the strongest reasons for entering into Confederation. It was not very judicious on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to try to raise up a feeling in this matter between one Province and the other. The action contemplated here has no reference to one Province more than to another. If Quebec has railways in the same position as those instanced in Ontario there is not an hon. gentleman on this side who will not do his best, by vote and voice, to obtain for her remuneration. It is not by setting up one Province against another, but by giving to every Province the same mode of justice, that the Confederation will be held together. This action on the part of the Government was a breach of one of the fundamental principles of Confederation. You are aware, Sir, and the House is aware, that the chief reason which prompted the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec to contemplate Confederation at all at first was to obtain control over local matters and over local property, and when the Provinces retained certain rights and certain powers, these rights and powers should be held sacred; and I cannot imagine anything more dishonorable than to try and snatch away with a strong arm those rights. I do not know how many roads there are in the other Provinces in the same circumstances as the Ontario roads mentioned, but I repeat wherever such a road exists, it matters not in what Province, there are no gentlemen in this House who will be more anxious to do justice, to do all that lies in their power to obtain justice for them than hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

Mr. WILSON. I had no intention of making any remarks upon this question, until I heard the hon. member for Monk (Mr. McCallum) remark that the municipalities in the county I represent were more favored on account of amalgamation and becoming Dominion roads. He referred to the manner in which they were supplied with railway facilities. He said that the people of that locality would not, on any consideration, exchange their position, since the Credit Valley road had become part of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for the position in which they stood previously. He also referred to the fact that it was under the previous Government that the Canada Southern was taken as a work in the interest of the Dominion; and tried to draw the conclusion that, therefore, the arguments offered on this side, in support of our demand upon the present Government, would bear no weight. I do not base the case so strongly upon the fact that the Government assumed control of those roads, although I contend that the Dominion Government ought not to have assumed the control of roads constructed by the municipalities and the Local Government, as thereby the Government encroached on provincial rights as I do upon the policy the Government adopted last Session in granting aid to roads already built. It is the bounden duty of every hon. gentleman who has the interest of Confederation at

heart, to show a firm resistance to every act of encroachment by the Dominion Parliament. If we are to remain a part of Confederation, we should, on each and every occasion in which provincial rights are encroached upon, resist such encroachment. The Quebec Government having granted a certain amount of aid for the construction of a road, that is now in the interests of the great International road, they were recouped by the Dominion Government, and the Dominion Government having adopted that as their policy, we, in Ontario, similarly situated, have a right to demand similar consideration. I would here state that we have no disposition to raise sectional feelings, but we believe that we have a fair and just claim, and we merely ask for our rights, in the same manner as hon. gentlemen last Session felt disposed to demand their rights, with this difference, that we merely ask what they were in a position to demand from the Government last year under peculiar circumstances. Had the hon. gentlemen from Ontario who supported the Government had the same determination as the members from Quebec, we would not be in the position in which we are, but would have equal rights with the other Provinces. But I would give my hon. friend to understand that, although we may not be deprived of railway facilities at the present time, adequate perhaps for the wants of that locality, it is not from any aid or assistance that we have received from the Dominion Government, and I further claim that that locality would have had the same railway facilities whether the Government had assumed, as they did, in 1883, the control of all the roads in Ontario or not. That had nothing to do with the facilities we are now enjoying. That was not a part of their Act, to offer us any advantages or any benefits on account of their assuming those roads. Therefore, if there was any argument in what he said, though I do not think there was, it certainly would not apply, as far as that locality is concerned, as the people there had all these facilities regardless of the Act of 1883. Further, I suppose that hardly any members on that side of the House, those who were in the House during the last Parliament, would have recorded their votes for the agreement entered into between the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I suppose the members supporting that bargain would not have supported it if it had been announced from one end of the country to the other, that not only the amount they were then granting to the road, but millions afterwards, would be demanded for the construction of that road, not only through the North-West but through the older Provinces of the Dominion of Canada. If that scheme had been presented to them, if the representatives from the Province of Ontario had known, as they now know, that the Government would have said: We must recoup the Province of Quebec for the amount of money it has expended, they would have hesitated before they recorded their votes. In the original agreement for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, it was not entertained that the Government should assist that company in the construction of roads through the older Provinces. I believe, and I have just grounds for believing, that it was no more than reasonable and fair to expect that, if this company built the road through the North-West Territories, they should seek to make connection with existing lines to convey the freight from the North-West Territory to the seaboard through the older Provinces. I therefore feel that the Government were not justified in the course they took, of granting aid to Quebec last Session; but, if so, I say their duty is now to deal in the same manner with the Province of Ontario as they then dealt with Quebec. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and many of those who have spoken on the subject, seem to offer as an excuse, a reason and justification for the course the Government has been pursuing, that we

at the present time, although the roads have amalgamated, although they have been assumed by the Dominion Government, as good if not better facilities are now offered to the municipalities than before that assumption by the Dominion. This has nothing to do with the subject under discussion. That is no part of the argument. No doubt those roads could have amalgamated; very likely they would have amalgamated, if they had remained under provincial control, and while remaining under that control, we would have had perhaps better facilities than existed prior to that time, on account of the roads with which they amalgamated offering better facilities for the traffic and the conveyance of freight. Therefore, that portion of the argument, amounts to nothing. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Dawson) seems to think that he was justified when he was in the Local Legislature in opposing a grant to the Credit Valley, on account of its being a local road, and the section through which it passed being well supplied with railway facilities. But what was there stated very explicitly was that it was to be a road constructed for the purpose of conveying freight and traffic from Toronto westward, to offer cheaper rates and facilities, that they were not enjoying under the existing railways, the Great Western and the Grand Trunk. That road was serving a useful purpose; it was performing an important service in that section of the country. It may be at present performing as useful service under the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is now a part and parcel of that great trans-continental line, and must be the most important link in the traffic between the east and the west; because, I contend, as I have stated before in this House, that if you build the North Superior line, if you construct the line from Gravenhurst to Callander, and go around the north shore, the greater portion of the traffic will go by the Ontario and Quebec and by the Credit Valley westward, making its connection at Detroit, either with the Michigan Central or the Wabash road, and so getting to Chicago, and they will use this road all the year round, and will carry more traffic over it than over the main line. That being the case and the natural outcome of the construction of the road, I say that part of the road—the Credit Valley—if no other portion, will be entitled to consideration at the hands of the Government, similar to what Quebec received on account of that portion of its road assumed by the Canadian Pacific Railway. As an evidence of this, showing the intention of the Government, showing the object they had in view, during last Session they asked this House to grant a charter for the construction of a road, or a portion of a road, so as to reach Detroit. What object could the Canadian Pacific Railway have in view? Was it merely to have running arrangements with other roads? No; the object was to reach Detroit, and there to enter into an arrangement with the Wabash, or, very likely, to purchase it (as it is in difficulties at the present time), and reach Chicago over that road. When once there, they are quite safe in reaching the North-West, and then they will have one of the finest lines from the seaboard to the North-West, in an old section of country, that will always furnish them with a very large amount of freight; and that portion of the road, from Gravenhurst to Callander and from this point to the North-West, will, for a portion of the year at least, be comparatively of little use. I think that my friend from Monck (Mr. McCallum) should have been a little chary of his opposition on the present occasion. We know he had a seat in the Local Legislature; he occupied a position there at the time a large amount of money was voted by that Legislature for the construction of railways; and that he supported the Premier of the day in granting \$1,500,000. Some of that money was not expended until a few years ago; the whole of it was not expended at the time he left the Local Legislature; but he supported the Government of John

Mr. WILSON.

Sandfield Macdonald; he aided and assisted the Province of Ontario in the expenditure of this money; he gave his countenance; he gave his vote. True, when the present leader of the Opposition formed a Government, my hon. friend then found he had granted a million and a-half and should not grant any more railway aid. He voted consistently every time from that day onward, that no more aid should be given to railways. Prior to that time he was not so careful of the people's money. He gave his aid and his assistance to the hon. Postmaster General on every vote that was recorded on that occasion, and they got the \$1,500,000. Therefore, I say that he ought to have some consideration and some sympathy for the Province; he should have some consideration for the just claims of the people on whom he helped to impose the burden of \$1,500,000. Since this system was adopted of granting aid to railways in the Province of Quebec, it was found that the time had come when a halt had to be declared. I must say that unless we come to some arrangement and settlement of this difficulty, this agitation will continue. I believe that those who put forward the claim for a recoupment of the aid they have granted have a just and fair claim, and it ill becomes any hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House to say that we make the claim for a political purpose. If we look at the individuals who have been down here on deputations, and the various county councils who have passed resolutions asking for recoupment, and the city councils who have sent in petitions to the same effect, we shall find that a majority of them are Conservatives and friends of the present Government. I therefore feel that they ought not, at the present time, to charge members on this side of the House with having a political object in view. The hon. member for Renfrew, as an illustration showing that the Ontario Government made no distinction in granting aid to roads, whether they were Dominion or local roads, referred to the Kingston and Pembroke Railway. I believe that was chartered under the old Parliament of Canada; and I know that when I occupied a seat in the Local Legislature, amendments to that charter were granted by that Legislature, and therefore it was considered in every sense of the word as a provincial road, and therefore the argument he attempted to base upon that road falls to the ground.

Mr. ALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words to advocate the wishes of the strongly Conservative county council of the county of Grey. At their session in June last they passed resolutions requesting this Government to take this matter into consideration, and to recoup those municipalities who had paid large sums as bonuses to the different railways. I think this House will believe me when I say that, so far as North Grey is concerned, this question is purely non-political. That county is more burdened with railway debts than any county in Ontario, in proportion to the value of the lands. It has given within a trifle of \$700,000 in municipal bonuses to the various railways passing through it. I could mention one township which gave \$55,000 in bonuses; and, Sir, to-day, I believe, such is the position of that township that, if the land were sold by auction, it would not bring an average of \$15 per acre. Many of the townships in the country which value their property at \$50, \$60 or \$75 per acre, are not indebted to the same extent. This county council, representing those farmers who are so heavily indebted, believed that the Government had established a precedent in recouping the town of Pembroke and the Province of Quebec last Session, and that they also had a just claim in demanding some remuneration to those farmers who had paid so liberally to railway bonuses in the county of Grey. I think the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) stated that it was a great advantage to us in having the railway changed from a narrow to a broad gauge; and I understood from his remarks that he insinuated that the Canadian Pacific Railway were

the means of that change and of this advantage. Well, Sir, long before the Canadian Pacific Railway had an existence, or any intention of taking over the Toronto, Gray and Bruce, the latter company had broadened the gauge to the uniform gauge of the country. And, Sir, in addition to the bonuses which the Ontario Government had given towards the construction of that road, the municipalities along the line, which had given every dollar they could in bonuses, and in many cases more than they could afford, requested the Ontario Government to advance a still further amount to enable that company to broaden the gauge and place it in a position to be worked with the other railroads of the country; and the Ontario Government gave, in addition to the former bonuses the sum of \$150,000, to enable that company to rebuild the road, before the Canadian Pacific Railway Company obtained possession of it. The hon. member for Cardwell mentioned that we were very anxious to place that road under the control of a Dominion line, and that we requested the Grand Trunk Railway to take possession of it. We acknowledge, Sir, that we were very anxious to get that road under the management of a large and wealthy corporation, and to-day we do not deny the fact that we are in a better position than we were before. We do not deny the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have added materially to the advantages that road confers upon the county. But, Sir, I endorse the sentiments expressed by the county council, to the effect that as the Government had established the precedent of recouping the Provinces for the bonuses paid by municipalities, we were undoubtedly entitled to a share of the reimbursements thus made by the Government. I hope the Government will take into their consideration the reasonable request of the county council, of Grey, and grant that aid to the farmers to which I believe they are thoroughly entitled. It was rather amusing, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) advance the idea that we should be generous, and not try to create discord or jealousy between the Provinces. It is all very well for that hon. gentleman, after his Province has received all the loaves and fishes that have been going, now to ask the members from Ontario not to create ill-feeling by pressing their claims for an equal share.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The railway legislation of last Session not only added largely to the Dominion debt, but laid the foundation to many claims. While various municipalities are pressing their claims against the Government, I wish to file a small claim on behalf of the township in which I reside. I cannot contend that it is a very large portion of the Dominion, but it is an important one, particularly to those who reside there. It is so located, also, that its highways were constructed at considerable expense and are maintained at great cost. In addition to its ordinary expenses, it has contributed its proper quota to Dominion works, also to distant local railways, and has been forced to build its own railways or largely contribute thereto. This has been done to the extent of \$30,000 by the township, including its town and village, and when these claims for recouping are being considered I want the township of Enniskillen to be remembered. I ask for this on what I believe to be a sound principle, and if the principal is paid we will not say anything about the interest. I wish for a moment to allude, although it has been mentioned before, to the manner in which the railway account is being kept with relation to Ontario, and in this connection I will quote no less an authority than the First Minister. During last Session, when railway aid measures were before the House, a discussion took place, in which that hon. gentleman said:

"If we look back for some years to the time when the original project of building the Canadian Pacific Railway was initiated, we find that Callander was selected as the most easterly point of that railway. It was chosen so long ago as 1872. It was then understood

that because our ideas were not so large and our means were not so great, and the prospect of the development of this country was not so assured then as it is now—it was understood that under the terms of the arrangement with British Columbia the railway should start from British Columbia and come east until it joined the Canadian system of railways; and it was held that if the eastern terminus was fixed at Callander that would be a convenient point, where Toronto, which represents the great commercial portion of Ontario, could join it, and that the eastern portion of Ontario could join it, and that the eastern portion of Ontario and the Province of Quebec could work westward as fast as they could and all join at Callander."

Then he goes on to refer to the change made by granting aid to the railway from Callander to Pembroke, and says that "everybody of common sense must have seen" that the same aid must be given to the line to Quebec. On a former occasion I referred to the location of Callander, and I think I shall be justified in referring to it again. Hon. gentlemen opposite have forgotten where Callander is; or, more likely, they doubt that other people understood where it is, because it is argued that bonuses having been granted from Callander to Pembroke it became necessary to continue that bonusing on as far east as Quebec. But it should be remembered that Callander is located a few miles from Ottawa river, which is the boundary between the two Provinces, and it is continued down that boundary all the way to Pembroke. In whose interest was this done? Was it in the interest of Toronto, which is said to be the commercial centre of Ontario? Does it point towards Toronto? Does not every mile take it away from Toronto and lead direct to Montreal, the commercial metropolis of Quebec? It is said that it comes to Ottawa. It is true that Ottawa is all in Ontario. This argument is continually mentioned by representatives from Ontario. A somewhat broader view was taken by the late lamented member for Maskinongé (Mr. Houde), who, in referring to the Pembroke Railway, said:

"To the Aylmer and Pembroke Railway, \$272,000, of which amount, as that road runs between the two Provinces, I will assign one-third to Ontario and two-thirds to Quebec"

This is the manner in which an hon. gentleman from Quebec treated the question.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). The fact is, that a portion of the road is located in the Province of Ontario.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Unquestionably; but the great proportion is so near the boundary that you can throw a stone into Quebec.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I am speaking of the road to which Mr. Houde referred. A part of it is located in Ontario, and the proportion is, as stated in that hon. gentleman's speech, about one-third.

Mr. FAIRBANK. The whole is on the boundary of Ontario which shows that he was more liberal than I have given him credit for being. Not only is the extension from Callander to Pembroke charged entirely to Ontario, although I have shown that it goes directly to Montreal and points away from the commercial metropolis of Ontario, but when a road which is constructed, leading to Toronto, that is, the road from Callander to Gravenhurst, it is also charged entirely to Ontario. The two distances would very nearly balance each other, one being 120 miles and the other 110. But hon. gentlemen opposite, following their leader and the ex-Minister of Railways, charged the entire amount of both of them to Ontario. But the charging does not stop here. The whole Canadian Pacific Railway on Ontario's soil and rock is charged to Ontario. I wish the people of that Province to understand thoroughly the manner in which this railway account is kept. Deputations are not told when they come here, as they did the other day, that their application is wrong in principle, but they are told that the Dominion has already given so much to Ontario there is no possible basis for a further claim to rest upon. It will be interesting to know to what is claimed the

aid given it amounts to. We are given an idea of this in the speech delivered by the Minister of Railways last Session :

"Nor need I remind the House that in the carrying out of this great work of an inter-oceanic railway, we have provided for the rapid construction of no less than 650 miles of road from Port Arthur to Callander, involving the expenditure within the Province of Ontario of over \$20,000,000 in connection with the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway."

The hon. gentleman also referred to the construction of the railway from Callander to Pembroke, and also to the construction of the Callander and Gravenhurst Railway. Adding the cost of these together gave a total of \$22,780,000 as the expenditure within the Province of Ontario at that time. But you will have noticed in the discussion to-day that the amount has grown. We have heard of over \$30,000,000 referred to. How does this come about? The reason is obvious. Last Session the calculations were only made from Callander to Port Arthur or Thunder Bay, but now we have the larger amount. The reason for this may be illustrated by a map which I hold in my hand. We find from this map that the boundary of Ontario was placed at Thunder Bay, or rather at a line drawn due north from Thunder Bay, near Fort William. It is clear and well defined, the color is clearly shown, and the name of Manitoba is clearly printed upon the map up to that line. I find this map was issued by the Department of Public Works and the name I find attached to it is "Sir Hector L. Langevin, K.C. M.G., C.B., 1883." I am not an authority upon colors. I do not think the color is "blue;" I think it is more of another color. In speaking further upon the question of railways and the obligations of Ontario, the First Minister remarked :

"But we cannot forget that all the advantages hitherto have been to the Province of Ontario, to my own Province. Why, Sir, the whole of the railway from Ottawa to the far North-West, until it strikes Manitoba, runs through Ontario; and besides the subsidies that have been given, the railway running round the north shore of Lake Superior has opened up a country magnificent in its future; magnificent forests have been found to exist there, and its mineral wealth is enormous; and, Sir, that whole country has been developed; the \$12,000 a mile granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, so far as Ontario is concerned, will pour an enormous wealth into her Treasury by the opening up of that country; good as we know, for its forests; good, as we believe, for its agricultural capabilities; good, as we believe, also, in its mineral resources; therefore, we are only granting justice to the Province of Quebec in paying them the same amount that we have done to the Province of Ontario.

We get from this an idea of the amount we have still to pay—we get an idea of the "development" of the county. We have some further information upon the county "developed" at a more recent date, from the chief organ of the Government in the Province of Ontario. I read from the *Mail* of quite a recent date:

"If it be said that the mountain section of the Northern Railway was more costly than the mountain section of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and that in the case of the Canadian Pacific the heavy work on the Pacific slope has been assumed by the Government, the answer is that the Northern Pacific had no rock division, 650 miles long, such as that which stretches in unbroken desolation between Port Arthur and Callander."

That is the development which the First Minister speaks of. Justice is referred to very forcibly in the extracts I have read; and the question suggests itself, If the claims of last Session were simply justice, only justice, why did the Ministry, as has been said, "wait until the second bell had rung before they surrendered?" In stating the railway indebtedness of Ontario last Session at \$22,500,000, and finding it now increased to over \$30,000,000, we have a new showing of the watchful parental care which this Government exercises over that Province—a parental care which I fear will not be fully appreciated by that Province. Their desire to prevent the extension of the Province west of Thunder Bay seems to have been because they wished to prevent the increase of the railway debt of Ontario—because the further west we went the larger would our indebtedness become. I think that there is no doubt that our railway resolutions of last Session were a bad business, bad now, and bad in the

Mr. FAIRBANK.

future. We, on this side of the House, thought then it was a bad business; we believed that "anybody of common sense" must have understood it was a bad business. And what is the summing up of the whole matter? The Government had determined to give a large sum of money to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and it became necessary for them to give subsidies to Quebec, and also to partially sugar-coat the pill for the Province of Ontario, by giving them certain sums. But I think that in this matter we have got into a difficulty which it is hard to see the end of.

Mr. TROW. I would not have risen to my feet—for I am very diffident on this, as on all other occasions—had it not been for the remarks made by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White), and the hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins), who apparently accused the mover of this motion of bringing up the resolution merely for some political purpose. Now, I know that was quite foreign to him, and that he brought it up for no such purpose, but merely in the interest of the Province of Ontario. It is a matter of indifference how long we discuss this matter on this side of the House, for we are unfortunately not in a position, in point of numbers, to bring that pressure on the Government which supporters of the Government may do, if they feel inclined, in a similar manner to that in which the supporters of the Government from Quebec did last Session. We on this side of the House attach no blame whatever to the supporters of the Government from the Province of Quebec in getting justice done to their Province. What we say is, that the supporters of the Government from the Province of Ontario are silent in the interests of their own Province. It strikes me very forcibly that those hon. gentlemen, even in the arguments they have used, have stood diametrically opposed to the interests of their own Province. It seems to me it would be better for them to take a leaf out of the books of the hon. members for Quebec, even if they had to retire for a few days or hours to No. 8, and deliberate calmly over the matter. It might happen that the leader of the Government would ultimately succumb to their persuasive efforts. My own county has probably done more than any other county in western Canada in the way of bonuses for railway construction. We have one line running from Lake Erie to the Georgian Bay, a distance of some 160 miles, and there is not a municipality on the line but has contributed very largely towards its construction. I know that the county I represent has given at least \$350,000. The town of Stratford alone gave \$60,000 to aid in the construction of that road; the county voted \$120,000; the township of Mornington, \$40,000; the township of Wallace, \$40,000, and other municipalities corresponding amounts. So that if any county is interested in being recouped by the Government it is the county of Perth; and I do think the Government would be justified in giving these municipalities something in compensation, as they have done to other municipalities heretofore.

Mr. COOK. Before the motion is put, I wish to correct a statement made by the hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. White). He stated that when that bonus was recouped to the town of Pembroke he had a larger majority outside of the town of Pembroke than I had in my whole county. He said he had the returns before him.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I said I had not the returns.

Mr. COOK. I saw a book that looked very much like the returns on your desk. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he was wrong. I do not suppose that he meant to state what was not correct, but he did not read rightly the returns, or if he had not the returns, he ought to have been more careful in making a statement without them. His majority outside of the town of Pembroke was 104; my majority was 138. There is only a difference of 34, but his majority outside of Pembroke was not as large as the

majority I had in my county. The hon. member also stated that the Province of Ontario received large revenues from the late disputed territory.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). No; what I said was, that in that portion of the territory which was not in dispute a considerable amount of money had been received through the opening of the railway.

Mr. COOK. Well, they have been receiving something, but not very much, from the fact that lumbering operations are not carried on there to a very large extent. He also stated that the Pacific Railway developed that country very greatly, and I understood him to refer to the territory which has been decided by the Privy Council to belong to Ontario. I want to say that I do not think that road has developed that country, as regards the timber. Of course, it sent in a number of gentlemen there; John Shields and other men of that ilk have received from this Government large timber limits illegally in that section; but I do not think they have developed the country to any extent whatever. I have not heard of those parties having commenced lumbering there. There are a few companies operating there that were there years before this Government came into power. My hon. friend also said that this was a political move. Of course, he measures other people's grain in his own half-bushel. I suppose he knew it was a political move when the town of Pembroke was recouped to the extent of the bonus it gave to the Canada Central Railway. It was done just before the election, when the campaign was going on, and that was a very suspicious time. The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien) stated that the county council of Simcoe had sent a deputation here on a fool's errand. Well, I must protest against such language. I think the county council of Simcoe, although largely Conservative, with a majority almost two to one, is a very intelligent body of men, as intelligent a body of men as you will find in any county council, probably in any Legislature, in this country, although a large portion of them are Conservatives. I suppose my hon. friend has no kindly feelings toward them, from the fact that I believe he was at one time an aspirant for the position of reeve in one of the townships of the county, but they rejected him, and he wishes to take this opportunity now of paying them back, by giving them a slap in the face. I am obliged to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), for endorsing the statement I made, that the county solicitor had drawn the agreement so loosely between the municipalities and the railway company that a coach-and-four could be driven through it. I am sure the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) will not thank him very much for this endorsement of my statement.

Mr. POPE. I have a few words to say on this subject before the debate closes. You would think, from what we have heard from the other side of the House, that Ontario was very unjustly dealt with. You would think that this policy was pressed upon Ontario by the lower Provinces, and particularly by the Province of Quebec. I fail to see that Ontario has been so very unjustly dealt with, though I can quite understand how this important delegation from Simcoe came here and pressed their claim for the return of the subsidies. Is there any one in the world who will object to take money when he can get it? That was their position. If money was due to them they were ready to take it; and they acted like gentlemen. But what is all this row about? Is there any man who can show me? I find that there are forty-two roads which have either declared themselves to be under the Dominion Parliament or that do not come under the operation of this Act. Then, I find that there are roads affected by this Act; and I wish the attention of those hon. gentlemen who have declared in this House, and who go into the highways and streets, declaring that they are ready and willing to do justice by everybody,

and only want others to do likewise by them. I am not speaking of those roads in Ontario, which are themselves at liberty, under Provincial charters, to lease their roads or to lease other roads; nor am I speaking of the Grand Trunk or other roads enumerated in the Act of 1883 as coming under that Act. I am not speaking of those lines leased by the Grand Trunk, but of those which have not been leased, and come within this Act. Well, Sir, of those seventeen roads, how many do we find in the Province of Ontario? You will be surprised when I tell you that there are two roads affected by this Act, which these hon. gentlemen are making such a noise about, and only two. All the other roads which were chartered by Acts from the Legislature of Ontario amalgamated themselves with or leased themselves to the Grand Trunk or other leading railways before the Act of 1883 was passed. Now, Sir, of those seventeen, how many roads do I find in the Lower Provinces? I find fifteen—the Waterloo and Magog, the St. Martin's Junction, the South-Eastern, the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly, the Quebec Central, the Quebec and Lake St. John, the Northern and Western of New Brunswick, the Montreal and Vermont Junction, the Montreal and Sorel, the Massawippi Valley, the Kent Northern, the Jacques Cartier, the Albert, the Chatham, and the Grand Southern. And yet you do not see them coming here. Now, I ask these gentlemen who get up here and declare that they are ready to pay every other Province, to step up and show that they are willing to do it. Let them put their hands in their pockets, and we are willing to meet them. I claim it is absurd for men to come to this House and ask to be paid back subsidies on account of the amalgamations of railways when, as a consequence of the amalgamations, they have much greater accommodation than previously, when instead of one train a day there are six trains a day. Let them go to the Lower Provinces, where the roads are four or five times as numerous, and recoup them.

Motion agreed to.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 17th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER informed the House that he had received from the Registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada, certified copies of the judgments and decisions of the said court in the election appeals relating to the electoral district of Levis, in the Province of Quebec, and the electoral district of the West Riding of Northumberland, in the Province of Ontario, by which judgments the elections in the said two electoral districts were declared to be void.

Mr. SPEAKER also informed the House that, in conformity with the Act, 37 Vic., cap. 5, sec. 36, he had issued his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, to make out two writs of election for the said electoral districts.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURRAN. As the presence in so many button-holes of the green immortal shamrock indicates that this is St. Patrick's Day, I beg leave, without further preface, to move that when this House rises at six o'clock this evening, it

do stand adjourned until to-morrow at three o'clock in honor of the patron saint of old Ireland.

Mr. CASGRAIN. Mr. Speaker, —

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CASGRAIN. It appears to be the opinion that when I rise to speak in this House I ought to be shut down.

An hon. MEMBER. Shut up.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I do not intend to oppose the motion which has been made. On the contrary, I have a double reason for not doing so, because my children have some Irish blood in them. But that is not the point at present. I think the hon. member who has taken the lead in this matter has taken a part that should have been taken by the leader of the House; but as the First Minister is not here, though he ought to be here, if my hon. colleague from Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) will delay the motion until the First Minister is here, he will render me a service personally, and perhaps the public also. If he persists, I may not object at the present moment, but I will take an opportunity on another occasion to express my views. But I think he ought to accede to my request.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved that the House go into Committee on Thursday next, to consider the following resolution:—

Resolved, That it is expedient that hereafter the officers and servants of the Library of Parliament should consist of:—

1. Two officers, one to be called the General Librarian, the other the Parliamentary Librarian, and to hold a joint commission as "Librarian of Parliament" and to have equal powers.

2. Two first-class clerks.

3. Two second-class clerks,

4. Three third-class clerks.

5. One chief messenger.

6. Three messengers.

Resolved, That the salaries of the officers holding said joint commission shall be fixed at sums not exceeding the sum of three thousand (\$3,000) per annum for each officer, and that of the Chief Messenger shall not exceed seven hundred dollars, and that the salaries of the other officers and of the servants of the Library shall be fixed from time to time by Order of the Governor in Council according to the scale of salaries provided for in any Act or Acts relating to the Civil Service which may be in force at the time of passing the said Order.

Provided always, that the salary of any officer or servant now employed in the Library shall not be diminished.

Motion agreed to.

DISPUTED TERRITORY—INDIAN TITLE.

Mr. MILLS. I would like to enquire of the Government when we may expect to receive the information relating to Indian matters, correspondence between the Governments of Ontario and the Dominion, in reference to the Indian title to the disputed territory. These papers were asked for several weeks ago. We know the Government will make some claim to these territories adverse to the claims of the Province of Ontario, and we have no means, without these papers, of knowing the nature of their claims.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will have the matter attended to.

TRANSLATION OF PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I have been asked to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that the French versions of the *Hansard* and the Votes and Proceedings do not reach the press in due time. I do not say that is the fault of the Government, but simply call their attention to it so that it may be remedied. The French newspapers complain that they are four or five days late in getting their *Hansard* reports and Votes and Proceedings. Another grievance on the part of French-speaking members and the French Canadian press is that they do not get the French versions

Mr. CURRAN.

of the blue-books as soon as the English blue-books are issued.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. (Translation.) In answer to the hon. member, as to the remarks he has just made concerning newspaper men, I must tell him that this matter does not at all lay in the power of the Government. It is a matter which is altogether within the jurisdiction of the House and, therefore, application should be made to the House. There are committees appointed for that purpose and these committees are obliged to see that the both versions of *Hansard* should be distributed at the same time. As regards the hon. member personally, and also other hon. French-speaking members of this House, I must tell him that the returns brought down in the House are generally published in English first, and that, consequently, the translation must be made afterwards. That is the reason why these returns are not published in both languages at the same time. However, if the hon. member will recollect what has taken place during last Session and during the present Session, he will find that, in several instances, the two versions have been issued at about the same time. At all events, the moment the English version is issued by the members of the Government it is sent to the translators, and from that moment it is taken out of the control of the Government and is put under the control of the House. I answer in French to the hon. member because this matter concerns more especially the French members of this House.

REPORT ON MANUFACTURES.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE. I beg to call the attention of the Government and the House to a defect in the report relative to the manufacturing industries of Canada. I have perused this report carefully, and am unable to find in it any mention of the manufacturing industries of British Columbia. Although the commissioners went as far east as Prince Edward Island, the most western Province, the Province of British Columbia, is left out entirely. Why, I cannot understand. It cannot be because we have no industries there, for we have more industries in British Columbia than have some other Provinces which are mentioned in this report, and it therefore appears to me that a slight has been cast on the Province of British Columbia by this omission to pay a little attention to her industries, especially as the people of that Province pay more *per capita* into the Dominion Treasury than do the people of any other Province in the Dominion. Perhaps some hon. gentlemen opposite imagine that we have no industries in British Columbia, and to remove that impression I will refer to a few of them. We have the lumbering industry on a very large scale, our fishing industry, our canned fish industry, which is larger than that of the rest of the Dominion put together; we have the manufacturing of furniture industry, the organ factory, boot and shoe industry, cigar factories, sash and door factories, brass works, boiler yards, stove factories, glove and shirt factories, foundries, soap factories, marble works, carriage factories, several breweries, a ginger ale factory, and many others too numerous to mention, and I may say that within the last three or four years those industries have considerably increased in capacity, and it is in the interest of the Government and the country at large that something should be made known about them as well as about other industries in the other Provinces. Our coal industries also are of vast importance to the Dominion, giving as they do employment to hundreds of men. The area of our coal fields is immense, and the quality of our coal is unsurpassed. I sincerely trust that a supplementary report will be made and submitted to this House which will embrace the industries of British Columbia.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I can assure the hon. gentleman that if a supplementary report be made British

Columbia will be included. The object the Government had in view was to obtain such information as could be secured between the first of June and the first of January, with reference particularly to the more important manufacturing centres. It was not intended to take in the whole of the Dominion, but only the principal manufacturing centres, and this will explain also why, as regards the Maritime Provinces, more prominence was given to St. John, Halifax and other leading points than to less central points. If any supplementary enquiry be made, of course it will embrace British Columbia.

Mr. BLAKE. I have observed the defect in the report to which the hon. gentleman alludes, but I have imagined a different explanation of it from that to which the hon. gentleman alludes. I thought that in the mind of the Government, their exports were entirely overshadowed by their great importing industries, especially the importing of Chinese.

DAILY ISSUE OF THE DEBATES.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I desire to call the attention of the *Hansard* Committee to the fact that several journalists complain that they never receive the *Hansard* for a week after it is published. We agreed to give up one of our additional numbers for the sake of supplying the journals. If they are to be supplied at all, I think they should be supplied promptly.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). We did not agree as a matter of fact to give up anything. The Committee desired to give up one of the bound volumes in order to supply the newspapers. But the distribution takes place in the same way as the ordinary Sessional Papers, and sometimes some two or three papers or the issues of two or three days go out together, instead of one going out every day, as it should.

THE BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask the Government if they can give us any idea how long this protracted debate on the tariff will continue. I understand that a list of fifteen or twenty speakers has been made by the whips, and the people of the country are anxious to know when we shall get to business.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We have no rule for shortening the debates.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BURNS. Convinced as I am that the subject under discussion is pretty well exhausted, I rise with a great deal of diffidence, and feel that in doing so I am perhaps not only trespassing upon the patience and temper of the House and on our time here, but that I will cast but very little new light on any matter which has been referred to. The subjects which have been referred to by the Minister of Finance are certainly of very great importance, and have been very fully dealt with by members on both sides of the House. Every argument which has been advanced by gentlemen on the opposite side, every statement which has been made by them, not only in the present debate but in years gone by, has been answered not only by the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House but by the country, and by the country more than once. Therefore, as it would be only to take up the time of the House to again answer them, and as I am especially reminded of that fact by the enquiry just addressed to the Government by the hon. member for Northumberland, I will only occupy a short time as I am as anxious as any hon. gentleman can

be to proceed to the serious business which has brought us here. There were a few observations made by gentlemen on the other side, which I can only characterise as reckless statements, which I think make it necessary that some one who is in some degree conversant with some of the matters referred to should make a few remarks in reply to them. The situation has been described by the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), and the hon. member for Queen's, New Brunswick (Mr. King), as grave and gloomy. They have told us that the taxation of the country is increasing. I think they went to the length of stating that taxation had increased at a greater rate than in any other country, at even four times the rate that it had increased in any other country. They stated also that the exodus was going on at a far greater rate than at any other period in the history of Canada, and many other things. I will attempt to show by some statistics that I have prepared that, so far as the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are concerned—and it is to those two Provinces that I intend to confine my remarks—the gentlemen I have referred to, as well as the member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), who seems to pay special attention to those Provinces, are in error. They have attempted to show that previous to the election of 1882, the imposition of duty, or, as we say, the readjustment of the tariff, would have the effect of crushing the industries of those Provinces, that the effect of the National Policy would be to injure the lumber trade, to injure those engaged in the fishing industry and those engaged in farming. The statements which I will read to the House will go to prove I think that under the operation of that policy, those special industries have not been destroyed, but that on the contrary they have increased and prospered. We find a large increase in the exports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. We find that in 1878, the export of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia amounted to \$13,768,810, and in 1884, under the influence of this National Policy, which was to crush out the lumber trade and the fisheries and the farming industry, they had increased to \$17,352,428, an increase of \$3,583,618 in the short space of six years. I might remind the House that this increase is made up altogether of the very things which this policy was to stamp out of existence—lumber, and the products of the fisheries, and the produce of the mine and the product of the farm. In 1878 the export of fisheries from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia—for I take them together—amounted to \$5,197,840. In 1884, they had increased to \$6,213,152, or an increase of over a million dollars. The product of the mines in 1878 was exported to the extent of \$652,231, while in 1884 it had reached \$954,980, or an increase of \$302,749. The lumber exports of 1878, from those two Provinces were \$5,573,469, and in 1884, under this National Policy they had increased to \$7,317,647, or an increase of \$1,744,178. Grouping together the agricultural and animal products, we find that in 1878 the exports were \$910,252; in 1884, \$1,697,130, or an increase of \$786,878. The gross increase in the exports of minerals, fish, lumber and farm produce from 1878 to 1884 was \$3,849,117. Now, Sir, if the National Policy was so disastrous in its effects as those hon. gentlemen prophesied it would be, some years ago, and as they assert it is to-day, I ask why it is that our exports of products have gone on increasing? In proof of the fact that our increased exports have been productive of an accumulation of wealth to the country, and as some proof that the wealth of the country has increased, I propose to read some figures with reference to the state of those Provinces as regards the amount of extra capital which they have now compared with that which they had in 1878. In 1878 the balances in the Government Savings Banks in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island were \$4,371,310.60; in 1884 they had increased to \$12,212,675, or an increase of

\$7,840,765. The paid-up capital of the chartered banks was \$5,794,760 in 1878; in 1884 it was \$6,380,246, or an increase of \$585,486. The gross deposits in chartered banks in 1878 was \$5,816,212, while in 1884 they were \$9,753,446, or an increase of \$3,937,234. I ask, is that any proof that the condition of those Provinces is less favorable under the influence of the National Policy, that they are less wealthy and less prosperous to-day than they were in 1878? I will take one industry alone which, in the elections of 1882, we were told would have to bear the heaviest burthen under the National Policy, and that is the fishing industry. That is an industry with which I am well acquainted; an industry in which the people of my county are more directly concerned than in any other; an industry which gives employment in the county I have the honor to represent, as well as in other counties of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, to a very considerable portion of the population. Now, Sir, in 1878, the amount of capital invested in fishing material—exclusive of the capital invested in fishing craft, boats and schooners, which is a very large amount—the capital invested in those two Provinces at that time was a little over \$200,000. In 1883, which is the latest date up to which I can find any reliable statistics, the capital invested was \$1,200,000, or an increased investment in that industry of over one million dollars. The value of the fish caught in 1878 in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia was something over \$7,600,000; and in 1883 it had increased to very nearly \$11,000,000. Taking the amount invested in fishing material in the year 1878 and the value of fish caught in that year, we find they represent the sum of \$7,872,741; while in 1883 they reached \$12,043,183. Speaking specifically, the increase in the value of materials in 1883 over 1878, was \$956,490; and the increase in the value of fish caught was \$3,213,952, making a gross increase of \$4,170,442 in that industry alone. That, Sir, is exclusive of a very large increase in the amount of capital which we know as a matter of fact had been invested in the building and fitting out of schooners and boats with which to prosecute that industry. Now, Sir, after referring to those special industries in which New Brunswick and Nova Scotia are more largely interested than any other Province of the Dominion, I may be permitted to make reference to the cause of the depression—to make the same reference that has been made by gentlemen on both sides of this House. The depression in trade in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, if any depression in trade exists, is only in one or two particular industries, but mainly in the shipbuilding business. To a certain extent there is a depression in the lumber trade, but that depression is not in the direction of any decreased output, or of any decreased export, but it is in the direction of lower prices for our products. But while that industry may be affected in this respect, and while our lumber may be bringing a less price to-day than it did in former years, every person engaged in that industry, every person outside, I may say, of the shipper, the farmer who sells his produce to the lumberman and the man who works in the woods, in fact everybody connected with that trade, from the farmer to the manufacturer of the lumber—every person, I think I can safely say, with the exception of the shippers, has derived large gains from that industry during the last four years. The shipbuilding industry is, no doubt, very depressed, and I see no reason to hope that so far as wooden ships are concerned that trade will be revived. The days of wooden ships are gone by, and we are brought face to face with the fact that in the future the carrying trade of the world will be done by steamers, or if not altogether by steamers then by iron vessels. To show to what extent steam vessels are superseding sailing vessels I will quote to you some figures which I have prepared as showing the amount of tonnage arriving from sea in the Provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, in the years 1878 and 1884 respectively, and it will show

Mr. BURNS.

the large increase of steam tonnage over sailing tonnage. In 1878 the number of steamers that arrived in the ports of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia was 1,040, with a gross tonnage of 635,457. In 1884 the number of steamers was 1,528, with a gross tonnage of 1,081,163, showing an increase in number of 448, and of tonnage 440,706. The number of sailing vessels that arrived in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia ports in that year was 5,637, with a gross tonnage of 1,132,899. In 1884 the number of sailing vessels had increased very considerably; but, as you will notice, the tonnage had increased but very little. As against 5,637 sailing vessels in 1878 there were 7,324 in 1884; but as against 1,132,899 tons in 1878, there were only 1,213,456 tons in 1884, showing a very slight increase in tonnage but a decided increase in the number of vessels. At this point let me give to the House my idea as to the cause of the increase in the number of vessels without any corresponding increase in the tonnage. The explanation to my mind lies in this fact, that the increased number of vessels which arrived was largely made up of fishing and coasting vessels, vessels of very small tonnage; because, if you take the number of vessels in connection with the extra tonnage, you will find that the vessels only averaged about 50 tons each. So we have, comparing 1878 with 1884, an increase in steam tonnage of 440,706 tons, and an increase in the tonnage of sailing vessels to the extent of 100,557 tons. This will go to show, as I have stated, that steam tonnage is rapidly superseding sailing vessels, and that the decline in shipbuilding in the Maritime Provinces is not due to any cause we can control or due in any respect to the effects of the National Policy. I hope to live to see the day when we, being determined to keep pace with the age and retain for ourselves the large carrying trade we have enjoyed for so many years, and which we still continue to enjoy to a very great extent, though to an extent rather more limited than heretofore, will be building not only iron sailing ships but iron steamers and in that way showing our determination to maintain our place as the fourth or fifth maritime power in the world. I may be pardoned if I refer in this connection to the increase in the fisheries that has taken place in the county which I have the honor to represent; for disguise it as we may, while we are disposed to take a statesman-like view of questions and view them from a national standpoint, we are disposed to look at what more immediately concerns us and at the state of affairs which exists in the locality in which we have special interest. I find that in the County of Gloucester the value of the fish caught in 1878, added to the value of the fishing material was \$544,000. In 1883, only five years afterwards, it had reached \$700,000, or an increase of over 25 per cent. in that brief period. If the fisherman is so oppressed as hon. gentlemen opposite would lead us to suppose, and would lead the fishermen to suppose, I ask, why have they gone on year after year adding to their production and their wealth? An hon. gentleman opposite asked, what have the Government done for the fishermen; what have they done for the lobster men? My answer to that hon. gentleman is this: The Government of the day, owing to the large increase in the revenue of the Dominion, were enabled to devote \$150,000 a year as a bounty in order to stimulate and develop our fishing industry. That is what the Government of the day have done for the fishermen and lobster-men of the Maritime Provinces. The Government have, moreover, given to those engaged in the lobster industry free tin. They have also given free salt, free lines, and free twine.

Mr. VAIL. They already had it.

Mr. BURNS. Admit that the fishermen always had free salt. But if we were to believe what hon. gentlemen opposite asserted time after time, if we were to believe what hon. gentlemen opposite stated during the campaign of 1882, the

fishermen would be taxed on salt and on everything else that entered into their industry. I recollect very well that during the campaign in New Brunswick that was one of the strongest points which hon. gentlemen opposite attempted to make. They said to the fishermen, if you go for the National Policy and return members pledged to support it, you will find not only that lines, twine and everything else you consume and use will be taxed, but salt also.

Mr. VAIL. That is not so.

Mr. BURNS. I have a lively recollection of what occurred during that time. It was distinctly stated that a tax would be placed on salt.

Mr. MILLS. And you said the producer pays the tax.

Mr. BURNS. I did not say that the producer pays the tax. The Government have given the fishermen and lobstermen of the Maritime Provinces, as well as people in other parts of the Dominion, not only the articles I have mentioned duty free, but also free tea and free coffee. We know as a matter of fact that tea is almost a necessary of life, and that it enters very largely into the consumption of the lumbermen and fishermen; and were it not perhaps for the National Policy which obtained from luxuries a sufficient amount of revenue, we would have been unable to get free tea and free coffee.

Mr. FORBES. How about free meal and free flour?

Mr. BURNS. I say that practically in New Brunswick we get free flour. The number of barrels of flour imported from the United States into New Brunswick is very small as compared with the quantity we receive from the Upper Provinces. And I ask these gentlemen who asked that question, Has the 50 cents per barrel imposed on flour, increased the price of flour to the consumer to that extent? I answer most unhesitatingly, no, it has not; and for this reason, a reason which has been cited more than once, that so long as we have in Canada a surplus product, so long will we not feel the effects of the imposition of the duty. We might as well say that the imposition of a duty of a dollar a thousand on spruce deals—of which my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. King) is quite *au fait*—would enhance the price to the extent of the extra dollar. An hon. gentleman on the opposite side has asserted with that recklessness which characterises many of the assertions of the gentlemen on the opposite side, that there are thousands out of employment in the Maritime Provinces. I ask him, did he consider what he was going to say before he made that statement; did he ask himself, Is the statement I am about to make a correct one? I challenge hon. gentlemen to prove that to-day there are thousands out of employment in the Maritime Provinces. No such thing, Sir. On the contrary I assert that to-day the workman of New Brunswick is in as good a position, if not in a better position, than he has been at almost any time in the history of New Brunswick. I say that to-day the farmers of New Brunswick—and the farmers form a large proportion of the population of that Province—are in as comfortable circumstances as they ever were in the history of that Province; that to-day they are getting as good prices for their products as they ever got, when you take those prices in connection with the prices of the articles which that farmer has to buy. I say that the purchasing power of the farmer's money, of the artisan's money, of the laborer's money to-day is greater than it has been at almost any time in the history of the Maritime Provinces. Not only did the hon. gentleman assert that thousands are out of employment in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia to-day, but he went further and asserted that the laborer and the artisan of England were in a better position to-day than at any time before this. I ask these hon. gentlemen if they have read what has been published at a very recent

period of the troublesome times they have had in England—of the number of unemployed in the great manufacturing city of Birmingham, or in the city of London? If they have read those reports, they are the best answer that can be made to the assertion that the laborer and the workman of England are in a better position to-day than at any time heretofore. Now, Sir, in this country labor—to quote the language used by the hon. member for Queen's—is in this position: A man can get an honest day's wages for an honest day's work, and with that honest day's wages he is enabled to buy sufficient food and clothing for his family to live in comfortable circumstances—far more comfortable circumstances than the laboring men can in that great country of free trade—England. Let us contrast the position of the laborer of this country with that of the laborer in England a little further. You will find, Sir, that here he lives in a style entirely different from that in which the laborer of England lives. What are considered every day necessities of life here, are denied the working men of England. The food which is considered a luxury in England, is here considered an article for use every day and hour. We find, Sir, that in comparing rates of taxation in the two countries, hon. gentlemen opposite steer clear of telling this point; they fail to tell us that while England has free trade—a policy from which I say she is suffering—taxation there is far greater than it is in this country. It is not necessary for me to enter into details; I think they have been produced for the information of this House before. It is enough to say in general terms—enough to make the statement which I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to deny, that the rate of taxation in free trade England is much greater than it is in Canada. We have in this country no such thing as an income tax, or at least not one which bears the slightest resemblance to the tax so called in England. My hon. friend the member for Queen's, New Brunswick (Mr. King), in the statement which he made to the House the other night, rolled up a very large bill against the Upper Provinces. In his efforts to show that New Brunswick was heavily taxed he went into calculations showing the increased amount we have to pay to Quebec and Ontario for their manufactured goods. The same hon. gentleman would have us believe that it was our interest to trade with the United States; he would have us believe that we could buy goods more cheaply in the United States than we can in Canada, and yet we find that in the United States those goods were produced under an impost much heavier than exists in Canada to-day. The hon. gentleman must have been driven to his wits' end to make out a grievance for New Brunswick when he showed that a large amount was due New Brunswick, because of the higher prices we had to pay for the productions of Ontario and Quebec. True, he said that state of things existed only in the earlier years of the National Policy, and that to-day we are buying those goods at a very moderate price. Is it not better that we should buy our manufactured goods from Quebec and Ontario—assuming for the moment that we are not able, as hon. gentlemen say, to compete with those Provinces in the production of manufactured goods—is it not better to buy from Quebec and Ontario than from the people of the United States, who are strangers to us? I remember, Sir, reading a speech delivered by the hon. member for Queen's, I think in 1879, in which he made the statement that if the Government wished to depopulate the country they had only to apply the National Policy. Now, Sir, has that statement been verified? Has the country become depopulated? Is New Brunswick depopulated under this tariff? I see my hon. friend nodding—making that assertion by a movement of his head. Now, Sir, if the country is depopulated why is it that by the last census the population of the country has increased? Why is that so much wealth has been accumulated? Why is it that the savings of our people in both the savings banks

and the chartered banks are much greater now than they were under the larger population, as my hon. friend would have us believe. My hon. friend stated the other night that while New Brunswick and Nova Scotia in 1882 supported the National Policy by sending representatives here to support the Government which instituted that policy, a change has come over them since that time. I ask him, Sir, where is the truth in that statement. Did the county of York at a very recent date say that the people there had changed their minds? Did the county of King's, shortly after the general election, when my hon. friend behind me had to face the music of a second election, say that it had gone back on the National Policy? Did the county of Albert, which for the second time since 1882 sent a representative to support the Government, say that it had changed its mind on the National Policy? No, Sir; on the contrary, not only in New Brunswick, but throughout the whole Dominion, the National Policy continues to be endorsed by the people. My hon. friend in his speech the other night referred at great length to the report of the commissioner on the manufacturing industries of the Dominion, and tried to make a point by showing that in the town of Woodstock the new industries started since 1878 gave employment to 113 extra hands, receiving \$510,000 in wages. In that way he attempted to throw discredit on the whole report. I do not think the hon. gentleman did himself justice on that occasion. It is quite evident that that statement is either a misprint or a clerical error, because if you turn to the general comparative statement on pages 130 and 131, you will find the increases correctly given. According to that comparative statement the county of Carleton, Woodstock in particular, is shown to have had in 1878, 318 hands employed, receiving a yearly aggregate of weekly wages of \$128,174, whereas in 1884 there were 475 hands, receiving \$165,365.22. Now I find that in the whole Province of New Brunswick in 1878 there were employed 11,974 hands, while in 1884 there were employed 14,035, showing an increase of 2,062 of hands employed in our manufacturing enterprises, notwithstanding that trade was in a depressed condition and that our factories have been stamped out of existence by this National Policy. We find also that while in 1878 the yearly aggregate of weekly wages paid in the Province was \$4,680,641, in 1884 there was paid an aggregate of \$5,298,754, or an increase of \$618,113 during those five years. An hon. gentleman on the opposite side, I think it was the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), stated that the Government had broken faith with the country because it had failed to get reciprocity of trade with the United States. I do not think, Sir, that that gentleman was warranted in making that statement. I have seen no evidence to lead me for a moment to believe that the Government have broken faith with the country. On the contrary, I believe that the Government at every favorable opportunity has done all that it honorably could do to secure reciprocal trade relations with the United States. When the National Policy was introduced, and when the tariff framed under that policy was made, we find, as part and parcel of that measure, that a law was placed on our statute book authorising the Governor in Council by proclamation to admit the natural products of the United States duty free whenever the United States would open its doors and admit our natural products duty free. We know that since that time every reasonable effort that we honorably could make has been made to induce our friends on the other side of the line to enter into freer trade relations with us; and Sir, I believe it is not in the interest of Canada, or in accordance with the dignity of the country, that we should make any greater efforts in that direction than we have already made. When the United States desire to trade with us, they will find that we are willing to trade with her. But in connection with this matter, I might,

Mr. BURNS.

with the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, draw the attention of the Government to the necessity of continuing their exertions and making greater efforts to secure for the Maritime Provinces reciprocal trade relations with a market which to my mind would be more advantageous to us than that of the United States, that is, the market which can be had in the West Indies. While it is not a matter of vital consequence to the Maritime Provinces to secure that trade, it is a matter of very great consequence indeed, and I do not think any member from the Maritime Provinces is travelling outside of a proper line when he expresses the opinion that the Government of the country should be fully alive to the necessity of making a treaty with the West India Islands that would open to us the markets of those islands for our products. We in the Maritime Province produce largely everything which the West Indies require and consume. Our principal productions are lumber, fish, and farm products. We produce everything they require in these lines, and we consume their productions, so that a treaty which would be fair and beneficial to both sides might be made. I repeat that the Maritime Provinces expect that the Government will continue to use every legitimate effort to secure for us that trade. The hon. member for Queen's (P.E.I.), in his allusions to the United States, made the statement that the greatness of that country could be attributed to this fact, that there were no custom houses from the extreme north to the extreme south—or from the extreme west to the extreme east, or between the States. That is exactly the state of things that exists in Canada to-day. That is exactly the state of things we wished to bring about when we entered Confederation to have free intercourse between the Upper and the Lower Provinces and that we have secured. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the natural market of the Lower Provinces is the United States. Is the United States any more a natural market for the Lower Provinces than England is for the Western or the Southern States of the American Union? Yet though the Southern and Western States, to which the tariff of the whole Union applies, find their largest market in England, no prominent man in the United States would say that because the Eastern States do not furnish the Southern and Western States with a market, their productions should not be protected. We find that the union of the Maritime Provinces has had the result of bringing about the very state of affairs alluded to by the hon. member for Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies). We find that the trade among those Provinces has grown very largely and continues to grow. Let me repeat here a statement made in another place, that, though it may not be apparent to most minds, yet it is a fact that the trade between the Upper and the Lower Provinces, so far as the productions of the Lower Provinces are concerned, is growing very much, that the goods consumed by the Upper Provinces and which are brought from the Lower Provinces amount to a very large sum. In one year the amount increased some \$250,000. I know that in the article of fish alone, there has been an increase of 40 or 50 per cent. during the last five years, and that with the opening up of the North-West, with the general binding together of the country and the increase of population, the Maritime Provinces, if they cannot compete with the Western Provinces in the matter of manufacturing goods, can, at all events, send them their natural products. After the period of depression will have passed away, and when the demand for manufactured goods becomes greater, it will be found that the Maritime Provinces will be able to manufacture not only the goods they consume themselves, but will also be able to manufacture goods for the supply of the west. We will have a revival of business. This period of depression, which is not confined to Canada, but extends to every country in the world, and notably to free trade England, will become a thing of the past, and we will have an

improvement which, I think, will satisfy every reasonable man that the influence of the National Policy has not all events been injurious. I labor under the very great disadvantage that so much has been said on this question that it is difficult to make a new point, and therefore I hope the House will overlook the very imperfect manner in which I have put my views before it. I rose more especially for the purpose of controverting the statements made by the hon. gentlemen from New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, and I hope I have succeeded in showing that the Maritime Provinces are not in that gloomy serious condition in which they would have us believe them to be. I believe on the contrary that during the past five years, the period in which the National Policy has been in operation, the various industries of the Maritime Provinces have gone on prospering, the people have accumulated a very large amount of wealth and have reason to be hopeful for the future. I have reason to believe that not only in the staples of lumber and fish their position will improve, but that they will be able, by their energy and through their proximity to the sea to, compete with the older Provinces in manufactured goods.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has devoted a good deal of time to showing that the Province of New Brunswick is much more prosperous now than it ever was before, and that the prosperity of that Province is the result of the National Policy. What industries does he cite to prove this assertion? What statistics does he give to prove that the National Policy has been a success? Has he given the statistics of manufacturing industries? Not to any extent; he attributes the increased prosperity of New Brunswick chiefly to the increased prosperity of the farming, fishing and lumbering industries. He is the first gentleman I have ever heard in this House assert that those industries were in any way favored by the National Policy, or that their prosperity could be taken in any way as a proof of the success of that Policy. What has the National Policy done for the exports of farm products to the foreign markets? Has it improved the foreign market? Has it obtained the entry of these goods into the United States at a lower duty than formerly? Has it increased the demand for them in the United States? Has it increased the demand for fish in the United States? We all know that the success of the fishing industry depends entirely upon the American market. What has been done in that respect for the fishing industry by the National Policy? We know that at present our fish is admitted free into the United States; we know that this free admission will cease next spring, but we do not know that the Government have taken any step towards securing a continuance of the treaty, or towards substituting a new treaty which will continue to the fishermen of New Brunswick the privilege of free admission of fish into the United States. It may be taken for granted that the Government have taken no such steps, because if they had they would have been certain to tell us and take credit for it, and the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces must condemn the policy of inaction of the Dominion Government, and demand that some steps be taken to assure the continuance of the privileges which they now enjoy. This leads me to what the hon. gentleman has said about reciprocity. He says the Government have done all they could to obtain reciprocity. I thought he was going to make some ministerial revelations, because we had never heard of any steps being taken by the Government to that effect, but he went on to explain that all the Government had done was to put a provision in our tariff laws authorising the Government to abolish Canadian duties when corresponding duties were abolished by the United States. That is what he claims is doing all the Government could do to obtain reciprocity. Now does the hon. gentleman suppose that reciprocity is obtained simply by making an official arrangement

like that in our tariff laws? The hon. gentleman must know better than that; he must know that it is necessary to send an ambassador to a foreign country with authority to agree upon the terms on which a reciprocity treaty can be entered into. That was the course adopted when the late reciprocity treaty was secured, it was the course adopted by the Government of my hon. friend (Mr. Mackenzie) when they sought to obtain reciprocity with the United States, and it was a course which succeeded, so far as the negotiations with the Government of the United States was concerned, the treaty having been afterwards blocked by the United States Senate. It is not the people of the Maritime Provinces alone, although they are specially interested in this matter, who will call on the Government to carry out the pledges they have made with regard to obtaining reciprocity. The great end and aim of the National Policy, it was said, was reciprocity. In the historic National Policy resolution, it was formally declared that the effect of the National Policy would be ultimately to bring about reciprocity with the United States. That was regarded as the climax of all the perfections of the proposed policy, and that was the main argument used to induce the people of Canada to adopt a policy which, in other respects, was admittedly hostile to many of their interests. What has been done? What negotiations have been opened with the United States? What commissioner has been sent there to treat with them? What attempt has been made even to meet them half way? We find even in the President's message this year that it is the policy of the United States to obtain reciprocal treaties with the other nations on this continent. We do not find that the Government has been meeting them half way. If it has been taking any steps in that direction, if it has been carrying out its pledges, it is time that it should make the country aware of it, because the expiration of the Washington treaty during the coming spring will intensify the desire which exists in many parts of Canada to obtain a treaty of this kind. But no doubt the statements of the hon. member for Gloucester will be dealt with in greater detail by those who are more familiar with the local interests concerned, and I shall pass at once to consider briefly the points brought before us by former speakers. I cannot do better than commence with the remarks of the hon. Finance Minister himself, the great authority on all questions of finance, the great oracle on all questions of policy. That hon. gentleman this year, as usual, opened his Budget with a great flourish of trumpets. He was going to prove to this House, to make the House and the country believe, that things were in a very prosperous condition generally. He opened his speech with a remark of that kind, but as he went on, we were led to think that the flourish of trumpets was intended to conceal the emptiness of the Budget itself which he was to disclose to the House. He posed, as he has always posed hitherto, as the prophet—I might say more than the prophet—the high priest of the National Policy. He stood before us with all the fervor of a new convert in that attitude. We know he is a convert, we now that not many years ago he was an opponent of protection, and we know that a new convert is always more fervent than an old and steadfast believer. He has shown us that fervor this year in the capacity of a new convert.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I hope hon. gentlemen who make those sounds on the other side do not wish to ridicule the position of the Finance Minister.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I know it is an awkward position for the hon. gentleman to be placed in, and I hope they will spare his feelings and not make any more of those noises. In

that capacity of high priest, he has felt it his duty to explain the perfections of the idol, of the deity he worships, and he has clothed that deity with all the perfections that are possible; he has not only told us the actual perfections of the creature, but he has been carried away by his brilliant imagination, and the whole of his utterances in reference to it has been that of an enthusiastic devotee rather than the calm and staid utterances of a Finance Minister. Let us see how he proceeds. I find, on looking at his speech, that it is not only in respect of his fervor, and of his devouring admiration of the deity he worships, that he represents a false prophet or a high priest of the old pagan times, for he is like Mahomet, he is getting new revelations all the time. He has a new revelation this year, which is that it is possible to increase the expenditure of this country without increasing taxation; in other words he set out with the declaration that, although we spent a great deal more now than under the old régime, it costs not simply no more, but in fact the magnificent amount of $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents per head less than under the old régime. In dealing with a statement of this sort, we must, I think, adopt the plan which Mark Twain and his comrades adopted when travelling in the Holy Land. After detailing some tremendous yarns which they heard from their Arab guide, Mark Twain says: "We managed to believe the yarn by dividing it up amongst the seven of us." No one of them believed the whole, but by dividing it up amongst the seven they managed to believe it. So, with the whole of the Finance Minister's statement. He may think that, if they were divided up amongst the Opposition, or if they were unequal to the task, the whole House, they might be able to believe his statements. For instance, he tells us that the increased expenditure on public works and harbors is \$1,910,256 since 1878. He says himself it has nearly trebled, but it has not cost us any more than it did in 1878. He goes on to defend his action in spending three times as much as his predecessors. He says:

"But who will say that, if the Government or the country has a surplus sufficient to induce Parliament to vote some of the money for the construction of public buildings, for the improvement of harbors, and the navigation of our rivers, the Government is not justified in spending in that way? These works and buildings, you may say, Sir, are the assets of the Government and the public."

This is just what we used to argue when he boasted of his surpluses, that it did not amount to much, because it was merely an inducement to extravagance, and here he boasts of this expenditure and asks: Who will say, that, if the Government or the country has a surplus, they are not entitled to spend it for all sorts of purposes? He does not go on to show us that these expenditures were necessary, or that they are returning us a fair profit. He says they are assets. On the same principle you could wipe away the whole debt of this country and consider it as nothing. If you can treat an expenditure as nothing wherever you have some asset to show for it you might wipe out the whole debt of this country, because for the whole debt we have some asset or other to show in which the money has been sunk in different amounts. As to this particular statement, that it cost less to provide this amount of \$2,908,851 than it did to provide the third of that amount six years ago, I do not think I can believe it, I do not think I can believe even my fair share of it as a member of the Opposition, one seventieth part of it. Then he goes on to tell us that the taxation per head has been reduced. He says the total taxation from 1874 to 1879 was \$93,295,770, and that the deficits were \$4,818,000. He adds the deficits to the expenditure, with which mode of book-keeping I shall not quarrel at present, and assuming the population then to be 4,021,000, he makes the taxation \$4.88 per head. But we come to the taxation for his own five years. He says that, for these five years, the amount was \$157,687,879. Now, on the face of it, there is an increase in the total taxation of \$64,392,109—during these 5 years, or an average of

Mr. CASEY.

\$12,878,500 per annum. He assumes the population now to be 4,364,800 or an increase of 343,800. Now, Sir, we find the population in those years has increased nearly $8\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., while the taxation has increased 65 per cent. according to his own figures; and yet he asks us to believe that the taxation per head has not increased, although the increase in taxation has gone on eight times as fast as the increase in population. Now, Sir, this is a still less credible statement than the former. I not only fail to believe my due share of it as a member of the Opposition, but I cannot believe the 211th part of it, my proportional share if it were divided among the whole House. I believe if you scatter it broadcast through the country and lay that statement before every individual in the Dominion, you will not find half a score who could believe the five-millionth part of it. Now, in estimating this taxation per head he goes on to play some remarkable tricks with the \$20,000,000 surplus he claims to have had during those five years. He says the surplus should not count, that it is no part of the taxation, and therefore he proposes to take the \$20,000,000 of surplus from this \$157,697,000 of receipts. Now, why should not the surplus count as a part of the taxation? Is it not contributed by the people? or is it manufactured in the Finance Department? Did the astrologer in that Department find it somewhere amongst the stars, or is it one of the manufactured products of the National Policy? I do not think so. I think every dollar of that \$20,000,000 came out of the pockets of the tax-payers, came out of the general business circulation of the country; and that it is as utterly unsound and baseless a proposition to say that does not form part of the taxation of this country, as to say that any other part of that taxation, no matter how directly collected, no matter how immediately expended on public works, should not be considered as such part of the taxation. But he is not content with this. He takes the surplus away once from the total tax receipts of the country, and then he takes it away again from the total expenditure of the country. He has put down \$137,258,000 as the total expenditure for those five years, and he takes the surplus away again from that and leaves \$117,000,000; and by some further operation that I do not understand he gets rid of another \$13,000,000 of this expenditure and comes down to a figure of \$104,293,934, which he calls the "necessary taxation" of the country for those five years. I do not know how he has got rid of this last \$13,000,000. Perhaps the figures in the *Hansard* have been misprinted and that has misled me; I have not seen the corrected copy, but at all events those are the figures given in the *Hansard* report of his speech. But I take his own word for it that that was all the taxation that was necessary for these five years. If we subtract that from the amount of taxes actually received—for all receipts are taxes in one shape or another—from the sum of \$157,678,879, we find over \$53,393,000, which the hon. gentleman himself confesses and declares was not necessary taxation during those five years. Now, Sir, the result of his wonderful juggling with the surplus is to show that he took from the pockets of the people \$53,393,000 in those five years more than he considers was necessary. The hon. gentleman is a master of figures, no doubt. He has a complete mastery of these figures; he can prove what he likes with them; he can make them do or say what he likes; and I am only sorry he did not carry the same process further and prove to us that during these last five years we have had no taxation at all. It would have been just as easy, just as logical, and just as correct as to put forth the argument he has made to this House. Now, Sir, let us take the true facts in regard to this question of taxation. Let us take the total amount of money received from the people in these five years of \$157,687,879, and divide it by the population which the hon. gentleman himself estimates at 4,364,000; and we find that the taxation is

\$7.34 per head, or an increase of \$2.35 per head over the taxation imposed by the late Government. Now, Sir, this amounts to \$11.75 a year for an average family of five persons, and to \$58.75 per family for the five years. Now it is right the people should know this; it is right they should know how much the hon. gentleman and his National Policy have cost them. It will be perfectly legitimate and in order for me then to try and show them that he has been worth what he has cost; but when he tries to show them that he has not cost them anything, he is taking an unfair, an illogical, an incorrect, and an unbusinesslike view of the question. I must say that his argument in regard to our taxation and expenditure has been sufficiently ingenious to prove to the House that he felt himself in rather an uncomfortable position; it has been ingenious enough to show that he made an effort to explain away a *prima facie* case, as it appeared to an impartial observer; but has not been ingenious enough to produce the desired impression, and he leaves us with the conviction that he found himself in a tight place and has not been able to see his way out of it. We come now, Sir, to take a little note of the changes which the hon. gentleman proposed to make in the tariff. He has proposed to relieve the poor man to some extent from the burdens laid upon him by his heavy system of taxation. How does he do it? He puts woollen rags on the free list. What does this mean? What do people import woollen rags for? Woollen rags are imported to make shoddy. What is shoddy used for? It is used to manufacture shoddy cloth. Why is it used to manufacture shoddy cloth? Because it is cheaper than wool; and the hon. gentleman is putting on the free list an article for the manufacture of shoddy cloth to be allowed to come in here free in competition with home-grown Canadian wool. He is protecting the farmer by allowing woollen rags, the refuse of all the beggars in Europe, perhaps, to be brought in here free in competition with our home-grown Canadian wool.

An hon. MEMBER. Along with small-pox and cholera.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, Sir, attention was called to that point the other night. It is a very serious matter that these rags may be the means next summer—and are certain to be if the season proves as sickly as is expected—of importing cholera and small-pox into this country, and the hon. gentleman's proposal specially to encourage an importation of this kind is one that I can only characterise as monstrous.

Mr. BOWELL. How long have they been on the free list?

Mr. CASEY. I do not know how long they have been on the free list. The resolutions propose to amend the tariff of Customs duties by adding to the free list a number of articles amongst which I find woollen rags. It appears that they are now admitted free by Order in Council. I do not know how long they have been so, but I suppose the fact of taking an article off the list of articles which were admitted free by Order in Council, and putting it upon a list of articles which are admitted free by Statute, means the perpetuation of that free admission, means that it has become a settled policy of the Government to admit woollen rags free. I congratulate them, Sir, upon the heroic resolution they have shown in coming to that decision. They have also come to the heroic decision to perpetuate the free admission of musk in pods, a boon, no doubt, to the laboring man of Canada, to the horny-handed son of toil, but opening up again a most injurious competition with the native musk-rat. Then we have another article which is to be admitted forever free of duty, an article which is mysterious in its nature and uses—foot grease. I do not know why the hon. gentleman did not put hair oil on the same list. If foot grease is to be free, I do not see why hair oil should not likewise be free.

Mr. BOWELL. Do you know what it is?

Mr. CASEY. No, I want to be informed on that point.

Mr. BOWELL. I am quite sure you would not talk such nonsense if you did.

Mr. CASEY. No doubt the Minister of Customs knows what it is, but I am very sure that the Finance Minister was quite as much puzzled as myself by this item when it was first presented to him as one which should go on the free list. Then there is the item of "locust beans for the manufacture of horse and cattle food." I have urged from time to time that Indian corn should be admitted free of duty for use as cattle food, not as artificial cattle food, but in its natural state. I have urged that for the benefit of our farmers, who are largely engaged in fattening beef for the English market. While that relief has been denied, this foreign material, locust beans, is going to be admitted free for the manufacture of artificial cattle food. It is quite evident that the proprietor of some artificial food has got this item inserted for his own benefit. I cannot go through all the items intended to alleviate the lot of the depressed working man of Canada. I might mention fancy grasses, precious stones,—agate, amethyst, aqua marine, crysolite, crosordolite, emerald, sapphire, topaz, turquoise; I will not read the list because I might seem to be reading a description of the Heavenly city from the Holy Book, and I will not appear to be guilty of such irreverence. But it is quite evident that with such material free of duty the cotton operative who has long been desirous of a holiday, as one of the Conservative papers tells us, will employ a large period of his well-earned rest in accumulating sets of precious stones which he will now be able to import free under this arrangement. One point is righted by these changes. We have time and again urged that it was unfair to tax the cheap stoneware imported for the poorer classes at as high a rate as the china and porcelain imported for the rich, and this wrong has been righted. How has it been done. Has the duty on the cheap stoneware been deducted? No. The duty on china and porcelain has been brought up to the same point, 30 per cent. The Government have followed the system of levelling up instead of levelling down. One or two factories have possessed too much influence to allow the Government to reduce the duty on the common ware, so the duty had to be put up on china ware to make it equal. A friend of mine was once travelling in an island which shall be nameless, but where the people are very witty, and he saw an inhabitant actively digging up the earth floor of his cabin. My friend said: What are you doing? The inhabitant replied: "Sir, I am raising the ceiling of my house." He was raising the ceiling by digging out the floor. By some such humorous method of how to equalise things or to get rid of acknowledged inconveniences the Government have equalised the poor man's duties with the rich man's duties, by retaining them in the former case, and increasing them in the latter. I want to pay a little attention to the hon. and eloquent member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster) who treated us to a very interesting lecture the other evening on everything connected with this subject. He began by saying that we complain about monopolies, and that he had to go back to the days of Imperial Rome to find a parallel to the monopolies now in existence in Canada, if we were to be believed in regard to that matter. He said if our statements were true, there was no comparison except the state of affairs when the *publicani*, the farmers of Rome's public revenue were sent to distant colonies to exact what they pleased and return part of their ill-gotten gains to the public treasury. I thank the hon. gentleman for the illustration. I do not think he could have more forcibly illustrated the way in which protective taxes are collected. They are collected indirectly through a class of farmers of the public revenue. The manufacturers are given a bonus by protective duties

and put in their own pockets in the shape of higher prices as long as the protective action of the tariff really subsists as large a proportion of what is collected, if not a larger proportion, than that which goes into the public Treasury. The system of collection of revenue by protective taxes is similar in wastefulness to that which obtained under the old Roman Empire, and in some cases equally oppressive to the people taxed. The hon. member for King's went on to tell us that the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) had made the subject of the balance of trade a hobby-horse, that he had dragged it into the discussion and had tried to make a great deal out of it by showing that a balance of trade against us indicates a state of things inconsistent with prosperity. But it was not the hobby-horse of the hon. member for North Norfolk; it was the hobby-horse of the Finance Minister. It was the Finance Minister's hobby-horse some years ago, when the balance of trade was in our favor. I was going to say he rode it to death, but he did not quite ride it to death; he rode into a very comfortable place for himself and then turned it out to grass or stored it in a lumber room. At all events he did that which is usually done with a worn out hobby-horse; I do not know exactly what, as I never had one. In order to show to whom the ownership of this now despised animal belongs, I will quote some remarks made by the Finance Minister in regard to the balance of trade at the great Conservative convention, held in Toronto on March 1st, 1881. The hon. gentleman said:

"During the last two years we have nearly equalized our exports with our imports.—Cheers. Whatever free traders may say, our people cannot understand the theory that the larger the excess of our imports over the exports the more prosperous is the country. We say that as with the individual so with the nation; and that if he expends more than he receives poverty stares him in the face. If on the other hand his receipts exceed his expenditure his condition is hopeful. The latter is the position of the Dominion if we take into account our receipts for freights.—Cheers.

The Conservatives cheered these utterances at that grand Conservative convention. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not cheer these statements now. I have read them with as good emphasis as I could possibly use so as to afford hon. gentlemen opposite an opportunity of cheering the statement of the Minister of Finance; but they do not cheer worth a cent. That hobby-horse has been ridden to death; all that was possible has been got out of it, and now it is cast aside. The balance of trade is now against this country, and instead of that being an evidence of poverty, it is now regarded, I suppose, as one of the most hopeful signs in our financial and commercial condition. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) went on to call us to account for asserting that certain wonderful things had been promised as results of the National Policy. he said that we could not prove by a responsible member of that party that it was promised that we would have continuous prosperity if the National Policy came into force, and he played the neat little oratorical trick of calling upon us on the spur of the moment to produce documents to prove our assertion that such promises had been made. Well, we do not go about all the time with our pockets stuffed with such documents, but it is not because they do not exist, and I will give him specimens of one or two of them. On July 2nd, 1878, the *Mail*, which I suppose he will admit to be a responsible organ of the party made some assertions like these:

"Our manufactories of locomotives and cars are amongst the things that were"—

How are they now, Mr. Speaker? I think I can ask you with some confidence that you have a knowledge as to how our manufacturers of locomotives and cars are at present, for in the city in which you reside is the largest manufactory of locomotives, I believe, in the Dominion. I had the pleasure of inspecting that manufactory during the latter part of last summer, and I found that splendidly equipped

Mr. CASEY.

machine shop, which is capable of turning out I do not know how many locomotives per year, which is capable of employing and did employ about 500 men, had not a single locomotive under construction, and only 45 men employed. They were not doing locomotive work at all in that shop, but were doing odd jobs for the Quebec waterworks or some other waterworks—something entirely out of the ordinary run of their business and unconnected with the making of locomotives. They had several locomotives on hand already made, which they could not sell even at a reduced price. That is the condition of our manufactories of locomotives at the present time, and though I have not visited the car factories I understand that they are not in a much better position. The *Mail* goes on to say:

"Our woollen mills, our machine shops, our publishing houses, one by one go to the States, drag out a languid and debt-burdened existence, or collapse. * * * This is undoubtedly what the Government [Mr. Mackenzie's] intended, and so far they have reason to be pleased, but there have, unfortunately for them, appeared some disagreeable concomitants of the situation on which they did not calculate. * * * In due course of their scheme thousands lack work in Montreal and Toronto."

How is it now? Do not thousands of men lack work in Toronto and Montreal at the present moment? Ask the people of Toronto if that is not the case and if they are not contributing money for the support of those who are out of employment. Ask the people of London, a comparatively small city in Western Ontario, but one in which the manufactures are pretty large in proportion to its size. Are the people out of work there? Ask anywhere you like in Canada, and you will find that thousands of people are out of work. The article goes on:

Workmen's families live two and three in a house to make up the rent. many have exhausted their savings last winter and know not how to face the next. Our townsmen who still remain have little money to buy farm produce.

How is it now? Have they much money to buy the farmers' produce, and if they have, why is it that the price of farm produce has been reduced instead of increased?

On the other hand the States under our Free Trade system send in what produce they choose. Between the two, the great majority of our farmers get poor prices or no prices for cattle, butter, cheese, pork, oats, wheat and many other articles.

The two things which kept the price of butter, cheese, etc., low, were according to the *Mail*, the poverty of the workingmen and the fact that the Americans were able to send in their produce free of duty. Now that has all changed. The Americans do not send in their produce free of duty, and hon. gentlemen say that the workingmen have lots of money, but how are the prices of these articles? The price of wheat on that very day was 90 cents per bushel; in May of the same year it was \$1.50 per bushel, a figure which it has not reached since, and is not likely soon to reach. It is now under 80 cents in Toronto. As to butter and cheese, the National Policy could have no effect, because no change has been made on the duty on those articles. The *Mail* of the same day quotes from the *Sarnia Canadian*:

"The price of wool this year is one of the farmers tribulations. For the very best article he only gets 22 cents. Across the river the price is 32 cents. * * * Our wool on being exported to the United States pays a duty of over 50 per cent., added to the price here brings the figures up to what is paid in Port Huron. Our wool growers are entirely at the mercy of the Yankees. Our Government does not protect our farmers, and wool is allowed to come into Canada free of duty. A Government that would submit to such injustice does not deserve the confidence of the people."

The *Mail* quotes that and puts it in a prominent place. What have the Government done? Have they dared to tax the kind of wool we import? No, the woollen manufacturers will not let them tax wool, and American wool, Cape wool, and Australian wool, the kinds used by our manufactures come into Canada free; we are still at the mercy of the American and foreign producer, and we can still say "that any Government which would submit to such injustice

does not deserve the confidence of the people." It has been asserted time and again that we should have protection on the kind of wool our manufacturers use, so as to induce our farmers to grow that wool, and yet at present, with wool at 18 cents per pound, cheaper than when this wool went up, there is no duty on that kind of wool. The farmers of western Ontario at any rate are beginning to grow short wool in considerable quantities, and a duty on that kind of wool would raise the price to the full extent of that duty, and yet the farmer is denied this protection as an offset to the increased price he has to pay for his goods to the woollen manufacturer. I now come to a speech made by the Premier himself at Parkhill, on July 3rd, 1878, when he quoted an old story which had been told him by a friend when he was making a speech in Peterborough in 1872:

"A very good friend of mine, a great personal friend, who is what we would call a Grit—said to me the other day: 'What fortunate fellows you are, Macdonald. Here you are with everything prosperous around you, the sun shines on you, our fields are teeming with prosperity, and everything is smiling on you; while in days of old, when our friends were in the Government, we had clouded skies and dried up fields and no crops.' 'Sir,' said I, 'it only shows you that Providence is on our side, and if you are a wise man, and a prudent man, if you wish a continuance of the same skies and of the same rain and of the same crops, you will keep us where we are. Be sure, my good friend, the weevil will come again with the Grits.' He was very nearly a prophet for although the weevil did not come the Colorado bug did, and he did not know that that insect was a greater favorite with farmers than the other."

With regard to the Colorado bug I must join issue with the Right hon. gentleman. The Colorado bug did not come in with the Grits; it was in full force in my section of the country in this very campaign. It was one of those Yankee importations, like the National Policy, which have been brought over by the Conservatives from the other side, and which have done us so much injury. As to the weevil coming with the Grits, we have not seen one in our part of the country from 1857 until this summer and last, when two-thirds of the crop was eaten by them, and therefore we turn the tables on these hon. gentlemen and say that the weevil comes in with the Tories. In connection with the assertion that Providence was favoring them, the right hon. gentleman went on to say:

"We were going to have a big crop now, although there was a Grit Government in—but that was because the Grits were going out. The clerk of the weather was a good sound Conservative, and he took good care of the crops, knowing that a Conservative Government was going to get the advantage of them after the next election."

Well, Sir, they had not imported Wiggins at that time, and I do not know whom he referred to as the clerk of the weather. At all events it is quite certain that Providence did give them every chance in the way of good crops, good climate and productive soil, to show what was in them and their policy; and what has been the result? Is Providence with them now? Do the skies smile on them as of old? Do prices keep up to their old figure? Have they reason to say, in regard to the poverty and destitution of the working people, that Providence is smiling on them and averting misfortune from them? I do not think they have. If hon. gentlemen are going to make that the test of the soundness of their policy, it is condemned at once. That good Providence who favored them has gone against them, finding them unworthy, and is teaching them the lesson that He has taught more than once to men He has favored and put in high positions. We read in holy writ of men whom Providence has favored and raised to a great height of prosperity, in order that he might cast them down from the greater elevation; and I think that hon. gentlemen will find that the kindness that Providence has shown them will be turned into condemnation in the long run, and that they will say very little of the favor of Providence at future elections. But, the hon. gentleman said:

"The National Policy would build up cities everywhere; and instead of having to send to a foreign country for so many goods, we should have our clothing made from wool of our own production, and our shoes made out of our own leather."

How much Canadian wool is made up into cloth by Canadian manufacturers?

Mr. FARROW. Lots of it.

Mr. CASEY. Well, the hon. gentleman had better go and consult the owners of the blanket factory at Cornwall, who gave evidence before the Committee on the State of Trade a few years ago, and he will learn that Canadian wool is used almost solely for the manufacture of blankets, coarse rugs, one or two kinds of carpets, and things of that kind. With this exception, and with the exception of small local factories, where a few hundred yards of cloth are woven for the neighboring farmers, Canadian wool is not used in Canadian manufactures to even as great an extent as was the case ten or twelve years ago. As to making shoes out of our own leather, the tanner has a protection, but the farmer has none. Foreign hides from South America and from the ends of the earth are allowed to come here to enter into competition with our own production. If that is what the hon. gentleman meant by making clothing out of our own wool and shoes out of our own leather, I do not think it is a very great gain to the farmer. But now we come to a very sarcastic remark of the hon. gentleman. He said:

"Mr. Mackenzie had said that he wanted to make this a very cheap country to live in. Well, when wheat was down to half a dollar a bushel, and barley down to a third of a dollar, and oats were 10 cents a bushel, this would be a cheap country to live in. But he did not know that that was exactly what the farmers wanted. (Great cheers). He could tell them that it was not what the manufacturers wanted, for when there were good prices there was plenty of business, and when there was plenty of business prices were good. The workingman, too, if he got a fair day's pay for a fair day's work could afford to pay a liberal price to the farmer; and the farmer could afford to pay a liberal price to the manufacturer if he got a fair price for his products. Where cheapness was the chief characteristic of a country, that country could not be prosperous."

The hon. gentleman was very sarcastic and very severe on my hon friend (Mr. Mackenzie) who sits in front of me, about making this a cheap country to live in. He said cheapness was inconsistent with prosperity. Now, what has been the contention of hon. gentlemen opposite during this whole debate? Why, that things are cheaper than they used to be—that sugar and woollens and cottons are cheaper than they have ever been before; and we know that wheat and barley are cheaper than ever before. If cheapness is inconsistent with prosperity I leave him to judge what must be the condition of the country to-day. Then, Sir, the hon. gentleman was not content with the declaration that the policy of the Grits was keeping us down, and the policy he proposed would raise us up, but he compared Canada with other countries. At the Amphitheatre in Toronto, on the 31st of July, 1878, the First Minister said:

"We must grow up manufactures by a judicious system of protection, and if we do, the laborer and the workingman will get employment. If we have only a sensible system of protection, if we have only a common sense system of law, we will find that the workingman and the capitalist will work together, and this country will blossom as the rose. If you desire this country to prosper, if you desire it to rise out of the slough of despond into which it has sunk, if you desire to see manufactures arise, to see labor employed—if you desire to see the value of land arise, if you desire prosperity, you will support the National Policy, and say we must have Canada for the Canadians."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. I am glad to hear hon. gentlemen applauding. We shall hear how they will applaud when I finish the quotation. After referring to the United States, which he said was underselling England at home, he said:

"If we can do this, and in our own modest way, encourage our manufacturers by reasonable protection to supply our four millions—our increasing millions, for they will rapidly increase under a system of protection—we shall then be able to do what the United States are doing now, export the surplus of our manufactures at a cheap rate, sell in foreign markets, and establish a foreign trade."

Is that a definite promise, or is it not? Hon. gentlemen have cheered when I have read that the workingmen would get employment. Well, the workingmen have got employment part of the time; there has been a boom in industry

part of the time; but hon. gentlemen opposite know, as well as I, and the workmen know better than I do, that they are not employed more than they were under the former régime. We all know that these promises have not been carried out, that prosperity has not been continuous, and we know particularly that this promise that we could export the surplus of our manufactures at a cheap rate to foreign markets has the effect of casting ridicule on the whole system of the National Policy, now when we are able to compare the results with that promise. Exporting to foreign markets! Why, only a few months ago, when the cotton millers found a plethora of goods on their hands, they talked about exporting; they considered whether they could sell any of their goods to other countries at cost, or even slightly under cost, and they found they could not. They concluded it was better to shut down and limit production for a time, until the home market would revive. To talk about exporting to foreign markets, when these very goods are made dearer by the system under which they are produced, is absurd. I do not know that I need quote anything further. These quotations alone show that the right hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald), the author of this policy and the man who carried it into effect, did make promises of great and continued prosperity, which have not been carried out. It is my duty, as a representative of a farming constituency, to consider how far the tariff benefits the farmer, if I can find it benefits them at all. I have been trying to find out whether it does or not. I have made a couple of tables of the relative prices of wheat and barley at a few points in the United States and Canada, so situated that the comparison of the different prices is a fair one. I take the prices of wheat at Chicago, Oswego, Toronto, Detroit and London. Of course Chicago and Detroit are a great deal further west than London and Toronto, and the prices there should be lower than the prices at Toronto and London, to the extent of the difference in freight. The prices at London and Toronto should be higher than those at Chicago and Detroit, even if there were no duty at all, on account of the difference of freight. Let us see if that is the case. The following table shows the rates at each point on the different dates mentioned:

	Chicago.	Oswego.	Toronto.	Detroit.	London.
Sept. 1, 1884...	79½	92	78	83	78-81
" 8 " ...	79½	91	80-86	{ 77-82½ } (No.1Wh.)	78-81
" 15 " ...	73½	88 (W)	78-80	{ 78½ } No. 1 (Wh)	75-78
" 20 " ...	75½	86 (F)	{ S84-86 } { T75-78 }	{ 81 } { 81 }	75-78
" 27 " ...	76½-77½	86-87	75-82	79-83	69-72
Oct. 4 " ...	79-79½	81-89	76-85	81½-85½	69-72
" 11 " ...	77	81-90	80-82	79-82½	69-75
" 18 " ...	72½-76½	85-87	76-81	76½-77½	69-75
" 25 " ...	73½	83-84	75-78	77½-81½	72-77½
Nov. 1 " ...	74½-75	83-85	74-77	77½-81½	72-75
" 8 " ...	73-73½	83-85	73-77	77-78½	72-75
" 15 " ...	72½-73	82-84	72-73	77½-79½	72-75
" 22 " ...	72½	82-84	70-72	76	69-72
" 29 " ...	73-74	81-82	70-73	76-78	69-72
Dec. 6 " ...	73½	81-82	72-76	75½-76	72-73½
" 13 " ...	71½-72	82	73-74	77	72-73½
" 20 " ...	70½-71½	80-82	72-74	76½-77	69-72
" 27 " ...	71½-72½	82	72-74	76½-77	69-72
Jan. 17 1885...	80½	90-93 (14)	83-86	90	75-79½
" 31 " ...	76½-77½	93	80-82	85½-86	81-84

I have given the range of prices for all classes of wheat because I have found it impossible to always secure quotations for the same grade of wheat at all these markets. It is clear from this table that not only has the duty not increased the price of wheat in the Canadian local market, but that owing to some cause—I do not say owing to the National Policy—but owing to some cause which the National Policy is powerless to overcome, the price of wheat have been kept lower in the Canadian markets than in the American markets situated further from the sea coast. It may be that the tax on coal has made the cost of

Mr. CASEY.

freight so much higher on Canadian railways that they cannot afford to compete with the American roads. I do not say that that is the cause, but it looks as if it were one cause; but whatever may be the cause, the effect exists and it is injurious to the Ontario farmer.

Mr. O'BRIEN. What was the feeling in the country when there was talk of taking off the duty last year? Was there not a general outcry against it?

Mr. CASEY. There was no outcry in my part of the country, because our experience is that the duty does us no good. There may have been an outcry in some parts of the country, but the figures I have quoted show that the duty, on the face of it, is no benefit to the farmer.

Mr. HESSON. Was not the difference greater four or five years before the duty was put on?

Mr. CASEY. I have found that on looking back four or five years a difference did exist, sometimes to the same extent, and sometimes to a less extent, and the inference I drew was, that the wheat duty has no appreciable effect on the prices of wheat in the Canadian market. Barley is another staple about which we heard a great deal when the National Policy was in discussion, and thousands of farmers favored it, under the idea that it would in some way improve the price of barley, but the following table will show how unfounded that idea was

	Toronto.	Belleville.	Oswego.	London.
Sept. 27, 1884...	50-73	75-76	48-52½
Oct. 4 " ...	48-70	50-70	No.2Can. 74	52½-57
" 11 " ...	48-70	71-75	48-52½
" 18 " ...	50-72	76-82	52½-57
" 25 " ...	50-73	55-70	71-76	52½-60
Nov. 1 " ...	55-73	50-60	71-79½	52½-60
" 8 " ...	53-70	(12) 50-58	70½-75½	43½-62
" 15 " ...	53-68	71-75½	43½-62
" 22 " ...	50-67	70½-75½	43½-62
" 29 " ...	50-66	70-82	43½-62
Dec. 6 " ...	50-66	70-78	43½-60½
" 13 " ...	50-64	70-76	43½-65½
" 20 " ...	50-64	70-75½	43½-55
" 27 " ...	54-66	70-75½	43½-55
Jan. 17, 1885 ...	58-70	48-60	72-78½	43½-46½
" 31 " ...	58-74	48-60	75-81	43½-46½

There is a wonderful break at times in regard to quotations in the Belleville *Intelligencer*, which I consulted as being a good Conservative newspaper.

Mr. BOWELL. A thoroughly reliable paper.

Mr. CASEY. Yes, when it makes statements at all; but it would appear that when the prices of barley were low it gave no quotations. Now, Sir, here is a difference of 10 cents to 25 cents between the prices at Belleville and at Oswego. The duty on barley is only 10 cents a bushel. The difference cannot be accounted for by the freight between these two points which are so close together; and it is clear that barley is higher in Oswego compared with Belleville, even with the freight and duty added. Perhaps the *Intelligencer* will find it convenient to explain here the great difference which exists between these two points. In connection with this question of how the tariff affects the farmer, we must consider not only the wheat duty, but the flour duty. The hon. member for Gloucester has told us that the flour and wheat duty does not affect the people in the Maritime Provinces; that it does not cost them anything; that it does not raise the price, because we export a surplus. That is a good free trade doctrine in theory, but there are circumstances known to the people in the Maritime Provinces which prove that it is not true in practice as regards those Provinces; and if the hon. gentleman will consult his friend, the member for Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell), who was very indignant when a flour duty was alluded to the other night, he will find that the duty does mean something.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is that?

Mr. CASEY. I was saying that the hon. gentleman could point out the effect of a flour duty.

Mr. MITCHELL. That is quite unnecessary; you are doing it so well.

Mr. CASEY. It is quite unnecessary to say more, as between the arguments which I am able to present to the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns), and the snub he has just received from the hon. member for Northumberland, he will be able to see that it does mean something.

Mr. MITCHELL. This conversational style of debate is not very—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. This conversational style of debate gives me—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. MITCHELL. I rise to a question of order. I rose for the purpose of saying that this conversational style of debate prevents my hearing references to myself and my county. I asked the hon. gentleman to explain what he had said, because, in consequence of the conversation going on all around me, I could not hear what he said.

Mr. CASEY. I was not disturbed by the hon. gentleman's interruption. It is rather pleasant, in the course of a long speech—

Mr. MITCHELL. Make it shorter then.

Mr. CASEY—to have an interruption, and I hope the hon. gentleman will favor me again, and whenever I have anything to say about the Grand Trunk shareholders, I will call his attention to it.

Mr. MITCHELL. I hope you will make it a little more clear than you have the flour duties.

Mr. CASEY. An effort has been made by some of the millers to have an increase in the flour duty. The Millers' Association, I believe, have tried to obtain it. The singular fact stares us in the face that the Finance Minister has not chosen to deal with the question in his Budget Speech. We are pretty certain that it is before him for consideration, and it is certainly usual, when a change of that kind is contemplated, to refer to it in the Budget Speech—either to indicate that the change will take place or that the request has been refused. However, I am bound to say that the principal millers in my own county have not chosen to sustain that demand. I have written to them to get their opinions, and they have intimated that they do not care for any change, unless it amounted to a dollar a bushel.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. A dollar a bushel.

Mr. CASEY. I should say a dollar a barrel. Because they say, in effect, that the American millers have the opportunity of selling their finer grades in the Eastern States, and with the high prices obtained for these, and with access to the finest qualities of western wheat at low prices, they are able to sell inferior grades to the constituents of my hon. friend from Gloucester and my hon. friend from Northumberland, and quite undersell the Canadian miller by selling the inferior grade cheaper. If the Ontario miller were allowed to import these grades of American wheat at reduced rates, to mix with the better quality of our wheat, they could keep their mills going the whole year and could supply their Lower Province customers at a lower rate and with better flour. I have not investigated this argument to its utmost extent, but I intend to lay the arguments of my milling friends before the Government and to ask them to come to some decision on the subject. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, 18th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

TERRY DIVORCE BILL.

Mr. TAYLOR moved first reading of Bill (No. 97) for the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry—(from the Senate).

Motion agreed to, on a division.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

Mr. MULOCK moved first reading of Bill (No. 98) to amend the Acts respecting Controverted Elections. He said: This Bill is to repeal section 1 of 39 Vic., cap. 9, which has been found not workable, and substitute what I hope will be found workable machinery for it. Under section 1, 39 Vic., cap. 9, provision is supposed to be made for proceedings against third parties, which the courts have held to be unworkable, and recently the courts of the Province of Ontario, have recognised some of the regulations of the Legislature of Ontario as workable and have proceeded under them. It is to some extent incorporating those provisions in lieu of our own. It is a matter of practice, not a matter of principle.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BOURBEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 99) to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878. He said: This amendment is to authorise the priest and the minister, in a parish where it is required, to grant a certificate for medical purposes. The second part of the Temperance Act of 1878, section 99, sub-section 4, says:

"Provided also that the sale of intoxicating liquor for exclusive medicinal purposes, or for *bonâ fide* use in some art, trade or manufacture, shall be lawful only by such druggists and other vendors as may be thereto specially licensed by the Lieutenant Governor in each Province, the number not to exceed one in each township or parish, nor two in each town; and in cities not exceeding one for every 4,000 inhabitants; such sale, when for medicinal purposes, to be in quantities of not less than one pint, to be removed from the premises and to be made only on the certificate of a medical man."

By the amendment that I introduce, it will be provided that the priest or the minister serving the parish where the person requires the liquor will be able to grant certificates.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WORKS ON NAVIGABLE WATERS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 101), to amend the Law respecting bridges, booms and other works constructed over, or in navigable waters under the authority of Provincial Acts. He said: The object of this Bill is to correct an error that occurred when a certain Bill was passed, in the clause giving power to the Governor in Council to make rules and regulations in order that the works on navigable waters might not interfere with navigation, or, when the plans were approved and the site selected, if obstacles were found to be created by such works, by such Order in Council the company or party having so erected a work over a navigable water might be compelled to remedy the evil caused by such work, and this is to reinstate the power.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE FACTORY BILL.

Mr. BERGIN. The Factory Bill has been printed in English and to-morrow morning, we are assured by the

printers, we shall have the French copy. Large demands have been made by members and by parties outside of the House—manufacturers and workingmen and workingmen's associations and others—for copies of the Bill, and we require to get the authority of the House for the printing. About 500 copies will be required. I move that 500 extra copies of the Factory Bill be printed for general distribution.

Mr. SPEAKER. This motion goes to the Printing Committee without being put.

FLOODS ON THE RICHELIEU RIVER.

Mr. BÉCHARD asked, Has the Government received any petitions or memorials from riparian owners on the Richelieu River complaining that the piers constructed in the said river, near the Town of St. John, by the Stanstead, Shefford and Chambly Railway Company, raise the waters of the said river, and that their lands are consequently flooded, and praying for relief? If so, have any measures been adopted or are any measures to be adopted for the relief of the petitioners?

Mr. POPE. There have been some petitions received, but the Government have not come to any decision in reference to the matter.

EXPORTS OF CANADIAN PRODUCE.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, What is the total amount of goods the produce of Canada (not including short returns) exported from the 1st July, 1884, to the 1st March, 1885? Total amount of same goods exported from 1st July, 1883, to 1st March, 1884?

Mr. BOWELL. The total amount of goods the produce of Canada, exported from the 1st July, 1883, to the 1st of March, 1884, was \$56,861,122, and from the 1st July, 1884, to the 1st March, 1885, \$56,347,281.

LICENSE COMMISSIONERS IN ESSEX.

Mr. LISTER asked, Have License Commissioners been appointed under the McCarthy Act for the county of Essex for the current year? If so, state name and date of appointment of each commissioner.

Mr. COSTIGAN. No new appointment has been made. If any changes have taken place, it will be with regard to the second commissioner, who might be the warden of the county. He would be subject to election, and there might be a new commissioner without any departmental action.

INSPECTOR OF WOODSTOCK, N.B., DOMINION BUILDINGS.

Mr. IRVINE asked, Who was the inspector of Dominion building in Woodstock, N.B., during its construction? What was the date of his appointment, also salary received up to date, and the rate per day? Is he still employed on said building?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. The inspector of works was Mr. J. P. Fletcher who was appointed on the 1st June, 1883. The salary paid to date is \$1,575. The rate of payment is \$75 a month. He is still employed, as the fittings and the heating apparatus are not quite complete. His services will be dispensed with at the end of the month when the work is completed.

Mr. MACKENZIE. When will the general return asked for as to the names and salaries of all inspectors of public works be brought down.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I suppose it is being prepared now. I will enquire.

Mr. BERGIN,

Mr. MACKENZIE. It was moved for three weeks ago, I think.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. It has not been brought down?

Mr. MACKENZIE. No.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I will enquire.

INSPECTION OF FACTORIES.

Mr. BERGIN, on the Order for Committee of the Whole to consider resolutions to provide for the appointment of inspectors and medical inspectors of factories, being read, said: I propose to ask the Government to allow this to stand, for the reason that until the principle of the Factory Bill is affirmed by the House, it cannot be discussed. As this Bill is a very important one, and is looked upon with very great interest by the country, and is a Bill which is looked for with great anxiety by the manufacturers and by the working classes, I would ask the First Minister and the permission of the House, that on Wednesday next it should be made the first Order of the Day. This would ensure its being carried through this Session, and, I know, would give very great satisfaction both to the House and to the country.

Mr. BLAKE. If it stands in its present priority it will come up first next Wednesday.

Mr. BERGIN. No, it would not; there will be so many before it.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman should observe it is at present a Notice of Motion.

Mr. BERGIN. The motion cannot be discussed until the principle of the Bill is affirmed.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood it was the motion the hon. gentleman was speaking of.

Mr. BERGIN. No, it is the Bill; I want the Bill to be made the first Order of the Day for Wednesday next, or Wednesday evening; and when the principle of the Bill is affirmed by the House, as I feel it will be, then the motion can be discussed in its usual place.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There can be no objection if it is the general consent of the House.

Mr. BERGIN. I will move, therefore, that Bill (No. 85) respecting factories, be the first Order of the Day for Wednesday evening next.

Motion agreed to.

MILITARY MAGAZINE AT ST. JOHN, N. B.

Mr. WELDON moved for:

Return of all properties owned by the Government for military purposes in New Brunswick, disposed of or leased since the transfer from the Imperial Government; the parties to whom sold and at what price, and as to leased properties, to whom leased, for what period and at what rents.

He said: I wish to call the attention of the Department to the situation of the powder magazine at Fort Howe, in the city of Portland, N. B., coterminous with the city of St. John. Many years ago the barracks were situated at that place, and after the barracks were moved to their present situation at the lower end of the town, the magazines were stationed there, and during the time the Imperial troops were stationed at St. John the magazines were guarded by the military. After the Imperial troops departed the guard, of course, was taken away, but the magazines remained. Since then, as appears from the answer to a question put in the House by myself, one of the magazines is let to private parties. Now the firm to whom it is leased is, no doubt, highly respectable, and probably, so far as the head of that

firm is concerned, will take all proper precautions; but I would submit to the Department whether it is right that these public magazines should be used for private purposes. When they are under the control of the Department, of course I assume that every care will be taken by the officers of the Department so that there will be no danger of an explosion. But that care and protection of the Department ceases when the magazines are in the hands of private individuals, and it does appear to me that it is not a proper use of public magazines to lease them to private parties. From the position of this magazine, if an explosion should occur, it would cause great destruction, not only to property, but perhaps to life, as they are situated near a thickly populated portion of the city of Portland, and an explosion would cause great damage to that city, and also to the city of St. John. I do not know whether the attention of the Minister of Militia has been called to this matter by the City Council of St. John, or the City Council of Portland, but I am aware that the question was brought up in the City Council of Portland, and they agreed to memorialise the Department about it. At present there is great risk and danger from the magazines. Of course where magazines are required for public purposes, they are under the charge of the Militia Department and of officers detailed for that purpose; but when they pass into the hands of private parties the magazines are passed under the control of the individuals to whom they are leased, or to their servants. The city is consequently exposed to considerable danger which would not exist if the magazines were employed for the legitimate purposes for which they were established.

Mr. CARON. The papers which have been asked for by my hon. friend will be brought down. I did not expect that the hon. gentleman would have made the explanation which he has made before the papers were brought down. I can tell the hon. gentleman that a portion of this fort is used by the Department of Militia for storing powder, but another portion, the Fort Howe which he has referred to, is under lease, but as far as my memory serves me, it is leased from year to year, and the lease is terminable at any moment when the fort is required by the Department of Militia. I may say to the hon. gentleman that in several other cities of the Dominion it has been considered of great advantage to the city to have the military powder magazines when not required for that purpose by the Militia Department, handed over for the use of merchants, in which to store their powder, as it could be more safely stored there than anywhere else in the city. I can also say to the hon. gentleman that, whether the fort is leased or not, the supervision of the Militia Department is still maintained over those stores during the time the lease is in existence. I shall bring down the papers, and after they come down I shall be glad to supplement the information they contain with any further information in my power.

Motion agreed to.

ANNUNCIATION DAY.

Mr. SPEAKER. My attention has been called to the fact that Wednesday next is Annunciation Day, and will therefore be a holiday. I suggest, with respect to the motion of Mr. Bergin respecting inspectors and medical inspectors of factories, that the hon. member be allowed to change the motion so that it shall stand first on the list of Public Bills and Orders, not mentioning Wednesday next. This will be done with the consent of the House.

CLAIMS OF THE ISLAND OF CAPE BRETON.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness) moved:

That it be resolved,—

That after the Treaty of Paris the Island of Cape Breton was annexed to Nova Scotia by Proclamation on October 7th, 1763.

And that it was ordered by the Governor and Council of Nova Scotia, on the 10th of December, 1765, "that the Island of Cape Breton should be erected into a distinct county, to be known by the name of the 'County of Cape Breton,' comprehending the Islands of Madame and Scutarie and all islands within three leagues, and that a writ should be issued for choosing two representatives; and further that the freeholders should be at liberty to choose non-residents."

That "John Grant, Esq., and Mr. Gregory Townsend were elected, and proceeded to Halifax to take their seats in the Assembly, on June 3rd, 1766."

That the said John Grant, Esq., and Mr. Gregory Townsend, on the report of a Committee of the Assembly composed of Messrs. Butler, Morris, Smith, Brenton and Burbridge against the validity of their election, were prevented from taking their seats in the Legislature.

That the Legislature of Nova Scotia exercised the power of taxing the people of Cape Breton without allowing them any representation in the Assembly for 21 years, thereby creating discontent so intense and lasting that the Imperial Government as a remedy separated the island from Nova Scotia in 1784.

That during the twenty years preceding its separation from Nova Scotia, owing to the injustice done Cape Breton, its population decreased from 1,500 in 1763 to 1,100 in 1783.

That Cape Breton, while ruled by a Governor and Council, was so favorably known and desired by immigrants from the old country, that as Governor Desbarres, of the Island, writing to the Under Secretary of State on the 17th August, 1785, says: "Nova Scotia is jealous, and don't wish with thorough sincerity the success of the Government, lest its growing importance and value should raise it to the first rank amongst His Majesty's and the national favorites."

That the population of Cape Breton during the thirty-five years of its separate Government increased from 1,100 in 1783 to 26,100 in 1820.

That the persistent jealousy and intermeddling of Nova Scotia secured the re-annexation of Cape Breton without the consent of its people by a Proclamation issued on October 16th, 1820.

That the people of Cape Breton during the succeeding twenty-four years used every constitutional means to remonstrate against the re-annexation, but without success, as the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council confirmed it in 1844.

That the unjust treatment of Cape Breton by Nova Scotia from 1820 to 1867 appears manifest from the fact alone that while, during that time \$9,000,000 had been expended in Nova Scotia proper on public account, only the comparative trifle of \$168,523 was expended in Cape Breton, and that on St. Peter's canal, in the County of Richmond.

That since 1867, under Confederation, notwithstanding the enormous increase of the public debt of the Dominion, for which both political parties are responsible, and for the interest on which the people of Cape Breton are taxed in common with the people of other sections of the Dominion, no expenditure chargeable to capital account was ever yet made excepting St. Peter's canal.

That the prosperity of Cape Breton up to the present time had been retarded largely by the exercise of preponderating influences favorable to such portions of Nova Scotia as Halifax, Cumberland and Pictou, whose interests are not supposed to lie always in fairly recognizing the importance of Cape Breton.

That the area of Cape Breton is more than double that of Prince Edward Island, its population nearly as large, and in addition to their many common interests, the former possesses unlimited mineral resources which remain undeveloped owing to the want of facilities afforded to rival counties in Nova Scotia proper.

That in the opinion of this House the isolated position of Cape Breton, apart from the consideration of its inexhaustible mineral resources, entitles it to that consideration at the hands of this Parliament, which is given to Prince Edward Island, in the way of affording facilities for the development of its various industries.

He said: Before placing these resolutions on the subject of the claims of the Island of Cape Breton, apart from other sections of the Province of Nova Scotia, in your hands, Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain as concisely as possible my reasons for submitting them to the consideration of this House. The history of Cape Breton is an interesting one; but it is peculiarly interesting to the present inhabitants of the island. I do not intend to discuss the history of that island previous to the fall of Louisburg, in 1758, but I desire to call attention to the treatment which it has received since that time. In doing so it is not my intention to find fault with the dead past. I simply desire to call the attention of this House and of the country to the fact that, if the Island of Cape Breton had been treated in a manner similar to other sections of the Dominion, its population, which is now about 84,000, would at least be double. I have here a history of the island, which I hold is the only reliable history of the island ever published, simply because the histories published in former times were derived from sources which were not reliable.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read, read.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). It is not my intention, as has been suggested, to read the history of Cape Breton; but it is my intention to call attention to sections of its history, which relate particularly to the injustice that has been done to the island by political parties in the past. This history was written by an English gentleman, who resided in the island for forty years, and it can therefore be considered an unbiased history. The facts were obtained from official sources, and from sources which were not prejudicial to the interests of the island. The name of the gentleman who wrote this history was Richard Brown an English gentleman, who was familiar with all the resources of the island as well as with its people. In 1869 he published the history and dedicated it to the youth of the island, whom he addressed in this language:

"When I first visited the island, more than 40 years ago, my professional duties led me into various districts, at that time quite destitute of inns and the ordinary means of locomotion. Thus I was frequently compelled to ask from the inhabitants both shelter and subsistence, as well as aid in moving from place to place. I need hardly say that in the comfortable houses of the merchants and the farmers—in the log huts of the new settlers—in the wigwags of the wandering Indians—in short, everywhere I received a hearty and hospitable welcome. In later years, during a long residence at one locality, I had the happiness of enjoying the friendship of a wide circle of neighbors of all ranks."

That is his opinion of the people then resident upon the island, and of whom the present stock are the descendants. He obtained his information from the most reliable sources, as will be seen from the following:

"For the great bulk of the most important matter embodied in the following letters. I am under great obligations to Sir Roderick Murchison, for free access to the extensive library of the British Museum, and to His Grace the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos for permission to examine and make extracts from voluminous colonial documents in the Public Record Office. To the courteous and obliging officers of both these truly noble national institutions, I beg to tender my sincere thanks for their valuable aid in guiding me in my researches."

This conclusively proves that this history is a reliable one. It may be said, that Cape Breton progressed as rapidly as any other section of the Province of Nova Scotia or the Maritime Provinces; but this does not, however, prove that sufficient attention has been given to affording facilities to the people for prosecuting the various industries of the island. I find that as early as 1758, the fishing industries of that island were far in excess of what they are at the present day, and it is not only very interesting, but highly necessary to quote the statistics of that day, in order to show that notwithstanding the progressive increase of population in the island, it is not owing to any special attention, or in fact to any attention at all, having been paid to that island since that particular time. The historian says:

"The loss of Cape Breton was a severe blow to the navy of France, as the fishery on the coast was one of the chief nurseries of her seamen. According to a document placed in my hands by the late Chief Justice Dodd of Sydney, about forty years ago (in 1829) no less than 15,000 were employed in the fisheries of Cape Breton, when Louisbourg was taken in 1758. I cannot do better than give you the following copy of this document:

"State of the fisheries carried on by the French in the Island of Cape Breton previous to the British taking possession in 1758.

	Decked Vessels.	Shallops.
Egmont Bay, near Cape North.....	30
Niganish Bay and Cove.....	245
Niganish Island.....	30
Port Dauphin, or St. Anne.....	100
Entrance of Great Bras d'Or.....	20	40
Petit Bras d'Or.....	60
Spanish River, or Sydney.....	6
Indian Bay, or Lingan.....	50
Scattarie Island.....	200
Main à Dieu.....	190
Lorambec.....	80
Louisbourg.....	300	300
Gabarus Bay.....	50
Fourché.....	50
St. Esprit Island.....	60
Grande Rivière.....	60
L'Ardoise.....	14
St. Peter's.....	100

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

	Decked vessels.	Shallops.
Petit de Grat, Isle Madame.....	100
River and Bay of Inhabitants.....	100
Different places in Gut of Canso...	100
Totals.....	726	1,555
726 decked vessels, at 8 men each...	5,808	
1,555 shallops, at 6 men each.....	9,330	
Total.....	15,138 men	
726 decked vessels, at 700 quintals..	508,200	
1,555 shallops, at 300 quintals.....	466,500	
Total.....	974,700 quintals.	

In 1878 the total number of men employed in the fisheries of the island was 4,491; the number of boats, 3,226; the number of vessels, 98; the tonnage, 2,691 tons, and the value of the fisheries, \$1,276,193. In 1758 there were 15,138 men employed; number of vessels, 726; shallops, 1,555; and the value of the fish taken at that time was more than double that of the fish taken in 1883. This conclusively proves that one class of the inhabitants of the Island of Cape Breton will be largely increased in number for some period of time yet, because if the ability to maintain the fishermen on the island will be equal to what it was over 100 years ago, it would treble the present fishing population of the island. That the island was considered important at that time is proven from the following fact which the same writer refers to:

"There can be no stronger proof of the value of Cape Breton in, the estimation of the French, than the fact, when negotiations for peace were mooted in the year 1761, the French Minister, the Duc de Choiseul, offered to cede the whole of Canada to England upon certain conditions, of which the most important was the restitution of Cape Breton. As Mr. Pitt would not consent to this condition the French Government broke off the negotiations and recalled their agent from London."

Just because the British Government at that time refused to restore the Island of Cape Breton to the French Government, the war was continued two years afterwards. Peace was, however, declared in 1763, and the Island of Cape Breton was annexed to Nova Scotia. After Cape Breton was annexed to Nova Scotia it was ordered that two representatives be elected for the island—which was constituted into one county—to the Legislature of Nova Scotia. At that time the population of Cape Breton was about one-third of the population of Nova Scotia, but notwithstanding this, only two representatives were allowed the county of Cape Breton, which embraced the whole island, in a House composed of forty representatives. This shows how utterly impossible it was for Cape Breton at that time to procure any show of fair play in the Legislature of Nova Scotia; and notwithstanding that only two representatives were allowed for the island, they were refused the privilege of taking their seats in the Legislature because there was no homesteads on the island. The franchise of Nova Scotia at that time was a freehold franchise, and unfortunately there were no freeholders on the island, and after two gentlemen were elected to sit in the Local Legislature they were refused the privilege of taking their seats, because they were not elected by the freeholders of the island. Then their seats were declared vacant, and the island was refused representation in the Nova Scotia Legislature for 21 years. During that time the responsibility of representing the island in the Local Legislature was thrown on the City of Halifax. It was promised from time to time that freehold tenure would be given to the residents of the island; but notwithstanding this promise, lest Cape Breton should be represented in the Legislature, the right was withheld for the whole period of 21 years. But, according to this history, I find:

"Although Capt. Holland's survey had been long completed, and grants of land had been issued in the neighboring Island of St. John's, the *bonâ fide* settlers at Louisbourg and other parts of the island, for no assignable reason that I could discover in the record, were still denied the privilege, or rather right, of obtaining any other title than licenses

of occupation to the lands they had improved. They were therefore still disqualified to send representatives to the Assembly, not from any fault of their own, but simply because the Government would not give them grants. To remedy this grievance, the House passed a resolution on April 2, 1770, 'That no writ shall issue to the Island of Breton, because of the want of freeholders to make an election, and that the isle be deemed to be represented by the member for the County of Halifax, into which it has resolved and become a part thereof as heretofore.' This, you will observe, was no remedy whatever, as the inhabitants had no voice in choosing representatives for the County of Halifax. We may presume, however, that John Butler and Robert Campbell, who took their seats for the County of Halifax when the House met on June 6, 1771, looked especially after the affairs of Cape Breton."

There is a lurking suspicion in the minds of the people of the Island of Cape Breton that the privilege the people of Halifax obtained at that time has continued to exist ever since. I hope, however, that transpiring events will convince them that their suspicions are not well founded. Notwithstanding the great length of time during which the representatives of Halifax enjoyed the privilege of representing the island, I am happy to say that a public expression of opinion now in the city of Halifax convinces me that there is a growing feeling of sympathy for the island in that city, and I hope that feeling will be made manifest not only in the Local Legislature but in the Dominion Parliament. In 1774 another remedy was proposed for the very great wrong which was done to the island at that time. The historian says:

"We have now arrived at a momentous era in the history of the British Colonies—the breaking out of the American Revolution. As all the events of the war of independence must be quite familiar to you, I shall say nothing concerning them, except so far as they affect Cape Breton, which, happily, owing to its insignificance at that period, suffered less from the depredations and attacks of the enemy's privateers than the adjacent colonies. Energetic measures were, of course, taken by the Governor of Nova Scotia for the defence of the Province, not only against external but internal enemies also; for it was well known that there were many disaffected persons scattered through the country who had originally come from New England, disposed to aid the revolted colonies. On 28th August, 1775, a proclamation was issued, ordering light infantry companies to be raised throughout the Province. The total number of men required was only 1,010, of which 'Cape Breton Isle and Isle Madame' were each ordered to raise 'two companies of Acadians and others well affected,' of 50 men each—200 in all. It cannot escape your notice that Cape Breton, including Isle Madame, was not fairly treated in this apportionment. The whole population of the island, exclusive of the Indians, according to Governor Legge's census in 1774, was only 1,011, whilst that of Nova Scotia proper was, at the lowest estimate, 20,000; and yet the latter was called upon to furnish only 800 men, or one to every twenty-five, whilst the former was required to supply 200, or one in every five."

Thus you will see that Cape Breton was called upon to furnish five men to each one that Nova Scotia was required to furnish according to population, and I regret to find that that policy has been continued up to the present time. When fighting men are required, the military authorities are very anxious to look to the Island of Cape Breton for men to fight their battles; but when we are at peace, the Minister of Militia of this Dominion—and I regret that he is not in his place—fails to accord to us a fair apportionment of the public money devoted to that service. Now, Sir, I come to the most delightful era in the history of the Island of Cape Breton, that is, its separation from Nova Scotia in 1784. When I first visited that island there were many residents who recollected that particular time. There are many still living on the island who regret the day that it was made part of the Province of Nova Scotia, in 1820, and since these resolutions were made public I have received many letters from the residents of the island congratulating me on my efforts to secure the separation of the island from Nova Scotia proper, notwithstanding that the resolutions have no intention of asking for separation at present. As soon as it became known that Cape Breton was separated from Nova Scotia, many persons directed their attention to the island, and a large tide of immigration set in towards it in 1784:

"About 800 persons arrived, and settled in various parts of the island in the early part of the summer. It is stated by Desbarres that an accession of 3,397 speedily followed the publication of his proclamation on September 1st, describing the natural advantages of the

island and offering a liberal supply of provisions for three years to immigrants, with clothing for themselves and their families, lumber and materials for farm buildings, and tools and implements for clearing land."

Shortly afterwards, in 1785:

"The great rush of immigrants, and the bustling scene presented by so many people busily engaged in erecting barracks, storehouse and dwellings, seemed quite to have turned the head of the Governor, and made him fancy that Cape Breton would soon eclipse all the neighboring colonies. From the very first he appears to have imbibed an idea that the people of Nova Scotia were jealous of Cape Breton, and looked with dissatisfaction at its rising importance. Writing on August 17 to the Under-Secretary of State he says: 'New settlers are coming in fast; the New England people do not like the settling of the Island of Cape Breton at all; they know it will be the loss of every advantage they derive from the fishery. Nova Scotia is jealous, and don't wish with thorough sincerity the success of this Government, lest its growing importance and value should raise it to the first rank amongst His Majesty's and the national favorites.'"

We find at the close of its career as a separate colony its population increased very rapidly during its period of self-government.

"All the best lands fronting on the lakes, rivers and sea-coast were taken up previous to the year 1820; since that period the lands in the rear of front lots have been occupied by the later immigrants, who are in consequence distinguished by the name of 'Backlanders.' The great influx of Scottish immigrants (said by some authorities to have exceeded 25,000 souls), gave quite a new complexion to the population of Cape Breton, if it can with propriety be said that it was, before their arrival, distinguished by any complexion whatever, being composed only of a few hundred Micmacs, Acadians and English and Irish settlers. The island is now decidedly 'Scotch,' with every probability of its continuing so to the end of time. Although many of the first settlers came to Cape Breton sorely against their will, none, I believe, have had reason to regret the change from the wretched abodes they left to the comfortable homes they now occupy."

Unfortunately, in 1820, Cape Breton, without the consent of its people, was re-annexed to Nova Scotia by a proclamation. The proclamation reads as follows:

"DOWNING STREET, August 15, 1820.

"SIR,—I had the honor of intimating to you, previous to your departure from this country, the decision to which His Majesty had come of re-annexing the Island of Cape Breton to the Government of Nova Scotia; and you must have observed the alteration which had in consequence been made in your commission and instructions.

"His Majesty considers it most desirable that this arrangement should be no longer delayed, and has commanded me to instruct you to take into your immediate consideration the measures which may be necessary to give effect to His Majesty's instructions. For this purpose it will be necessary that you should in the first place direct the issue of writs for the election of two members from the County of Cape Breton, to sit in the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia; and in this you will follow the course adopted in 1765, when two members were actually so returned."

This proclamation was issued by Bathurst, and a proclamation was also issued by the Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia, shortly afterwards, which reads as follows:

"Whereas His Majesty, with a view to promote the welfare of his faithful and loyal subjects of Nova Scotia and Cape Breton, hath been graciously pleased to direct that the Island of Cape Breton should be re-annexed to the Government of Nova Scotia, and the same island should from henceforth be and remain an integral part of the Government of Nova Scotia,—

"I do therefore, in pursuance of His Majesty's instructions and by and with the advice of His Majesty's Council, declare that the Island of Cape Breton is, and from henceforth shall be and remain, a several and distinct county of the Province of Nova Scotia, to be called and known by the name of the County of Cape Breton, and to be represented, and the civil government thereof to be administered, in like manner as the other counties of the Province are administered and governed.

"And in pursuance of His Majesty's instructions I have caused a writ in the usual form to be immediately issued, directed to the Provost-Marshal or his Deputy, resident in the island, for the election of two members to serve in the General Assembly of Nova Scotia, being the number directed to be summoned to such Assembly before the time when the said island was first separated from the Province of Nova Scotia.

"And I do hereby, in obedience to His Majesty's commands, dissolve the Council of the said Island of Cape Breton.

"And that the peace and good order of the said island may be preserved, and justice duly administered therein, until more effectual provision shall be made by the Legislature of Nova Scotia, or until further order shall be duly made therein, I do hereby authorise and require that all judges, justices of the peace, constables and other civil officers in commission in the said island do continue in the execution of their respective offices, agreeably to the several ordinances passed by the

Governor and Council of Cape Breton, and under which that colony since its separation, has been hitherto administered."

This was, unquestionably, the greatest calamity that ever happened to the Island of Cape Breton. During the thirty-five years in which the island was governed by a Governor in Council, the progress of the island equalled, if it did not surpass, the progress of any other British contemporary colonies on this side of the Atlantic. Since that time, having regard to the discontent which prevailed on the island, principally owing to the fact that the island had only a representation of two in a House of forty, the interests of the island were, to a very great extent, neglected by the Legislature of Nova Scotia. During twenty-four years the people of the island remonstrated, in every constitutional manner, with the view of securing separation from Nova Scotia, and I find that a special session of the Local Legislature was called for in 1844 to determine whether the island would be set at liberty or not. I find that the Legislature of Nova Scotia was convened on the 20th July, 1844, and that the Governor of the day delivered his Speech from the Throne as follows:

"Mr. President and Honorable Gentlemen of the Legislative Council:

"Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly:

"I have called you together, in obedience to the instructions of Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, in order to give you an opportunity to determine whether you will appoint an agent to represent the Legislature of Nova Scotia at the bar of the Privy Council, in the case now pending before the Judicial Committee, regarding the legality of the annexation of the Island of Cape Breton to this Province, in 1820. I will cause the despatches I have received, having relation to this subject, to be immediately submitted to you. I regret very much that it should have become necessary to convene you at a season of the year at which it must be inconvenient for many of you to leave your homes; but it is satisfactory for me to know that the business on which you are summoned to deliberate is of such a nature as leads me to hope that it may be readily despatched, and that its early completion will enable me at once to release you from further attendance."

This was the Speech from the Throne, and I find that the resolution, the only business of importance which was submitted to the Local Legislature, reads as follows:

"Resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor, to inform His Excellency that the House of Assembly having taken into its deliberate consideration the despatches and documents submitted by His Excellency to the House, relative to the question now pending before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, have determined that, having full confidence in the learning, knowledge and ability of the Attorney and Solicitor-General of England, and the wisdom and integrity of the eminent tribunal before whom they are to vindicate the legality of the annexation of Cape Breton to this Province, it is unnecessary to employ an agent to represent Nova Scotia before the said tribunal; and further stating that the re-annexation of the Island of Cape Breton to this Province, by the Proclamation of 1820, and the Act of Assembly passed in pursuance thereof, was a measure very advantageous to the great body of the inhabitants of that island, and that it has largely benefitted by the care and protection of the Government and impartial administration of justice; and praying that His Excellency will be pleased to appoint a commission of five persons, to collect from the public archives of this Province such records, documents and information as may have a tendency to aid the said tribunal in coming to a decision upon the said question, and that His Excellency will be pleased to transmit the same to the right honorable the Secretary of State for the Colonies."

During the period from 1820 to 1844, owing to the discontent that prevailed in the Island of Cape Breton, the Legislature of Nova Scotia wisely increased the representation of the island; but even at this time the representation of the island was only 6 out of about 50. What is very significant is the fact, that out of the 6 gentlemen who represented the Island of Cape Breton in 1844, not one of them voted for this resolution passed by the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia. This proves the fact that, in 1844, a very grave discontent prevailed in the Island of Cape Breton in regard to the treatment it received at the hands of the Province of Nova Scotia. Since that time the people of Cape Breton have had the privilege of grumbling, which is accorded to every British subject, but, notwithstanding all their grumbling, they are

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

yet of opinion that very little attention was paid to the interests of the island from 1844 to 1867, although we had some hope that, in the near future, after that period, some attention would be paid to the interests of the island owing to the very large expenditures made in Nova Scotia proper from 1851 until 1867. In 1851 the railway policy was inaugurated in the Province of Nova Scotia, and no railway scheme could ever have been passed in the Local Legislature without the assistance of the representatives from the Island of Cape Breton; and I am happy to say that the intelligent representatives of the island at that time always favored the building of railways and public works in all sections of the Province of Nova Scotia, as they are willing to do now in all sections of the Dominion where it would appear that public works are necessary for the development of the country. In 1867, then, owing to the policy pursued from 1851 until that time, no less than seven million dollars were expended by the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia on railways, but, whenever any railway policy was advanced by the Local Legislature, the leaders of the Government of the day always promised that, as soon as the railways were extended east and west in Nova Scotia proper, then and not till then would steps be taken to build railways on the Island of Cape Breton. We were left to live in hope, but, unfortunately, hope has been long deferred, and up to this time neither at the expense of the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia nor at the expense of the Dominion Parliament have we one foot of railway on the Island of Cape Breton. However, in 1867 and for two years previous to that date, owing to the very peculiar position which the people of Cape Breton occupied relative to the Province of Nova Scotia, the feeling in reference to Confederation was most intense. They feared, and I was one of those who feared, that the interests of the Island of Cape Breton would be neglected to even a larger degree when we were connected with the great Dominion of Canada than they were while we were connected with the Province of Nova Scotia. The opposition was so intense on that island that not one representative was returned from any of its constituencies in favor of Confederation. Since that time, many changes have taken place in all sections of the Dominion, but on the island, with the exception of the fishing and mining sections, very little change has taken place, and I regret exceedingly to admit that, in many sections of the island, a very large exodus takes place. It takes place not owing to the National Policy, because from all the statistics I have in my possession the exodus took place while the Government adopted a revenue tariff. We have no statistics to show what the increased population may be under the National Policy, but I anticipate that there will be a very material proportion of increase in the fishing and coal-mining sections of the Island of Cape Breton owing to the adoption of that policy. In 1874 this Parliament adopted a new policy in reference to the Province of Nova Scotia. Before 1867, railways were built east and west in Nova Scotia, but this Government adopted the policy in 1873 and 1874, of giving the Windsor Branch in the Province of Nova Scotia as aid to railways in the western part of the Province, and the Pictou Branch as aid to railways in the eastern part of the Province. The Windsor Branch cost $1\frac{1}{2}$ million dollars, and the Pictou Branch over $2\frac{1}{4}$ million dollars. The aggregate amount which these railways cost was not less than \$3,500,000, so that this Parliament adopted the policy of giving that amount as a bonus for the extension of railways in Nova Scotia proper. Of course, that policy gave very general satisfaction, general satisfaction throughout the Province of Nova Scotia particularly, but I was one of those who felt at that time and now feel that, notwithstanding this and other concessions made to Nova Scotia proper, it did not benefit the Island of Cape Breton, directly or indirectly, to the

extent of one dollar, any more than similar expenditures in the great North-West or in Vancouver Island, or in any other portion of the Dominion to which our people would be compelled to go to earn their bread by the sweat of their brow. This is a feature of our isolated position which our friends from Nova Scotia itself can never realise. They fancy that if large expenditures are made in Nova Scotia proper, the Island of Cape Breton, as a matter of course, must benefit thereby, but I submit that any expenditures in Nova Scotia proper cannot be of any more benefit to the Island of Cape Breton than to Prince Edward Island, which has never contributed one dollar to public expenditures in the Province of Nova Scotia. This is one feature of our position which I desire to strongly impress on our friends from Nova Scotia, who I believe to be very sympathetically inclined, and which I desire to impress upon the representatives of all the constituencies of this Dominion. Besides giving these large sums to Nova Scotia for the railway system of that Province, in 1874 the Government of the day placed at the disposal of the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia, in round numbers, two millions of dollars in cash, which were placed to the credit of the Province in the Dominion Treasury. At that time I remonstrated strongly against placing either the railway or the money at the disposal of the Local Legislature, because I felt then, as I feel now, that doing so would not benefit the Island of Cape Breton to any extent; and I am sorry to say that my fears and anticipations have been realised. Notwithstanding that all these subsidies have been expended in the extension of railways east and west of Nova Scotia, not one dollar of it has ever found its way into the Island of Cape Breton, unless our people earned the money, as I said before, by the sweat of their brow. However, while this money was appropriated for railways east and west, the Local Legislature apportioned a very fair proportion of the amount for the Island of Cape Breton, and, under the pretense, I am sorry to say, as it appears now, at least under the promise that the money would be expended on the island, they secured the expenditure of all in Nova Scotia proper, and now the Local Legislature turns round and tells us that, after having expended all the subsidies placed at their disposal by the Dominion Parliament in Nova Scotia proper, they shall decline to vote a dollar out of the local revenue for the island. I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that, if this Parliament had not placed \$2,000,000 cash, to say nothing of the railways in Nova Scotia proper, at the disposal of the Local Government, the Legislature of Nova Scotia would annually receive 5 per cent. interest upon the money. This would place \$100,000 at the disposal of the Local Legislature for local purposes; and the portion of that which Cape Breton would receive at the hands of the Local Government, if applied for local works, would certainly not be less than one-fifth, or \$20,000. The expenditure of that money, therefore, in Nova Scotia proper, has deprived the Island of Cape Breton, forever, of the revenue for local purposes on the island of not less than \$20,000 a year. I hold that the money expended on railways in Nova Scotia proper, on account of the \$2,000,000 then placed at the disposal of the Local Legislature, did no more to advance the interests of the Island of Cape Breton than it did to advance the interests of Prince Edward Island, which did not contribute one dollar to the expenditure of these railways. In order to show the apportionment of the money, I desire to call your attention to the language used by the Provincial Secretary in introducing the Bill into the Local Legislature in 1875:

"He explained that the Bill proposed to give \$4,000 per mile to the Nictaux and Atlantic Railway, and a like sum to the Broad Cove Road, and also to add \$2,000 per mile to the subsidy already granted to the Western Counties Railway. As it appeared that the work was in some places difficult to carry on, and the company required increased aid. In considering the question whether the Province was warranted in granting the sums mentioned in the Bill, he stated the subvention already granted to the Yarmouth Road was at \$6,000 for 90 miles, equal to \$540,000; that of the Spring Hill and Parrsboro' Road at \$5,000 a mile

for 28 miles, equal to \$140,000; the New Glasgow and Canso Road \$5,000 a mile for 80 miles, equal to \$400,000; and the Canso and Louisburg Road \$5,000 a mile for 80 miles, equal to \$400,000, making in all \$1,480,000 for 278 miles of road already provided for. The present Bill proposed to subsidise the Nictaux and Atlantic Road, 70 miles, with \$4,000 a mile, equal to \$280,000; the Broad Cove Road, say 50 miles, with \$4,000 a mile, equal to \$200,000, and the Yarmouth Road of 90 miles, with additional subsidy of \$2,000 a mile, equal to \$180,000. These sums added to the sums already provided for as subventions, gave a total of \$2,240,000."

Now, Sir, the first Session of this Parliament I suggested that a subsidy be granted for a line from the Strait of Canso to Broad Cove, and I also suggested that a subsidy should be granted for a line from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg. I was approached by more than one hon. gentleman in this House—and I am not sure, but some of them were from Nova Scotia—who assured me that owing to the fact that I asked for a subsidy for the two roads on the Island of Cape Breton, it was a hopeless case to obtain a dollar for any of them.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Where is Broad Cove?

Mr. CAMERON. Broad Cove is in the County of Inverness, Cape Breton, one of the finest counties in the whole Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, as I have already stated, the expenditure of the whole of this money in Nova Scotia proper, has entailed a tax on our people—an indirect tax, it is true—because it has deprived our people of \$20,000 a year for local purposes. The whole amount of the money has been expended in Nova Scotia proper, and we are now asked by the Local Legislature to look to the Dominion alone for aid for railways on the Island of Cape Breton. However, Sir, since that time, although it is not very long ago, I am happy to say, that the whole policy of the people of Nova Scotia has somewhat changed in the direction of favoring Cape Breton. Now, there is a great deal of sympathy expressed for the island. Sympathy has been lately expressed, as I have already said, from the City of Halifax, where we least expected it. I have no doubt that every representative in the Local Legislature or in the Dominion Parliament who understands the position of Cape Breton, will feel that the people of the fine County of Halifax realise the fact that Cape Breton, up to this time, has not received the assistance which she deserved at the hands of the Local Legislature, at least. I have no hesitation in saying that we have the sympathy of Nova Scotia, and I believe to so large an extent that the representatives of Nova Scotia realise that something more must be done in the interests of the island hereafter than has yet been done—at least that fair consideration should be given in the construction of railways and other improvements which are necessary for that section of the country, for the carrying on of the various industries of the island, and for the distribution of our surplus products to the markets of the world. I find that we have sympathy in the Local Legislature, and I have no hesitation in making the assertion that if we had any sympathy from any part of the Province expressed publicly in the past; it was from the west. I say this with some regret, because I am a native of the eastern part of the Province. But the sympathy which exists now in the Province is of such a character that it cannot be ignored by the representatives of the people in Parliament. In 1883 that sympathy was very strongly expressed in the Local Legislature by representatives from all sections of the Province of Nova Scotia. It was expressed by the representatives from Halifax, and from all the counties in that neighborhood. It was so universal indeed that it was not considered safe for any person to appeal to the people of Nova Scotia unless he was in favor of doing justice to Cape Breton. I know that in former days when the subject of justice to Cape Breton was before the Local Legislature of Nova Scotia it was generally turned into a burlesque; but lately, owing to the fact that Nova Scotia occupies a position with regard to the great Dominion of Canada

somewhat similar to the position which we have occupied for 47 years relative to Nova Scotia proper, they feel there is a good deal in what we complain of. They feel, Sir, that while they contribute very largely to the revenue of this Dominion they have reason to complain, or think they have, that a fair proportion of the expenditure has not been made in the Province of Nova Scotia proper. This, I presume, has been to some extent the cause of the feeling which is now very prevalent in the Province in regard to Cape Breton. I will not refer to sympathy expressed later than the present Session of Parliament. The leader of the Opposition, on 20th February last, said :

"Another matter which has been left out of the speech was one which had been prominent for a good many years—a railway through the Island of Cape Breton. Railway extension in the eastern counties of the Province no longer enjoyed the attention of the Government. It was agreed last year that the Government in giving up Eastern Extension put this House in such a position that they would no longer be able to help the eastern counties. He recollected that his hon. friend, the hon. Premier of that day stated, in language perhaps prophetic, that in transferring the Pictou Branch the Government had merely transferred a trust and that they had transferred it to abler hands. That remark was not satisfactory to many here and it was partially explained away afterwards, but the fact that in his honor's speech this year no mention whatever was made of that eastern railway, proved conclusively that in their action last year the Government had done as much or more than any other Government, who had the subject under consideration to blast all the hopes of the people of Cape Breton who had been looking for years to this Legislature and this Government for what they ought to claim as their own. Probably this matter would be brought up again and there was no need to deal with it longer at this moment."

In answer to this very expressive language of sympathy for the island, the leader of the Government of Nova Scotia said :

"The remarks of the hon. leader of the Opposition were, for the most part, in the highest degree satisfactory, but the reference he made to Cape Breton was hardly fair. If the Government were to ask that hon. gentleman what solution he would propound he (Hon. Mr. F.) was afraid the answer would not be a satisfactory one. The Government might have introduced in their speech a meaningless paragraph on this subject, but he did not think such a course was advisable. Cape Breton had enough of 'paper railways.' He believed that both of the political parties of this country had made honest efforts to settle the question, and if unfortunate circumstances and unlooked for difficulties prevented those efforts from being successful, it should not be said that the Legislature had done so much for the west and nothing whatever for the east. The Legislature of Nova Scotia had never offered subsidies to the west without evincing the same liberality in their treatment of the east. If companies came to grief it was unfortunate, but the fact should be recognised that the Government offered east and west the same conditions, and if Cape Breton had not been as successful in regard to railway extension, he believed that it had not arisen from any want of willingness on the part of either political party to carry out the work."

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness). Any gentleman in this Dominion reading that speech would come to the same conclusion as the hon. gentleman who has just now said "hear, hear," but I can tell my hon. friend who says "hear, hear" that they never gave the same subsidy for Cape Breton as they did for the western part of the Province. I have just read from the mouth of the Provincial Secretary that the Yarmouth Road received \$8,000 per mile, whereas the Inverness Road was promised only \$4,000 per mile. Will the hon. gentleman say "hear, hear" to that. And he will find also that while the Yarmouth Road received \$8,000 per mile, the Louisburg Road was promised only \$5,000 per mile. Is there any reasonable person, then, who will not come to the conclusion that the statement made here, namely, that the Legislature of Nova Scotia had never offered subsidies to the west without evincing the same liberality in their treatment to the east, must be taken with a grain of salt. In point of fact we are still wanting railways. The admission is now made, it would seem, that there is no serious intention to extend railways into the island, because the subsidies given were always such as were insufficient to induce a company to undertake work of that kind; and small as those inducements were, the acts were so drawn that the subsidies lapsed, and there

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

is not one dollar to our credit to day in Nova Scotia for railway extension in the island. We had the further assurance from one party in Nova Scotia at least, if not from more than one, that there is no intention of ever voting a dollar in the Local Legislature for railway extension in Cape Breton. Notwithstanding the fact that a very large subsidy was given by this Parliament, in the Pictou Branch case, with the intention of carrying a railway from New Glasgow to Louisburg, by some means which it is difficult to explain, the railway was built to the Strait of Canso only. On this subject the senior member for Guysboro' (Mr. Weeks) said :

"As the ominous omission referred to—the omission of all reference to railway extension eastward and into the Island of Cape Breton; with regard to that question, which has been a burning question in this Legislature for a number of years, we must almost heartily deplore the necessity for that omission—if such necessity exists."

Having referred to this matter at length, he said :

"I am not of that class who are disposed to cavil unavailingly over a question of this kind, nor have I any intention of reverting to a bye-gone struggle; but looking back for any instant only I must say that I do not regret my public action, that it must be admitted that the prognostications of those whose fervid imaginations saw in the action of the Dominion Government last Session ground for the belief in the construction, by that body, of the Cape Breton road, have not been fulfilled. Upon whose shoulders the onus of building, or assisting in building, that road, now rests, is not for me to say. If, after looking across to the larger Legislature beyond us, no response is made to the cry that comes up from Cape Breton, if the bright anticipations of last year come to barren nothingness. If Nova Scotia, denuded of her railways, is powerless to assist that island, then, indeed, is Cape Breton placed in a most extraordinary position. Always aiding others, unaided herself, she must remain without the shadow of a hope of seeing a line of railway constructed within her borders."

This, then, is the opinion of the representatives in the Local Legislature in Nova Scotia in reference to the injustice, or, possibly—to put it in milder language—the neglect which Cape Breton, up to this time, has received at the hands of the whole of Canada. It may be said that the Nova Scotia railways, which cost over \$15,000,000 are a benefit to Cape Breton. I admit that they are conveniences just as every railway in Canada is a convenience for obtaining supplies and distributing, at rather an expensive cost, the surplus products of the island; but they are not any more a benefit to our island than to the adjoining island of Prince Edward, which was never called on to contribute a dollar for their construction. They did not lessen the cost of the distribution of the products of our island; on the contrary, the cost of the distribution of those products has been very largely increased on account of the extension of the railway from New Glasgow to the Strait of Canso. Before that extension we enjoyed steam communication to the north-west coast of the island and Port Hawkesbury, and it did not cost much more then to transfer the products of the island from Hawkesbury and other points on the north-west coast of the island to Pictou, than it costs now to transfer similar products across the Strait of Canso alone, and we pay extra for the transfer of the same commodities from the Strait of Canso to New Glasgow, a distance of 80 miles; so that so far as facilities for the distribution of the products of the island are concerned they are rather against us. It affords of course the people of the island great facility at this particular season of the year, to leave the Island of Cape Breton for the purpose of manning American vessels to prosecute the fisheries on our coasts during the summer season. There is a very large number of persons employed in that calling, who in the spring of the year were compelled to go by sailing vessels from the Strait of Canso to the United States, or walk from the Strait of Canso to New Glasgow, a distance of 80 miles, because that class of people could not afford the cost of travelling by stage, which was expensive. But now the railways enable them to leave in the spring, and the tide has already commenced to flow from the eastern part of the Province to the Eastern States. I observe by the press that a large number have already departed, and that more will follow them for the purpose of prosecuting the bank fisheries, and, later on, the

fisheries along the coasts of our island. But, Mr. Speaker, while I earnestly advocate the building of a railway from the Strait of Canso to Louisburg, or the building of the other road from the Strait of Canso to Broad Cove, either by the Dominion or by the Local Parliament, as was promised us more than once, I hold that there are other public works on the island which are as necessary for the prosecution of some industries on the island. I refer now to the improvement of harbors, to the construction of piers for the purpose of facilitating the prosecution of the fisheries and the exportation of the products of the coal mines from the island. I find that on the north-west coast of the island—and now I come to the county which I have the honor to represent—the Local Government built, exclusively at the expense of the local treasury in 1866, a pier at Port Hastings, and since that time the Local Legislature has ignored the responsibility of maintaining that pier, and that consequently the pier is now almost useless. There was also a pier at Long Point, which was a very useful one to that locality; there was one at Port Hood, at Sight Point, at Broad Cove Marsh, at Margaree Island, and one at Cheticamp. Those piers were maintained at the expense of the Local Legislature till 1878. The Local Legislature, then finding that they had not the means for maintaining those piers, have publicly declared it to be their policy to ask the Dominion Government to maintain them. There were other improvements undertaken on that island since Confederation which were of greater magnitude—the improvement of harbors; and I hold that the improvement of harbors, extensive harbors, or harbors which would give an outlet for the products of certain localities should not be made a charge on the consolidated revenue, or on income. The works on Benacadie, Catalone, Cow Bay, East Bay, Grand Narrows, Ingonish, L'Ardoise, Mabou, Militia Point, Port Hood, West Arichat, Cheticamp, Margaree, the St. Peter's canal, and works of that class should be chargeable to capital account; and I should be most happy, as an individual representing the island, to have it pointed out to us time and again that Cape Breton received more money on capital account than the money expended on the St. Peter's canal. When those works were undertaken by this Parliament, it was with a view of placing them on the same footing as the canals were placed in Ontario and other places. The representatives of our island always favored the improvement and enlargement of the canals in the west, and I for one shall be always most happy to vote the sums necessary for enlarging those canals, whenever it shall be made to appear that doing so will be to the general interest of the Dominion. There can be no question that the improvement of large harbors of this kind, the improvement of the entrances into those harbors, will be of general advantage to this Dominion—of general advantage to the shipping of the Province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick particularly. The improvement of the harbors on the north-west coast of Cape Breton where along an extensive coast of over 150 miles no harbors exist, except one, on the lee of an island adjoining Port Hood, but which cannot be used as a harbor for exporting products from the mainland, as it is distant at least a mile from the mainland, and as a deep channel intervenes, which precludes the hope of ever exporting from the mainland the product of the very extensive coal area which exists in that locality, unless that channel is bridged or closed. In order to show you that it was not the intention to have those harbors chargeable to income, I beg to call the attention of this House to the Act which was passed in 1869, and assented to on the 22nd of June in that year, which declared those harbors were of such great importance that they should be placed in the same category as the canals of the Dominion. The preamble of that Act reads as follows:

"Whereas it is expedient to provide means for improving the harbors and channels and rendering the navigation more easy and safe at the

several ports of Bathurst, Shippegan and Richibucto, in the Province of New Brunswick, Mabou, Port Hood, Margaree, Cheticamp and Liverpool, in the Province of Nova Scotia, Amherst Harbor and House Harbor, in the Magdalen Islands, and several ports and harbors between Cross Point and Cape Chat, both ports inclusive, in the Bay of Chaleurs and the coast of Gaspé, all in the Province of Quebec, and the Port of Chatham in the Province of Ontario; therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:—"

This Act provides that these harbors should be improved, and that tolls should be imposed on the shipping entering them, in the same manner as tolls are imposed now in the other sections of the Dominion on canals. And while the grants necessary to enlarge and improve the canals of Ontario and Quebec, and other portions of the Dominion, are charged to the capital account, I hold that since the policy of this Government has been changed, any votes passed by this Parliament for the improvement of the entrance to these harbors should also be charged to capital account. Thus our people would be called upon to pay the interest on the expenditure instead of the principal, as they are required to do now. Taking this view of the case, I find by the annual report of the Department of Public Works, in 1884, improvements were made in the Island of Cape Breton in the following places, which include the whole island: Benacadie, \$10,518; Catalone, \$1,500; Cow Bay, \$137,628; East Bay, \$2,045; Grand Narrows, \$3,000; Ingonish, \$87,556; L'Ardoise, \$10,545; Mabou, \$101,948; Militia Point, \$2,000; Port Hood, \$35,000; West Arichat, \$11,294; Cheticamp, \$10,000; Margaree, \$5,000; aggregating \$409,034 in the four counties of the island, being an average of perhaps \$25,000 a year. In addition to this, \$607,000 have been expended on St. Peter's canal since 1820 up to the present time both by the Local Legislature and by the Dominion Parliament. It will thus be seen that on public works, which, I believe, should be chargeable to capital account, \$1,000,000 have been expended on the Island of Cape Breton. I think the aggregate debt of the whole Dominion is not less than \$200,000,000. Cape Breton comprises about one-fiftieth of the population of the Dominion. We are therefore entitled to an expenditure on capital account in view of our isolated position of not less than \$4,000,000. Yet we find that since 1820 the expenditure on public works only aggregates \$1,000,000. It is, therefore, evident that we have an equitable claim to an expenditure of not less than \$3,000,000 on public works in order to place us on the same footing as other sections of the Dominion. Notwithstanding that, in the Trade and Navigation Returns, the imports and exports and duty paid are not given by counties and by Provinces, yet there is no difficulty whatever in calculating from them the amount of imports and exports and duty collected in every county in the Province of Nova Scotia. There is so little difficulty in doing so that as it is each representative who rises in his place here proudly points out that his county contributes an enormous amount to the revenue, that the imports and exports of his county are very large, and that it is, therefore, entitled to a very large expenditure on capital account. I find that the aggregate exports from the Province of Nova Scotia in 1884 were \$9,599,353, that the imports were \$9,658,104, that the goods entered for home consumption were valued at \$9,183,346, and that our Customs duties were collected to the extent of \$1,907,285. Therefore Cape Breton, containing one-fifth of the population of the Province of Nova Scotia, and with its people occupying as comfortable a position as an equal population in any other part of the Province, must necessarily contribute \$400,000 to the revenue of this Dominion. Now, as I have said, the amount expended on public works in Cape Breton, chargeable to capital account, up to this time, has been \$1,000,000. The amount of interest paid on one million of dollars is only \$50,000; we have then to our credit \$350,000, a large proportion of which I claim should be paid by the Government of the Dominion as interest in the shape of expenditures on

public works in the island. I have no hesitation in asserting that there is not a representative from any section of the Province of Nova Scotia who will not admit that Cape Breton contributes one-fourth of the revenue collected in Nova Scotia proper. We all contend, and with reason, that owing to our population being composed largely of miners and fishermen who require for use and consumption every article on which duty is paid, we contribute more than our proportion according to population; but I only take the ground that we contribute according to population, and even on that ground I am confident that our friends from Nova Scotia proper will extend us their sympathy and urge a practical return in the way of dollars and cents expended in public improvements on the island. The exports from the Island of Cape Breton, as given in the Trade and Navigation Returns, are as follows:

From Arichat.....	\$ 50,645
" Baddeck.....	89,926
" North Sydney.....	142,698
" Port Hawkesbury.....	236,863
" Port Hood.....	2,795
" Sydney.....	205,725
Total.....	\$728,657

In view of the fact that we raise coal to the value of \$1,000,000 a year; in view of the fact that we catch fish to the value of \$1,000,000; and in view of the fact that we export agricultural products to the value at least of \$750,000, every reasonable person must admit that our total exports must amount to more than \$1,286,577. They must admit that the exports from the Island of Cape Breton must amount at least to one-fifth the exports from the whole Province, and that instead of the exports being as shown by the trade returns, \$728,658, they must aggregate at least \$2,000,000. In the trade returns all the exports from our island are not credited us, as a large proportion of our exports are sent to the City of Halifax and distributed from that point; and that is the reason why the trade returns are misleading, leading those who examine them to believe that Cape Breton cannot be of very much importance. In the shire town of the county which I have the honor to represent the exports are only put at \$2,795 a year in the trade returns; but I have no hesitation in saying that the exports from that neighborhood are as large as those from any other town in the island, with the exception of Sydney and adjoining ports. The imports are:

Arichat.....	\$ 36,321
Baddeck.....	6,030
North Sydney.....	93,116
Port Hawkesbury.....	41,150
Port Hood.....	2,030
Sydney.....	45,575
Total.....	\$224,222

Instead of imports, as shown by the Trade Returns, of \$224,223, it should be one-fifth of imports to Nova Scotia, or \$2,000,000. I have here statistics which are very interesting, and which it will not take me long to place before the House. They establish that the increase in population from 1871 to 1881, when this Dominion was blessed with a revenue tariff, was only in the sections where the fishing industries and coal industries are carried on, and that in some of the agricultural sections there was a decrease. It is absolutely necessary, therefore, that facilities should be afforded the people of that island for the distribution of the products of the soil similar to those given to other sections along the length and breadth of the Dominion; it is absolutely necessary to give our people these facilities in order that they can have at home that which they can obtain abroad. This I urge as a reason for railway extension particularly. I urge as a reason for the improvement of harbors and piers that the population of those sections interested in the fisheries increases so rapidly that it is in the interests of the Dominion they should have all the facilities necessary to

Mr. CAMERON (Inverness).

prosecute their business. The following table shows the increase in population in the County of Inverness from 1871 to 1881:

	1871.	1881.	Increase.	Decrease.
Hastings.....	2,213	2,357	144
River Inhabitants.....	1,095	1,077	18
North Mountain.....	856	833	23
River Dennis.....	1,022	1,097	75
Indique.....	1,919	2,027	108
Port Hood.....	1,297	1,493	201
Malone.....	3,112	3,304	192
West Lake Anslie.....	397	430	33
Strathborne.....	1,442	1,588	146
Broad Cove Marsh.....	896	1,075	89
Mayarm Harbor.....	1,442	1,757	315
Cheticamp.....	1,915	2,726	811
N. E. Margaise.....	1,476	1,451	25
Zosnys Bridge.....	1,029	1,246	217
E. Lake Auslic.....	816	742	74
Whycocmah.....	2,398	2,444	44
	23,415	25,650	2,375	150

I find that there was a very large increase in population in the fishing sections of the county which I have the honor to represent, and, unfortunately, a decrease in some of the agricultural sections. Now, in a pecuniary point of view, I hold that it is the interests of this Dominion to give us facilities for the development of the resources of the island similar to those given to other sections of the Dominion, because if the increase in population during the decade from 1861 to 1871 were progressive, it would not be less than 4,683 in my county alone in 1881. Unfortunately, however, the net increase was only 2,235, showing unquestionably there was an exodus from that county alone during that period of not less than 2,448, without allowing for the progressive increase according to population. The class of people who, unfortunately, leaves our island is a class most desirable to retain in the Dominion, and I regret exceedingly to say that, notwithstanding my ardent desire that they would emigrate to the western portion of this Dominion, they unfortunately find their way across to the United States, and it is almost impossible to influence any of our people who leave the island to take up their abode in any of the western sections in this Dominion, they will rather settle around the New England portion of the United States, or, as a general thing, go further west and settle on the Pacific slope. But, valuing the population, which we lose at \$1,000 per head, which is a very low estimate, it aggregates during that decade, \$2,448,000. I have not the slightest hesitation in asserting that, if \$2,448,000 had been expended on that island during that time by the Governments of Nova Scotia and the Dominion, that population would have been retained, and at least as great a number more of the same class of people would have been restored to the island, because, if there is anything in our people, it is a love of their island home, and, if they have any opportunity whatever, of returning to the island, they always embrace the very first opportunity to do so. I find that, during that time, the class of emigrants that unfortunately left our island, have distinguished themselves in the United States and in other portions of Canada, and I am happy to say that the State Senate is represented by Cape Bretoners, I find that Legislatures in the United States are represented by Cape Bretoners, I find that the mayor's chair is occupied by Cape Bretoners, I find that the seats of aldermen are filled by Cape Bretoners, I find that some who emigrated from the island have gone to the Pacific slope in this Dominion and have returned as members of Parliament, and I find also that we have supplied Prince Edward Island with a representative. In view of these facts, I hold that strenuous efforts should be made to retain these people in our country. I will not refer to the population of the island any more than to its population by religions. I find that the island is peopled by 2,167 Baptists, 45,901 Catholics, 411 Congregationalists, 3,735 Church of England, 2,425

Methodists, 29,688 Presbyterians, and that there are only 190 who cannot be classed in some religious denomination. Therefore I think we have a very strong claim upon nearly, if not quite, all the religious denominations of this Dominion. By nationalities, I find that the island is inhabited by 58 Africans, 543 Indians, 148 Dutch, 7,960 English, 12,430 French, 347 Germans, 7,329 Irish, other nationalities of a mixed character only 241, Scotch 55,436, and I am happy to inform my friends from British Columbia that in our island there is not one "Heathen Chinese." The area of Cape Breton is 2,800,680 acres. The area of Prince Edward Island is 1,365,400 acres. The population of Cape Breton is only 84,500, although in 1820 it was 26,000, to a population of 16,000 for Prince Edward Island, but, since that time, the population of Prince Edward Island, which was more highly favored in many respects, and particularly in a political respect, has largely increased in proportion, and is now 108,891. I beg to assure you that I do not complain of the expenditure in any portion of this Dominion, I do not complain of the expenditure in any section of the Province of Nova Scotia, and, while my resolutions would imply the fact that the City of Halifax, Pictou, Cumberland and other counties in Nova Scotia, owing to a preponderating influence in the Local Legislature, secured advantages which we do not possess, it, unfortunately for us, only reveals the fact that they were truer, or rather that their representatives were truer, to the interests of their respective counties, or were more successful, at least, in securing public expenditure in their respective counties than the representatives of the people of the Island of Cape Breton. But, while I am willing, as it has already been said in the Local Legislature, to support measures for expenditure in all sections of the Dominion where it can be shown that such expenditures tend either to encourage immigration into our country, or to induce our people to remain at home, or to encourage them to return from the United States, I claim that a similar expenditure and for similar purposes should be made on the Island of Cape Breton. In conclusion, I may assure this House, as I have already, I believe, shown, that Cape Breton had many eventful periods. It had its periods of tragedies from its discovery about 200 years before the discovery of America by Columbus until the fall of Luisburg in 1758. It had its period of persecution, when its people were taxed without a voice in the Legislature of their Province for 21 years. It had its period of prosperity from 1784 until 1820 when ruled by a Governor and Council. It had its period of unjust treatment from 1820 until 1867, when it enjoyed not much more than the privilege of grumbling. On local works, they received only a fair share of the amount expended, but they complained, and with reason, that they had not expended on public works, chargeable to public account, on which they had to pay interest in other parts of this Dominion, a proportion of that which the people of other sections enjoyed. There was also a period of hopeful appeal to the Local Legislature and to the Dominion Parliament for aid for public works on the island; and lately we have arrived at a period of very general sympathy, which extends, I hope, from the Atlantic to the Pacific and which will find expression in expending money for the necessary public improvements required for the distribution of the products of our island. I think that in all those circumstances our people were patient beyond measure, and they now look hopefully forward to better treatment in the future. I beg now to appeal to all the nationalities in this Dominion, except the heathen Chinese, and to all religious denominations as well, for sympathy, and to all political parties in this Dominion, for aid in securing the money necessary to give us railroads and improvements, on harbors, and breakwaters, which

are necessary for the development of the inexhaustible resources of our highly favored island.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I am sure this House has listened with great interest to the hon. gentleman, and with more approbation of the general line of his speech, which is no more than it deserves, from the elaborate history he has given of the birth, parentage and education of Cape Breton. I fancy the hon. gentleman feels that he has gained what he desired to gain by bringing the position of Cape Breton and its wrongs before this House. I do not think, however, that this House is prepared to vote for this resolution as it stands, because I do not think we are sufficiently well acquainted with the wars between Nova Scotia and Cape Breton to decide which was in the wrong. To vote for the adoption of this resolution would be merely stating, among other things, that Nova Scotia has wronged and tyrannised over the people and crushed the energies of Cape Breton. Well, that may be so, but I do not think the House is prepared, without giving a study equal to that of the hon. gentleman on the subject, to declare that Cape Breton has been so deeply injured by the Province of Nova Scotia. We had great pleasure in hearing the hon. gentleman's speech, and we will have still greater pleasure in perusing it at our leisure in *Hansard*, and after we have studied it fully we will be in a position to decide how far Nova Scotia has injured Cape Breton, and what are the best means of redressing the wrongs of that interesting island. So far as Parliament is concerned, we have tried to get at Cape Breton by the extension of the line towards Canso, and that extension being, I may say, finished, I hope we will succeed in extending it across the straits to Sydney, or Louisburg, or some other point, perhaps to be selected by the hon. gentleman. Everything has been done in that direction, and I hope that the great capabilities of Cape Breton will be developed ere long by the construction of a railway through the island which will bring it into immediate and easy connection with the rest of the Dominion. I hope the hon. gentleman will be satisfied with the statement of his case, and will withdraw the motion.

Mr. CAMERON. In view of the remarks made by the right hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, and with the consent of the House, I beg leave to withdraw the resolution for the present.

Motion agreed to, and resolution withdrawn.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE NORTH SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. McCALLUM moved for:

Copies of all reports, correspondence and surveys, if any, in the Department of Public Works as to the improvement of the North Saskatchewan river for the purpose of navigation.

He said: I make this motion in the interests of the people of the North-West, as well as in the interests of the whole Dominion. I understand that we can navigate that river now at certain seasons of the year for a distance of a thousand miles, and it is desirable that we should have a thorough survey of that river to see if it is capable of improvement. Since we have acquired that territory the Government of this country have expended only \$20,000 in the improvement of that river, in removing boulders and taking obstructions out of it. According to the information we have, for 800 miles along that river the land is fit for settlement, the climate is excellent, and the soil produces good crops. I have myself been as far north as Edmonton, that is 200 miles north of Calgary; I was there in harvest time, and I know that the land produces first rate crops. Edmonton at the head of navigation is quite an important place—it is a large village. Out of the river gold is taken; coal is obtained from the river banks, and splendid crops grow on the lands adjoining the river. It was formerly

considered, and it was stated in this House, that the Canadian Pacific Railway had chosen the wrong route to the Rockies and thence to British Columbia. It was considered that the line should have crossed the narrows of Lake Manitoba and been carried through the Yellow Head Pass. I spent two months last summer in that country, and I am satisfied that in the interests of this country the Canadian Pacific Railway is properly located, for this reason: The road passes through what I call the southerly portion of the fertile belt. A glance at the map will show that the main Saskatchewan and North Saskatchewan run almost parallel with the railway at a distance of some hundred miles, and when that river is properly opened for navigation there will be two highways for that country. All the branches to build from the Canadian Pacific Railway running northward go to that river. We are now chartering roads to cross the Saskatchewan, and all these lines will be feeders to the Canadian Pacific Railway and not opposing railways. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the Dominion Government deserve the thanks of the people for the manner in which they have carried on the work, for the way in which the railway had been built, for the manner in which the country has been opened up and for the way in which they are dealing with settlers. While Government have done so much, I trust they have not yet done all they intend to do. The railway is going to be finished. I further hope that the Government will place a sufficient sum in the estimates to secure a complete survey of the Saskatchewan River. I call the attention of the Government to this matter, and particularly the attention of the able Minister of Public Works, and I trust a sum will be placed in the estimates for the improvement of that great river. In my examination of that country I could not, of course, go all along that river; and I regret that I am able to find very little information with respect to it. It has been navigated for 1,000 miles at a certain season of the year, but you cannot go to the head waters with a craft drawing eighteen inches. Anyone acquainted with water carriage is aware that you cannot carry freight or passengers with only a depth of eighteen inches. Before the Canadian Pacific Railway was built 8 cents per lb. was paid for the transportation of goods from Winnipeg to Edmonton, or in other words, \$160 per ton. Since the railway has been built, the rate has been reduced one half. It cost 1½ cents per lb. last summer to take freight from Winnipeg to Calgary, and 2½ cents per lb. to take freight from Calgary to Edmonton, a distance of 200 miles. If the Government would spend \$100 a mile on the trail from Edmonton to Calgary that expenditure would make a first class road. You can go three-quarters of the distance in your slippers, for it is like walking over a carpet. In some places there are some little creeks and sloughs which will have to be bridged, and that is all that is wanted to make the trail a first-class road. It is a very easy country through which to build a railway. I did not see so much of the Saskatchewan country as I desired, but I have here a report made to the Manitoba Legislature by Mr. Thomas Spence, and I cannot do better than read a portion of it. Mr. Spence says in regard to the Saskatchewan country of which I have been speaking:

"Considering the character of the Saskatchewan and its country it will be advisable to limit this pamphlet to a brief description of the best localities in its country suitable for more immediate settlement. Ascending from its mouth at Lake Winnipeg there are over two miles of strong current up to the Grand Rapids, which are nearly three miles in length, with a descent of 43½ feet."

Those rapids form the principal obstruction to the river. The descent mentioned could easily be overcome by building three or four locks, and then there would be free river navigation from Edmonton to Winnipeg. Mr. Spence continues:

"The country in the vicinity of the Grand Rapids has a considerable depth of good soil, and the banks of the river are high; there is also abundance of timber for fuel and building and game of all kinds, and
Mr. McCALLUM.

between this point and the lake would be very favorable for the establishment of fisheries. The Pas mission, situated at the mouth of the Pasquia, is about eighty-five miles in a direct line from Lake Winnipeg; the banks here are ten or twelve feet high at low water, and the soil a rich dark mould over a drift clay. At this place there is at present a small but prosperous settlement, and a Church of England mission has been established for many years.

"The next most favorable country for agriculture commences at a point about 140 miles above this, the soil being rich and the timber of a fair quality, the soil consists of a rich alluvial deposit, 10 feet in thickness above the water on both sides of the river, and well wooded with large poplar, balsam, spruce and birch, some of the poplars measuring 2½ feet in diameter. This character of country continues till approaching Fort La Corne, about 150 miles, and is well watered and drained by many fine creeks. A few miles west of this is the new and flourishing settlement of Prince Albert, situated on the south side of the north branch of the Saskatchewan, about 45 miles below Carleton. This settlement extends for about 30 miles along the Saskatchewan, the farms fronting on the river and extending back two miles. The settlers, though principally Scotch, are composed of English, Irish, German, Norwegians, Americans and Canadians. This settlement has increased rapidly, especially within the last two years, and now number about 300 souls, and the people are beginning to farm extensively. . . . The North and South Saskatchewan run in a north-easterly direction for about 120 miles before they unite. The channels are almost parallel, and with an average distance of 20 to 25 miles apart. The land between the rivers is all good. Along the south side of the south branch the land also is good and fertile."

"The country drained by the north branch of the Saskatchewan from Prince Albert up to Edmonton—a distance of over 500 miles by the river—as well as that by its extensive tributary, the Battle River, is of a general uniform character, more or less interspersed with woods sufficient for many years to come, but not sufficient to supply the wants of a large population; but this drawback will be overcome with the gradual development of the country and opening up of the vast coal deposits and the forests westward on its immediate banks; and by river or rail coal can be carried in all directions for every purpose; and it is highly probable that we have the most extensive, perhaps the finest coal fields in the world."

I might go on reading other portions of this report, but I do not desire to weary the House. I ask the House whether it is not necessary that people settling along that great river should have communication afforded in order that they may get the produce of their labor to market. I believe the Government, at an expenditure of less than one million dollars, can make the navigation of that river profitable in the interests of that country.

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

After Recess.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 15) to continue an Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. McDougald, Pictou.)

THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 6) to further amend the law of evidence in criminal cases.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)

Bill (No. 11) an Act to extend the jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Allen.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 94) to incorporate the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCallum.)

REFUND OF RAILWAY BONUSES IN ONTARIO.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Wilson—

For copies of petitions from the County Council of the County of Elgin, praying for a general measure of relief to Municipalities of Ontario which have aided railways declared to be for Dominion purposes by granting bonuses to them.

Mr. McCALLUM. Before the motion passes I wish to say a few words on this question. The County of Elgin has made a complaint to this House, and asks that this House should reimburse that county for the amount she has spent

in railway bonuses. In the first place, I believe that the county of Elgin and the city of St. Thomas took stock in the London and Port Stanley Railway to the amount of \$140,000, which amount they got pretty largely returned to them from the municipal loan of Ontario. They gave a large bonus to the Canada Southern Railway, and to the Credit Valley Railway, and having got these two roads they come here and ask that the House should repay them the money they expended in getting those advantages for their city and county. I remember passing through the city of St. Thomas, and though I came to the conclusion that the people deserve a great deal of credit for the assistance they gave these railways which had the effect of making St. Thomas a city, still I think they have already been well repaid for that expenditure. The mere fact that these two roads were declared to be roads for the general advantage of Canada is in my opinion no excuse for them asking the House to reimburse them for money they spent for their own advantage. I repeat that the people of that county deserve a great deal of credit for their enterprise, but I strongly object to the people whom I have the honor of representing in this House being asked to pay money to reimburse the county of Elgin for the advantages they have got. In fact, I think they have a good deal of, shall I say cheek, to ask that that money shall be repaid them. Why, Sir, the 162 municipalities which have aided railways want to have 591 other municipalities pay for improvements which they made. The hon. member for South Middlesex (Mr. Armstrong) said the other night that he thought there was something in my remarks until he analysed them, and he said that he was the agent of these people. Well, if the agents do not do what is right, if they squander the people's money, the agents themselves may be dismissed for not doing their duty. These hon. gentlemen are trying to make a political matter of this question. Where did it originate? First in the Local Government of Ontario, and next in the county of Oxford, and now they come to this House with a view of stirring up political feeling. The boundary question having been settled, they now want to raise another row. But they cannot raise a plea of that sort, because the people of Ontario will not be satisfied with relief to 162 municipalities until it reaches the other 591. The members for the county of Elgin think they have a special claim on the Dominion Government. Why, I was told the other night that I should not say anything on this question because I happened to live in the neighborhood of the Welland Canal, on which a large amount of public money was expended. It is true, there was a large expenditure there in the interest of the country; but if any man will look at the Public Accounts he will find that there has been a large amount of money expended for the benefit of the county of Elgin. I have a return showing the amount expended in the neighborhood of the County of Elgin, to enable the people there to take the products of their labor to market. Previous to Confederation there was expended \$310,537, and since Confederation \$258,574. in all \$569,111, over half a million dollars. Yet the hon. members from that county now complain; and because they happened to help themselves a little they want the rest of the country to reimburse them. Why, Sir, I can call this nothing but parish politics; and we had a whole day devoted to it the other day. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) found fault with this Government because he said they had taken away roads belonging to the Province of Ontario. But the people have got the roads, and they have got better service than they could have in any other way; they have three or four trains a day where they used to have only one. Sir, what do the people in the hon. gentleman's own county say about this matter? I see that the hon. member for West Elgin is not in his seat; but one of the papers of St. Thomas, in that county, the *St. Thomas Times*, says:

"A word with regard to the Canada Southern. Mr. Casey saw fit the other day to make a demand on behalf of the county and city for a return by the Government of the amount of aid granted to that road. The return given is the same as that urged as to the other roads—that the Dominion has taken it over. We wonder if Mr. Casey, when urging this demand upon Sir John Macdonald's Government, recollected the time and manner of the Canada Southern's being taken over. His constituents will recognise the inconsistency of his position when we point out that the Canada Southern Railway was taken over in 1874 by the Mackenzie Government without a word of protest from Mr. Casey! Mr. Mackenzie himself brought in the Bill on the ground that as there were some bills for bridges connected with the road before Parliament, it was deemed advisable to assimilate the jurisdictions. Sir John Macdonald appears to have been the only one who raised any question as to the bill. Mr. Casey had nothing to say against it, and nothing has been said against it from that day to this, when Mr. Casey gets up to demand \$225,000 for this county and city from the Government for having passed the Bill brought in by his leader, Mr. Mackenzie, and supported by himself! Could inconsistency go farther?"

To prove that this is all true, I have the Act of Parliament here for taking over the road; but it is not necessary to read it, as it is admitted; and I ask, could inconsistency go further, when the hon. member for West Elgin comes before this House and urges it as a sin against this Government that it did what the Government he was supporting for five years itself did? Does the hon. gentleman think we have short memories? Any one listening to this discussion would imagine that the Province of Ontario was not in the Dominion of Canada at all. Why, Sir, the hon. member for West Elgin the other night said that we were giving bonuses to railroads that we had no more interest in than in building a railway to the moon.

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. McCALLUM. Well, I often think, from the actions of hon. gentlemen opposite, in trying to belittle the country in every way and to make out that it is poverty stricken, that some of them are moonstruck, and I am more convinced of it now than ever when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) says "hear, hear" in approval of that. Another gentleman on that side of the House got up and said that we had as much right to ask a bonus from the State of Maine to build a railway through this country. The hon. member for West Elgin says that we pay in full for this road from here to Montreal. We only pay \$12,000 a mile. Suppose the Canadian Pacific Railway had stopped at Callander, what good would it be to this country? Is it not necessary that it should reach tide water, and that the whole line from the Atlantic to the Pacific should be under the control of one company? If we paid \$12,000 a mile in order to get a through line to tide water, I think it is nothing more than we ought to do. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Wilson), I must say, is a little more consistent than the hon. member for West Elgin. I had the honor of having a seat with that gentleman in the Legislature of Ontario, when that Government, which the hon. member for Lambton the other night said was the best Government under the sun, commenced to bonus railways, in order to make political capital, and in order, if it is parliamentary to say so, to buy up the members of that day. But to the honor of the hon. member for East Elgin be it said, he did not support his leader in that course. He voted against him on every occasion except when there was a vote of want of confidence, and I believe he voted against him sometimes then. Now, the Government of Ontario have spent their money and are face to face with direct taxation, and they come down and ask this Government to reimburse them. They talk about party politics. Why, Sir, the very expenditure of public money on railways in the Province of Ontario which was commenced when the leader of the Opposition came into power there, was in the interest of party politics. Any man who looks at the Journals of that House of that day, will find that he turned out Sandfield Macdonald's Government by a majority of one, and in less than two weeks he turned that majority into a majority of twenty-five.

Why, Sir, every man had a railway Bill, but to the honor of the hon. member for East Elgin, he did not support those appropriations. They spent that money, and they were not satisfied with the amount of money that had been voted, but they mortgaged the Province of Ontario for twenty years for \$100,000 a year; and, as I said the other night, they had to borrow money last year to pay some of those loans. They had to sell annuities in order to get money to meet this expenditure. I was told by the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Lister) that we had the greatest Government in the Dominion in the Province of Ontario. He may be in love with that Government, but I do not think the people of Ontario will show any love for it long. That hon. gentleman ventured to adopt the role of a prophet and prophesied that we would not come back to this House unless we supported this motion. I should think that a young member of this House, no matter how able he might be, ought to hesitate before adopting that role. I venture to say that if I want to come back to Parliament, my vote on this question will not only not prevent my return but will assist it. I venture to say that the people will endorse the stand I take, when I say that we should not allow 162 municipalities to rob 591. That is the position I take, I say that in this matter we have a duty to perform towards the whole Dominion as well as to the municipalities, and we must not shirk performing that duty. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that I am very much like my hon. friend from Hastings; they say I would like to do away with Local Governments altogether. I have never expressed any such opinion in the country, but I say that if the different Local Legislatures decide, if it should be the wish of the people that we should have legislative union, it would be a question for them to consider. I hope we have had enough of these parish politics, I hope this discussion will finish tonight, and I am satisfied this resolution will turn out to be a boomerang that will rebound to those who throw it; I am certain that when this question is put to the people of Ontario they will not take the stand expected by hon. gentlemen opposite. I protest against the Dominion giving the municipalities assistance in this shape because to do so, they will require to rob the other municipalities, and I will continue to protest against any such course being adopted until I hear better arguments for it than have been advanced so far.

Mr. WILSON. I wish to correct the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) in his statement that the riding I have the honor to represent borrowed the sum of \$140,000, and that we obtained the money from the Municipal Loan Fund. I have the satisfaction to tell the hon. gentleman that we did not get a single dollar from the Municipal Loan Fund, either that time or subsequently, having borrowed the money from a loan society, and, unlike some other municipalities, we paid every dollar we borrowed; we borrowed it from private sources and were called to pay the principal and interest when they became due, so that the statement that we had borrowed our money from the Municipal Loan Fund was utterly incorrect.

Mr. McCALLUM. I did not say you did; I said it was paid from the Municipal Loan Fund.

Mr. WILSON. I accept the hon. gentleman's denial, but I must say I took his statement down and am quoting him correctly. If he says we received the amount we expended on the construction of the road from the Municipal Loan Fund, he is as far in error in that statement as he was in the one I charged him with. He ought to know that none of the municipalities, even those that borrowed from the Municipal Loan Fund, received more than \$2 per capita and a certain consideration on account of the money

Mr. McCALLUM.

they had expended on railways. Further, he says that we ought to have but very little to say in the matter, because in the county I represent we have been greatly benefited by the railway, that we are in an enviable position, having splendid railway facilities, and that St. Thomas is now a city when a few years ago it was but a small village. Well, if we are in that position, we gained it by the energy and devotion of our people to the interests of their county. They were not, perhaps, like the people of the constituency he represents, anxious to hoard up their funds and expend but a small pittance, some \$20,000, to improve their locality. The hon. gentleman is the last man who should say he was bold enough and would dare to vote against doing justice to the people of Ontario. I have not a Government at my back as he has which would readily gerrymander a constituency for me and make my seat safe in the future; but on the contrary, I represent a constituency that has been gerrymandered in the interests of my opponent and to keep me out of the position I have the honor to occupy. The hon. gentleman referred to the amount of money expended on the Welland Canal. No one in that part of the country, from one end of Welland Canal to the other, knows better than the hon. gentleman what money has been expended in opening up the Welland Canal. Further, he states that I, while a member of the Local Legislature, opposed railway grants, which I admit, and I did so on the same principle and for the same cause which leads me to oppose them now. The hon. gentleman gave the whole of his party away in saying that in the Local Legislature grants to railways were brought down—for what purpose? For a purpose I would hesitate to mention in addressing members of a Legislature—for the purpose of corruptly influencing their votes. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the resolutions brought in here last Session were brought in for this purpose? If he applies such a charge to the members of the Local Legislature he must give it equal application to the members of this House. Had the railway resolutions introduced here last Session the effect of corrupting members of this Legislature and inducing them to vote for grants they would not otherwise support. I do not wish to apply the charge made by the hon. member to the representatives and supporters of the Reform Government of Ontario, to hon. members of this House. I could hardly believe that they would be induced to record their votes, under these circumstances, in any way other than what they conceived to be in the best interests of the Dominion, but we may have seen votes recorded which, if the resolutions had been brought down individually, might have been recorded differently, but I as an individual have always believed, and still believe it, to be a vicious principle, that any Legislature should be asked to vote in reference to a large number of railways at one time. The system adopted by the Local Legislature was far superior to the system adopted here. Each Order in Council was brought down, the papers in connection with the railway which was to receive aid were printed and laid on the table of each member, so that he might have an opportunity of looking over them and coming to a correct conclusion as to whether he considered that the road should or should not receive aid. Here we had nothing but a resolution presented to the House, we had no opportunity of forming a conclusion whether the roads proposed to be aided were entitled to aid or not, whether they were in the general interest or not. I therefore say that the system proposed to this House in 1883 was, in my opinion, a very vicious system, and it was not only proposed in 1883 but followed up last Session, and if we are to have each and every Session resolutions of this kind proposing aid to various and sundry railways, I fear that some members of this Legislature may at times be compelled to record

their votes in a way other than they would if they were left free to choose their own course. As I have said, I did not intend to make any further remarks about this question, and I would not have done so had it not been for the special reference the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) felt it necessary to make in reference to myself.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 4) to provide for the distribution of assets of insolvent debtors.—(Mr. Curran.)

PUNISHMENT OF SEDUCTION.

Mr. CHARLTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 27) to provide for the punishment of seduction and like offences. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I ask permission of the House briefly to call attention to its provisions. The 1st section provides for the punishment of seduction under the promise of marriage of any unmarried female of previously chaste character of 21 years of age, and provides that, in case of the marriage of the parties, it may be pleaded in bar of conviction. Section 2 provides that it shall be a misdemeanor to effect a feigned or pretended marriage. The 3rd section provides that it shall be a misdemeanor to inveigle or entice any female of virtuous and chaste character into a house of ill-fame. The 4th section provides that the evidence of the female shall be corroborated by other material evidence. The 5th section provides that the evidence of the party accused shall be taken. The 6th section provides that no prosecution under the Act shall be commenced after the expiration of one year from the time of committing the offence. The punishment for these offences is two years in the penitentiary or a less term in any other place of imprisonment. This Bill has been introduced on three previous occasions. It had passed the House of Commons on each occasion, but has failed hitherto to secure a majority in the Senate. I think I may assert that public sentiment is in favor of this Bill; the expressions of public sentiment, so far as they have been made, have been strongly in favor of this Bill. Some of the religious bodies during the past season have taken ground in favor of it. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church passed a resolution strongly endorsing the position taken in this Bill, and that resolution passed without a dissenting voice. The principle of the Bill is not a novel one. A law substantially of this character has existed in various countries and does at this time exist. In most of the European countries it exists in some modified form, and it also exists in nearly every one of the American States, and I shall call attention to a Bill much more stringent than this which was reported from the House of Lords in England to the House of Commons in 1883. The scope of the Bill is a narrow one. It only deals with two offences, seduction under the promise of marriage and a feigned or mock marriage. It has been said that the Bill does not provide any punishment for the woman. Well, the Bill in this case provides only for offences which may have been committed by means of false pretences or by a mock marriage, and I do not think it can be argued that, in either of these cases, the female is a guilty party in any sense whatever. The Bill which I mentioned as having been reported from the House of Lords will be found in the volume of Lords' Papers, Public Bills, Volume 3, of 1883.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It did not pass.

Mr. CHARLTON. It did not pass the Commons last Session, but I am not certain that it has not passed this Session. We have no record of the Bill. But I will call attention to the Bill as it passed the House of Lords. It

was entitled "An Act for the protection of women and girls." The second section of the Bill provides, that

"Any person who procures or endeavors to procure any woman under twenty-one years of age to become, either within or without the Queen's dominions, a common prostitute; or procures or endeavors to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom, or to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom, for the purpose of entering a brothel abroad, whether he shall or shall not inform the woman or girl of such purpose, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

The third clause provides:

"Any person who by fraud, intimidation or false pretence",—

Such pretences as are covered by this Bill.—

"False representations, or other fraudulent means, procures, or endeavors to procure, any woman or girl to have illicit and carnal connections, either within or without the Queen's dominions, with any man, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."

The fourth section provides that it shall be a felony to have carnal connection with a girl under 12 years of age; and the fifth section provides that it shall be a misdemeanor to seduce any girl under 16 years of age, and it shall be a criminal assault even if the purpose is accomplished with her own consent. The Bill is much more stringent than the Bill now under the consideration of this House. It is a Bill that passed the House of Lords by a large majority, and I cannot doubt that this Bill will become the law of England, if it is not already the law of England. It was reported from the House of Lords to the House of Commons in 1883. We have not the Journals of the House for the Sessions of 1884; the Bill probably reached the House too late to be acted on in 1883. This Bill reported by the House of Lords, is entirely in consonance with the legislation of the most civilised states to-day. As I said last Session in advocating the proposition of this Bill, the law exists in various forms, and in almost every instance in a more stringent form, than the Bill under the consideration of this House. It exists in almost every one of the American States, and in many of those States it has been on the Statute-books for many years. In the State of New York, I think it has been on the Statute-book for over forty years; a very stringent law providing punishment both by fine and imprisonment—five years imprisonment and \$5,000 fine, either one or both, in the discretion of the court. This law has been found to work so well that in no single case has there been any agitation for its repeal in any State where it exists, and where it has been on the Statute-book for many years. I think the experience of other countries in this matter will lead us to believe that the law is perfectly safe, perfectly proper. Certainly in this country the law with reference to offences of this kind is in a most unsatisfactory state. I shall not detain the House by a lengthy argument of the Bill. It has been under the consideration of the House now for three Sessions, and has been fully discussed, and I have no doubt the members of the House have their minds made up as to the propriety or necessity of passing this Bill. I have the honor to move that the Bill be now read the second time.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. In looking at this Bill while I object to several of the clauses, I think the second and third clauses are sufficient, in my opinion, to save the Bill. The second clause is this:

"Any man who procures a feigned or pretended marriage between himself and any woman, or any man who knowingly aids or assists in procuring such feigned or pretended marriage, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be punished as hereinafter provided."

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me if there is a crime in the world that ought to be punished, it is where a man gets up a pretended marriage, and induces an honest woman to believe that he is about to make her his wife; and gets a man under pretence of being a clergyman, for instance, who

is not a clergyman, to perform a mock marriage, and induces her, honestly believing that she is becoming his wife, to submit to this pretended marriage, and all the unfortunate consequences that must arise on the proof that the marriage is feigned. I think this clause of itself is quite sufficient to save the Bill. Then I think also that the third clause is a good one, which provides that any person who shall inveigle or entice any female of a virtuous or chaste character into improper places shall be punished. I think these two clauses, at all events, are sufficient to save this Bill from being thrown out. With that view, and in consequence of these two clauses being in that Bill, I shall vote for the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

BANKING AND LOAN FACILITIES.

Mr. ORTON moved second reading of Bill (No. 36) to provide banking and loan facilities to those employed in agricultural pursuits. He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill I shall not repeat some of the remarks I have made before in this House on this subject. I may state that the chief object of this Bill is to remove certain disabilities under which the farmers of Canada labor in not having the same banking facilities that are afforded to other classes of our community. I desire to point out that though the wealth produced by the agricultural class in this country can be manipulated and handled by a large class of middlemen, with all the facilities that a proper banking system can afford, the very farmers who produce this wealth, and who enable these manipulators to operate, have not that facility which should be afforded their industry in this country. That is one of the chief objects of this Bill. Another object is to enable the agriculturalists of our country to co-operate one with another in providing banking facilities and loan societies so that they may not be obliged to pay more than a reasonable rate of interest for the accommodation that we hope to give them under this Bill. Now, Sir, a few years ago I had the honor to move a Bill in this House the object of which was to remove certain great grievances under which the farmers of this country labored in consequence of the exorbitant rates of interest charged by loan societies. A Bill was passed which had a partial effect in that direction, but owing to certain opposition in this House it did not go as far as it ought to have gone, and we find to-day that some of the evils that we attempted to remove by that Bill have not been as thoroughly removed as they should be. This Bill proposes to remove some of those disabilities. One of them I shall refer to more especially, and that is the difficulty under which farmers labor when they desire to have mortgages removed from their property. This Bill proposes to give power to establish loan societies or banks which will loan to the farmers and give them an opportunity of being relieved from their loans at a short notice. Now a great deal of dispute arose with reference to the time that should be allowed for a farmer to get relief from a mortgage, and it was argued that he should be bound hand and foot to his bond for five years. Under the old system there was a 20 year or a long term plan in existence which was very injurious to those who borrowed largely, from the fact that when they desired to take up their loans, through their property becoming so cumbersome in their hands, and desired to obtain loans on more favorable terms, they had to pay a high rate of interest to the mortgagee in order to get that relief. In other words, instead of the mortgagees allowing them the same rate of interest for the money which they had to pay in order to get that relief, the capitalists allowed them but half the rate of interest which they charged for the loan. I am sorry to say that this same process is in operation to a

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

very large extent to-day, not only by loan societies, but also by private individuals. I know of cases in my own county where loans are made upon the same system, that is that instalments are made payable either yearly, half yearly, quarterly or monthly, and if the unfortunate borrower is not able to meet the instalments as they become due, he is liable to be punished by those who hold mortgages against the borrowers' property. This is certainly one of the most outrageous grievances the people of this country have to endure. Although this Bill does not give full relief, because it is not retrospective in its action, it at all event affords an opportunity, if these banks are carried on upon the principle I have suggested or any other principle that can be devised by this House, of paying off loans for any period on three months' notice being given; and it will relieve the farmers from a great hardship under which they suffer, for it will provide a banking institution from which they can borrow small sums of money, from \$10 to \$500, in order to carry on their operations, and can obtain those loans at a reasonable rate of interest and at short dates. I believe, if this Bill should be adopted by the House, both the position of the Government and the positions of the shareholders and borrowers will be met. I do not say that this Bill is framed with that wisdom and precision which would characterize a Bill framed by one thoroughly versed in all the intricacies of banking institutions. But so far as my humble ability goes, I have endeavored to incorporate in this Bill the great principles which have been applied for this purpose in other countries. So seriously is this question viewed in Great Britain that last year it was ordered by Lord Granville that a report should be furnished the House of Commons of the operations of banking institutions based on almost identically the same principles as those of the present Bill. That report has been made; it is a very interesting document, and is well worthy of perusal by hon. members who desire to see the farmers of our country prosperous, and when I say that I think the phrase covers the general prosperity of the people of Canada. I will not detain the House by further remarks, but will simply move the second reading of the Bill, which, I trust, will receive that consideration which I hope and believe it deserves.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, AMENDMENT.

Mr. FOSTER moved second reading of Bill (No. 58) to amend the Liquor License Act, 1883. He said: I desire to make a few remarks with respect to the very short amendment I propose to make to the Liquor License Act, 1883. So far as printed it reads simply as follows:—

"Section one hundred and forty-five of the Liquor License Act, 1883, is hereby repealed."

That, however, does not meet the whole of the case, and I propose, when this Bill goes into Committee, to add the following:

"And it is hereby declared that the true intent and meaning of the Liquor License Act of 1883 was and is that the provisions of 'The Canada Temperance Act, 1878,' relating to offences, penalties and punishments, and the procedure relating thereto, were not and are not affected or impaired by any provisions of the Liquor License Act, 1883, or any Act amending the same."

The difficulty that has arisen is simply this: That section 145 of the Liquor License Act, 1883, with which this amendment deals, has been held by the Supreme Court of New Brunswick to have repealed the penalties and procedure of the Canada Temperance Act. A large number of cases which were brought up by the different inspectors appointed under the Liquor License Act, 1883, were carried before that court, and in their decisions the judges have ruled as I have stated. It might not at first sight seem to be, even though that ruling be held to be true, an unmixed evil or an evil that had to be remedied, because under that

judgment it was possible to take the forms and procedure of the Liquor License Act, 1883. But that is not what is wished, that is not what was contemplated. The procedure with respect to the Canada Temperance Act has been fought out in the courts from 1879 to 1883, and the different points have been very fully gone over, and have been, in the main, settled. To go from that to the procedure under the Liquor License Act, 1883, which is new, would make it necessary to fight over those technical points again, and that is not a good thing to do, and therefore it is of very great moment to the different counties and cities which have adopted the Canada Temperance Act, and those which may adopt it hereafter that this matter should be made clear, and that there should be no doubt as to the procedure or the penalties of the Canada Temperance Act holding good. It was not the intention of the framers of the Liquor License Act of 1873, and not at all the intention of Parliament, that the Canada Temperance Act should be impaired in any of its provisions. In fact that was implicitly stated in a section which preceded this. But section 145 has been held by the Supreme Court to have done that, and it is to remedy that state of things that I propose this amendment.

Mr. WELDON. Of course there is no doubt that a great conflict has taken place between the Canada Temperance Act and the Liquor License Act of 1883. I do not propose to oppose the amendment, but I think it should not apply to cases which have been before the court. There are a number of cases which are considered to be settled, and if this clause is repealed without any proviso those cases might be brought up again. That would be contrary to the spirit of justice, and contrary to the principle that cases once having been decided there should be an end of the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) must see from his own statement that we cannot well proceed with the second reading to-night, because he says this Bill as laid before the House is insufficient without an amendment. Now that amendment we have only just heard for the first time, and it states that the true intent and meaning of the Act of 1883 was so and so—and in the face of the decision of a court of competent jurisdiction that the true intent and meaning is otherwise. Therefore, I think we cannot without fully considering the effect in the first place of the judgment—which we will be able to see—and of his amendment, proceed with this Bill. It is a very strong thing for the House to do, in the face of a judgment given by a court, to say that the true intent and meaning of a statute is otherwise than a court has decided. We may come to the conclusion that the court is right, and that therefore the Act should be amended instead of having a declaratory Act providing otherwise than as the court has decided. Perhaps when the matter is fully considered the House may come to the conclusion that the Act is right, that it should be amended as not carrying out the intent of the Legislature. For that reason I think the debate should stand over, that the amendment should be printed on the face of the Votes and Proceedings, and that we should have before us a copy of the judgment of the court, which I suppose we can obtain. With these before us we can do one or two things, either declare that the true intent and meaning of the Act is as the hon. gentleman contends, or that the court is right, and that as the language of the Act failed to carry out the intention of Parliament it should be amended.

Mr. MILLS. I understand that the Supreme Court of Prince Edward Island has taken a different view from the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, so that though the declaration proposed to be made by the hon. gentleman may differ from the judgment of the court in New Brunswick it would be in accord with the decision of the court in Prince

Edward Island. The matter does not therefore exactly stand in the same position as if it were a positive and unsupported declaration by the House that the court was entirely wrong.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I had not heard of the Prince Edward Island decision, but it only gives greater reason for our seeing both judgments and dealing with the whole question.

Mr. MILLS. Yes; but as to what is really necessary in the way of legislation it is for the House and not for the courts to decide, and it may be proper to proceed in some other way than the hon. gentleman proposes. It is very clear it is not desirable to allow a law to remain in a position in which it is not operative. Parliament has an opinion on the subject, and the country has an opinion on the subject, and it would be well, if there is any doubt as to what the meaning of the law is, that it should be made perfectly clear and workable, and it may be so made by a declaratory section such as the hon. gentleman proposes or in some other way; but it would be very undesirable that we should postpone all action until action should become impossible.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; it would have to be one way or the other.

Mr. ORTON. I am not going into the legal points which have been raised with regard to this Bill, but I think what has come up is an important reason why the House should show some hesitation in aiding any legislation on this subject. I think we must all feel that notwithstanding the apparent feeling of the people of this country in favor of the continuance of the Scott Act, the fact that hardly in any county in this country—I think I may say without fear of contradiction in no county or municipality in Canada—in which the Scott Act has been submitted to the people, have a majority of those entitled to vote declared themselves in favor of the Act,—when we recollect that fact, and the other fact that the operation of this Act is bringing ruin and disaster on a large portion of our people who have a right to claim the protection of the Government of Canada simply from the fact that they have been carrying on a legitimate and honorable trade, a trade legalised and authorised, not only by the consent of the people of Canada, but by the whole people of this country, I think we should hesitate before proceeding with legislation in that direction, and we should enquire whether the Act is calculated to carry out the very desirable object which is sought by hon. gentlemen who are such earnest and serious advocates of that Act. I think the time has arrived when it should be demanded and ascertained by the people who are going to suffer financially from the operation of that Act, whether it is really calculated to be a temperance Act or the contrary. If it is calculated to be an Act which will demoralise our people, which will increase intemperance among our people, which will lead to evils which do not exist now, I think the hon. gentleman who is so anxious to agitate for the passage of this Act, if he only found that he was acting in the wrong, would be willing to stop in the further pursuance of that object. I think that is another reason why the amendment tending to increase the operation of the Act should be fully and carefully considered by the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). I trust the promise which has been made by the Premier will be carried out, and that we will have a chance to consider these various amendments to the Canada Temperance Act. This Act has been adopted in a large number of constituencies of the Dominion, and notwithstanding the objections made by the hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton), I think a large section of the people of this country are favorable to the Canada Temperance Act. I rise simply to ask the Premier if he will permit these Bills amending the Canada

Temperance Act to be placed at the head of the Order Paper, so that they may be reached at an early day. Perhaps they might be referred to a special committee. I think it is due to the temperance people of this country that prominence should be given to these measures, and I ask the Premier, on behalf of the temperance men on this side of the House, to use his influence to have these Bills placed at the head of the Order paper. To-day an hon. member asked that a day should be fixed for the discussion of an important Bill with reference to the Factory Act, and I think it would be well that the Premier should, in deference to the temperance men in the House and in the country, give prominence to these measures in order that they may be all discussed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. All I have to say is, if the hon. gentleman desires that my hon. friend's Bill should be thrown over, until all the Bills, relating to the whole question—to the Scott Act and the McCarthy Act—can be discussed, my hon. friend behind me may perhaps lose his Bill. He brings down a Bill with a specific object, and I think, in the interest the hon. gentleman speaks for, he had better speak on this Bill, and not let any extraneous matters come in; otherwise the whole thing may be lost.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne). The most important Bill relating to the Canada Temperance Act, is that containing the amendments asked for by the Dominion Alliance, in the hands of the hon. member for North Lanark (Mr. Jamieson); and I wish to have discussed not only the Bill of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), but also that of the hon. member for North Lanark.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It will be time enough to discuss the Bill when we arrive at it.

Mr. McCARTHY. I only rise to say that if the Liquor Act of 1883 has the effect which one of the superior courts of one of the Provinces says it has, it was certainly not the intention of the framers of the Bill; and I think it right to say that the way in which this double or second section crept in was that the anxiety of the hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster), which I then concurred in, was that the legislation then proposed should not in any way affect the Scott Act. The clause as it was would, perhaps, have been sufficient to have that effect; but the hon. gentleman was very anxious, and the House will remember that it was at the close of the Session that the matter was proposed, and in that way the second clause was put in. I do not make this explanation on my own behalf so much as on behalf of the hon. member for King's, who, I believe, has been assailed for allowing it to slip in designedly or without proper attention.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. McCARTHY moved second reading of Bill (No. 64) to further amend the Patent Act of 1872. He said: The Bill, as I explained when I had the honor of introducing it to the House, is for the purpose of amending one provision of the Patent Act, namely, that particular section which gives to the Minister who has charge of patents jurisdiction to set aside a patent on the grounds mentioned in this section. The Bill provides, as the House will know, the machinery for an appeal, and also makes provision for the examination of witnesses under oath, and for a proper examination by the Minister who is to try and determine the question as to the validity of the patent. Attention has been drawn to the extraordinary provision in the law by a recent case of very great importance, known as the Bell Telephone case. In that case, on complaint being made to

Mr. ROBERTSON (Shelburne).

the Minister, he felt himself compelled—and I do not know but that he was doing quite rightly, if the law is a proper law—to hear the complaint that was made against the Bell Telephone Company, and after hearing evidence to adjudicate and determine upon it; and the result was that he held that the patent was void. Now, that is an extraordinary procedure, and one which I think had better perhaps be swept away from the Statute Book altogether. I am not at all quarrelling with the provisions of the law, or saying that it is not a proper law; but when we have properly constituted courts, with judges who are above suspicion, to hear matters of this kind, I do not think it is necessary that a Minister should retain a jurisdiction such as this section gives him. He is an executive officer, and is necessarily a politician; and for many reasons which are sufficiently obvious, it is evident that this particular kind of jurisdiction should not be in the hands of a Minister or his deputy, but if it is to be in the hands of a Minister, I do not suppose any hon. member will say that there ought not to be an appeal. In the case I mentioned, one man has had the power to determine absolutely that a property valued, as I am told by the proprietors, at something like half a million dollars, is forfeited, and at one stroke of his pen, to sweep it away. Now, whether it be half a million or a quarter of a million dollars, or whatever the value may be, it does appear to me an extraordinary thing that the right of determining the question of property should be vested in one man without the right of appeal. Moreover—and in this I have no doubt I shall receive the support of my hon. friends who stand up for provincial rights, and who are very anxious that no legislation should be had that trenches on the rights of the Provinces—I think it is a very serious question whether the clause to which I refer is not unconstitutional. When a patent is granted under the authority of this Parliament, or by a Department created by this Parliament, that patent becomes a matter of property, and if the property in that patent is taken away, I submit, it can only, and ought only to be taken away according to the law of the Province in which the holder of the patent may reside. Now, this particular clause gives to a Minister, and also to the deputy of that Minister, jurisdiction to try the question as to the validity of the patent. I think the two things can be very easily separated. The one part of the clause which states the terms and conditions on which a patent shall be held is clearly within the competence of this Parliament; but the manner in which the question of the breach of the conditions is to be tried is a matter which appears to be wholly and exclusively within the competence of the Legislatures of the Provinces. To illustrate my meaning: suppose that the patent, instead of being a patent of the kind I mentioned, was a patent of land in the North-West, where we have power to grant patents; I do not suppose any person would contend that in granting a patent of land in the North-West this Parliament could annex to it the condition that in case any dispute arose as to its validity it should be tried in any particular way or before any particular tribunal. I can see no distinction in that respect between a patent of land and a patent of this kind. What I am saying now has no reference to the question as to whether the law should be swept away; but if it is to remain, I do not think anyone will have any objection to the Bill. The first clause provides power to summon witnesses; the fifth clause provides for the power of examining witnesses under oath; the sixth clause gives the power to the Minister to issue a commission to examine witnesses who may not be within his jurisdiction, so as to be summoned by subpoena—and so on. I will not weary the House with details. Objection may be taken to one word in the ninth clause and I am not at all certain that it should not be eliminated: "There shall be an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada from any present or future decision of the Minister." The

right to appeal from "the present decision" will, of course, be retroactive. It is a matter of procedure, but it is questionable whether we should pass anything in the character of retroactive legislation. However, this will be left for the committee to determine. For these reasons I hope the House will accept the principle of the Bill, and in committee any amendments may be made which the House will, in its judgment, think proper.

Mr. COLBY. I do not at all concur in the views expressed by the hon. gentleman. The 28th clause of the Patent Act which he proposes to amend was inserted as a matter of public policy, and the manner of enforcing it was deliberately decided by this Parliament at the time the clause was under consideration. It is very well understood that in England and the United States a patentee is under no obligation to utilise his patent for the public good. He has an absolute proprietary interest in it, whether he uses it or not, during the entire period of the patent. The contract is simply, on his part, that he shall, in his application, in his specification, in his drawings, and in his models, so discover the invention that when his property ceases it becomes public property, so that any person skilled in the arts can then have the full benefit of the invention; but during the life of the patent, in England and the United States, the patentee is under no obligations whatever to use it. He may lock it up; he may prevent any other person from using it or infringing on it; he may give the public no advantage whatever from it, if he chooses. That is not the policy of our law. Our law is more in accordance with that adopted by the continental nations of Europe—France, Belgium, and, I think, Germany. Under our law the contract is a conditional contract. The patentee is to have no right to utilise his invention unless he makes it beneficial to the country which gives him the privilege of utilising it. He must make it beneficial to the country by putting it in operation, by giving the public the advantage to be derived from its use. We deliberately, by this clause 28, make it a condition between the patentee and the public that the patentee must use it in this country under certain conditions, and we further state that the conditions must be entered in the body of the patent itself as conditions of the patent. He takes the patent subject to those conditions, which are in the interest of the public at large. One condition is, that he shall not import that invention after a period of twelve months from the time he takes out his patent. That condition is imposed in the interests of Canadian industry, in order that this country may have the advantage of the manufacture of the invention. Another condition is, that within two years he must cause his invention to be manufactured in some manufactory in Canada, so that any person wishing to obtain it can obtain it at a reasonable price. This condition is subject to modification; it is in the discretion of the commissioner, if proper reasons be advanced, to give the patentee an extension of time; but the principle of the law is distinctly laid down, as a binding condition of the contract itself between the patentee and the public, that he shall not import, after a certain period, and that after a certain other period he shall give this country the benefit of the manufacture of the patent. How is that carried into effect? The law says that the patent may be set aside by the ordinary courts for other reasons, but as regards the violation of this particular clause the Department of Agriculture is the tribunal to decide the question. That provision was made in the interest of the people of this country and of the manufacturing industries of this country. Any question arising under it can be but a simple question of fact; it can be but a question as to whether the invention has or has not been imported after the period of twelve months, or as to whether it has been, or has not been manufactured in the Dominion within the

period of two years. Both are simple questions of fact, with all the proof of which the respondent himself, the party charged with having voided his own patent, is fully seized. If he has not imported or has not manufactured, or if he has imported or has manufactured, the facts are clearly to be shown by his own books. Why was this not put into the hands of the ordinary courts? Why was it not made a question on which the ordinary tribunals could pass, beginning with the original court, thence to the Court of Appeal, thence to the Supreme Court, and finally to the Privy Council? The reason is evident. It was simply to protect the people, to protect the manufacturers of this country, to protect those who may desire to manufacture and work an invention in their own interests and the interest of the public, because these men would not enter on the formidable task of attempting to break down a patent if they saw they would be compelled to go from one court to the other, ending with the Privy Council, and probably be kept in the courts for years. The Department of Agriculture is the place, the tribunal, a cheap and summary tribunal; there every man, without the intervention of an attorney, without the intervention of my learned friend who introduces this Bill, dispensing with that valuable class of people, may go before the Minister of Agriculture, where the patent is, and where the model is, and where the proofs are, and make out his *prima facie* case that this patent has been voided on these two questions of simple fact; and then the Minister can call up the other party and satisfy himself with regard to the case. There are no abstruse legal points whatever to be decided but a simple question of facts; and if any incidental question of law should arise the Minister of Agriculture has the advice of the Minister of Justice at his disposal, who is in a position to give a legal decision. My hon. friend who introduced this Bill was worsted recently in a case he had before the Minister of Agriculture. He is not now a Daniel come to judgment. But my hon. friend's colleague, in speaking of other decisions of the Minister of Agriculture, did not speak of them at all in a disparaging way. His colleague, Mr. Cameron, who was an associate with him in this important case, said, on a former occasion:

"This interpretation has gone forth to the world. It is to be found in every patent office, and in every patent and solicitor's office. * * * It is, moreover, a decision which has received the approval of our highest courts."

That was a decision in a previous case, not in the last case.—

"It has received the approval of the Court of Appeal in Ontario, and it has received the approval of the Supreme Court, who not only have endorsed the conclusions, but have endorsed the reasons given by Mr. Taché, in what is described as his able judgment."

My hon. friend's colleague had no fault to find with the decision of that tribunal. My hon. friend's associate speaks of them as able decisions, which have received the approval of all the courts; but in this last unfortunate decision, in which my hon. friend's client was injured, the matter was a very serious one, and what is the serious effect and consequence? The serious consequence is simply this, that a great and gigantic monopoly has been broken down in this country; that the people of Canada, by the wise decision, the just decision, the careful and unexceptionable decision of the Minister of Agriculture, find that a gigantic monopoly has been broken down, which my friend in this Bill wishes to revive—for he makes it applicable to present decisions—and the people of Canada for all time to come are to have cheap telephoning instead of paying the excessive rates they would have had to pay had not these patents been voided. There could not be a better case in point. Would any weak company, desiring to give cheap service to the people of Canada, have ventured to attack that great monopoly, with all its wealth, if they had known that they were to be

dragged from one court to another, from the original court to the Court of Appeal, and from the Court of Appeal to the Supreme Court, and from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council? I say that the very case which he cites as a case which justifies the modification of this law, is a case, of all others, which shows the absolute necessity of this law, if the people of Canada and the manufacturers of Canada are to have the advantages which the Legislature intended them to have, and which it is wise and in the interests of all the people of this country that they should have. The whole effect of that law will be nullified. We have a model room. A manufacturer goes into that room and sees something which he can manufacture conveniently in connection with his own industries. He goes to the office and asks: Who is the patentee? Is this thing being manufactured in Canada? If not, I desire to manufacture it. He satisfies himself that it is not being manufactured, and he lays his *prima facie* case before the Minister of Agriculture. He can do it without the intervention of any solicitor. He can go himself and can fill up documents which he can obtain. Then the Minister of Agriculture calls for the patentee and the matter of fact is sifted, and this man can then go on, having voided that patent, and utilise, for his own advantage and for the advantage of the people of Canada, this invention which the patentee bound himself, when he obtained his patent, to give to the people of Canada. Would that poor man, that man of ordinary means, that manufacturer, venture on that if he saw he was under the necessity of employing able counsel like my hon. friend, the introducer of this Bill, and was liable to be taken from court to court and to be kept a long time waiting for a decision? He would not. Then the whole beneficial effect of this law would be nullified by making it a matter for the courts. The Legislature foresaw this, and saw that the only way to make the 28th clause useful to the country, the only way by which it could be carried out beneficially to the manufacturers and the enterprising men of this country, was to provide some cheap, some summary and easy and speedy remedy by which these questions of fact could be decided. The law has operated well. Every decision which has been rendered, except the last, has been satisfactory to the public at large, and the last has been satisfactory to all the public, except to my hon. friend and his associates and his clients. But no decision ever rendered by any court will, I believe, be attended with more beneficial results than the decision of which my hon. friend complains and which he states as a reason why this law should be changed; for, during all the future, this instrument can and will, by fair and legitimate competition, be brought at a cheap rate to the door of every man who wishes to use it throughout the land, and can be obtained at rates which could not have been dreamed of if this monopoly could have held this patent, so justly voided in consequence of their own acts, their own failure to do what was clearly pointed out in the contract given them at the time they took the patent. I object entirely to the Bill which my hon. friend has introduced. I think it is wrong. I think it is not at all in the interests of the country. I think that clause will be a nugatory clause, if the matter is taken from the present jurisdiction and thrown into the hands of the courts, and I shall feel called upon, if my hon. friend insists upon retaining that feature in the Bill, to divide the House upon the subject.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), presents this Bill to the consideration of the House on the grounds, as he argues, that the present law is unconstitutional. He argues that the law, as it stands at present, is an infringement on civil rights which were delegated to the Provinces alone, and as an illustration of that argument, he states the case of the grant of lands by the

Mr. COLBY.

Dominion, and then asks whether the Crown could afterwards cancel those patents, and concludes his illustration by saying he sees no distinction between the position of a patentee of lands and a patentee under the Patent Act. Well, if he does not see any distinction between the two cases, I think others will. There is a vast difference between the two. In the case of a patent of lands, what is patented? Something tangible, something that has a locality—immovable land. But, under the Patent Act, what is patented is a bare privilege, the creature of Parliament, which can be granted on such conditions and subject to such terms as the creator of that privilege may choose to assign to it. The patentee, under these circumstances, does not at any time own the absolute property. He has only the enjoyment of his right *sub modo* at best, and he cannot say, when the rescission of the patent takes place, that there has been a forfeiture of any right. There has been simply a carrying out of the contract which gave him a conditional privilege only. There is no absolute withdrawal of the right from him.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think my hon. friend has misunderstood my argument. I did not pretend to say that the imposition of the conditions is beyond the competency of this Parliament, but that the trial of that question, the creation of a tribunal for the trial of that question, unless it was the creation of a court, was beyond the competency of Parliament.

Mr. MULOCK. I understood my hon. friend to say that the property of a patentee in a patent was a private right; that it became property in the technical meaning of the word "property" under the British North America Act; and, that being so, that it was solely under the jurisdiction of the Provinces.

Mr. McCARTHY. Merely as to the trial. I quite admit, of course, that conditions may be imposed, and that they have been properly imposed.

Mr. MULOCK. My hon. friend argued that the House, in delegating the power to deal with the matter to one of its own officers, was proceeding unconstitutionally, and that cannot be, unless it is shown that the subject matter of the trial is not under the jurisdiction of this House. If the subject matter to be dealt with is under the jurisdiction of this Parliament, as this is, then I submit that Parliament, or the agent of Parliament, the Minister, or any other agent, can deal with it. He has not shown any necessity for this legislation, and I do not think that Parliament is called upon to amend or repeal measures, unless it can be shown to be in the public interest that the repealing or amending should take place. The only case that can be cited, the most recent case, the rescission of the patent of the Bell Telephone Company, I do not think amounts to a public grievance. In the part of the country that I am familiar with I am not aware that the public see that any injustice was done to the patentees or to the general public. On the contrary, it is my great pleasure to be able to testify to the general approbation with which the decision of the Minister of Agriculture in that case was received. My hon. friend from North Simcoe says: Why not delegate this to the courts? We have courts, and as long as we have upright and impartial judges, let them deal with the matter. Does he say that the Government, either this Government or any succeeding Government, is not equally fit to be entrusted with this power? It is true that there is a nominal decision in each case of an individual, but he does it upon the responsibility of himself and his whole Cabinet. If he is wrong his whole Cabinet will bear more or less of the blame, and he is, we must assume, ready to take the responsibilities of his act. He feels that he is only one individual deciding that case, but he knows that the whole remaining twelve of his colleagues share the responsibility of his action. Therefore, I think the

public have equal, if not greater, guarantees in this case, with the advantage that the Minister of Agriculture will deal as intelligently and carefully in the matter as if it were in the hands of the ordinary courts of the land. Further, I think, Mr. Speaker, there are very great objections to having mere questions of fact taken away from the judge in the first instance, and transferred to other courts. It is a cardinal rule, and has become almost an absolute portion of our law to-day, that no appeal on mere questions of fact can be entertained. We know that in all cases of appeal the judges are almost conclusively bound by the decision of the first judge on the question of fact. And what is the Minister of Agriculture called upon to decide here? Not questions of law; merely questions of fact. He is called upon to decide whether the patentee has or has not complied with the conditions of the Patent Act—namely, has he imported contrary to law? Has he manufactured or has he not manufactured? Bare questions of fact. What matter is there for appeal in such cases? The question under this Act is, did the patentee manufacture the article within two years? Now, is not one man as capable to decide that as fifty men? Another question is, whether he imported contrary to law. That is a bare question of fact. We require no Supreme Court to tell us whether he did or did not; we do not require to go to the Privy Council to ascertain that fact. Therefore, I say that even if we admit, for a moment, that it were proper subject matter for the provincial or other courts, nevertheless I say it is in no sense a case in which an appeal should be allowed if you have confidence in the court of first jurisdiction. Now this motion is only the first step. Let the House to-day pass this measure, and what will we have our friend here applying for next year, or the succeeding year? He will say: Why give this jurisdiction to the Government at all? Why not, in the first instance, take the whole matter to some of the courts? What is the life of a patent? Five, ten, or fifteen years, at the option of the patentee. Why, before the right can be determined, the patent will have expired, and thus, practically, there will be no power to enforce compliance with the conditions on which the patent was granted. If that principle is admitted, if what my hon. friend is contending for is granted, then you may as well say there is no power left to compel the patentee to comply with the requirements of the law. It is entirely in the competence of this Parliament to attach such conditions as it may see fit as to any privileges it may grant. No public necessity has been shown for this measure. Therefore, neither on local grounds nor on grounds of public necessity, can any argument be advanced in favor of the measure. One part of the Bill, however, I think might be agreed to—that portion of it which provides that the Minister may obtain evidence under oath. That is merely in order to further enable him to do complete justice, and to ascertain the truth and the whole truth. To that part of it, without having heard any argument upon it, I can see no objection.

Mr. WHITE (East Hastings). I am glad to hear that we have one common sense man in this country, and that is the gentleman who presides over the Department of Agriculture. The hon. mover of this Bill, on another occasion, said there was to be one common sense man on the Railway Commission. Now, Sir, when we have a gentleman who presides over that Department, and gives such excellent decisions, and so satisfactory to the public, I think we had better allow this matter to remain in his hands. I am very glad there is one court in this country from which we can get a decision so sound, and so early after the action is entered. The hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) asked how long after a person entered a case would he be able to get it through? You can commence the action in the County Court; it is then taken to the Court of Queen's

Bench, then to Toronto, then to Ottawa, and then to the old country. It takes a great many years and a great deal of money. Mr. Speaker, I move that this Bill be not now read a second time, but that it be read this day six months.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am a good deal surprised at the great warmth displayed by my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Colby) in his opposition to this Bill. The accusations that he levelled at me might perhaps entitle me to return the compliment. I do not know, therefore I do not say, whether my hon. friend was interested or not in the company that presented the petition to the Minister of Agriculture. If I did know I could not say, according to the rules of this House. Every hon. member, however, must be left to draw his own conclusion from what we saw and what we heard, and certainly I have not found any difficulty in drawing my conclusion upon the subject. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not at all quarrelling, and therefore my hon. friend from North York (Mr. Mulock) need not have argued so strenuously against a position which I certainly did not take up, and that is, that this Parliament had not power to impose any conditions upon the patentee. On the contrary, I said I approved of those conditions. I do not think it will very much advance the National Policy, but I congratulate the member from North York for his adhesion to the National Policy to that extent, because it will to some extent, at all events, be promotive of industry in the country. But, Mr. Speaker, I object to another clause, and that is that any one man, even a man so great and so just as I quite freely admit my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture is, should have the power to determine the rights of any person in this country by his mere *ipse dixit*. I am astonished to find that any member of this House will stand up and say that one man is to determine vast questions of right, where property may be in question, of very considerable value, as frequently is the case, without an opportunity of calling witnesses, and without examining them under oath. We are told it is a question of fact; that there is no question of law involved; and yet this question of fact is to bind the patentee, and to bind the complainant, because it binds one party as well as the other; this question of fact is to be determined upon the papers sent into the Minister, not even sworn to, and he, not having the power to swear them, and without the men being brought to be cross-examined, without an opportunity afforded to everybody, to every subject, of having the witness brought face to face, and of having an opportunity to cross-examine that witness. I am astonished that there should have been found any hon. gentleman in this House who would stand up in favor of a system such as that. My hon. friend says, and insinuates, that it is done in the interests of the profession which I have the honor to belong. Well, so far as that is concerned, I do not think, speaking for myself, that I require to make practice; I certainly do not feel as if I desired in any way to promote legislation with that end in view. But it is not a fact that the lawyers are not now employed to go before the Minister, for I think a number of lawyers appeared in this case, about three or four times the number that would have been allowed to appear before any ordinary court; and the Minister, with his usual good nature, heard lawyer after lawyer—I think about a dozen, all told. I only appeared before him on one occasion.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And probably got as high fees.

Mr. McCARTHY. And probably got quite as high fees as in many ordinary cases. That is an argument which might be addressed to a body different from this—that it is a poor man's court where questions can be cheaply and quickly determined. All those are arguments which might be characterised in language not very complimentary to the hon. member. The question is this: If the patentee gets

the patent upon those conditions, conditions which are fair, is it proper or right that his patent should be taken away by a tribunal constituted as this tribunal is? Why, the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) who has no confidence in the Minister of Agriculture or in any of his colleagues, as I understand him, thinks we ought not only to have confidence in the hon. gentleman but should accept his decision as a higher authority than the courts of the land, than judges sworn to do their duty impartially, judges only removable by joint address of both Houses of Parliament, men who hold office during good behavior in that way. The hon. gentleman must be—I am not desiring to make any attack on the hon. gentleman, I am not desiring to express an opinion about his decision in the last case, for I desired, and I thought I made myself plain when I introduced the Bill, to say that if he thinks proper there should be no appeal in the last case, and I think it would be better there should not be—but I say that this very important case, in which a vast amount of property is concerned, has brought prominently before the people the fact that their property may be taken away by the decision of one man, and he not a judge, a man not possessing legal training, not amenable to public opinion; by one man who is necessarily a politician, and whose judgment will not be accepted in every case, whatever may be his decision, as one of a satisfactory character. There have been Ministers of Agriculture, and there will be other Ministers of Agriculture, and I ask hon. members to try and remember who they were, and perhaps to look forward and see who will probably fill that position, and let them ask themselves whether they are willing that matters of such importance should be dealt with and decided by a Minister who happens to fill the position of Minister of Agriculture. Moreover, his deputy is vested with the same power as is the Minister, the deputy who is not even amenable to this House, who does not carry with him in his decisions that tremendous weight which is to be given to the decision of a Minister, according to the member for North York (Mr. Mulock), because he sees in it the decision of the whole Cabinet, a doctrine which members of the Cabinet will not desire to accept.

Mr. MULOCK. I did not wish to give the House to understand, for a moment, that I supposed the whole Cabinet personally were aware of the decision, or gave it as their judgment. I simply meant that in giving that decision the hon. gentleman compromised his Cabinet, and as regards the effect, made not only himself responsible but his twelve colleagues.

Mr. McCARTHY. Can there be any better argument than that offered by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, for doing away with such a law? He says the decision compromised the Cabinet, and that the decision must be viewed with respect to the effect upon the Cabinet and upon public opinion, and with reference to the chance of an adverse decision in this House, and matters of that kind, which certainly would not enter into the consideration of a judicial officer in determining a matter between two people in this Dominion. No better argument can be offered than the suggestion made by the hon. member for North York in the explanation he has given to the House. I desire not to be misrepresented by the hon. member behind me or by the hon. member for North York. I desire the House to understand that this is, as I have said, a one man's decision, the decision of a man who has no power to call witnesses, who decides upon evidence that is not sworn evidence, and upon statements made behind the back of the party interested, without opportunity being afforded for cross-examination. All this, I say, is, to my mind, so monstrous that I can hardly imagine it being brought to the attention of the House without the House desiring an amendment made to the

Mr. McCARTHY.

law. My hon. friend has endeavored to mix up the rights of patentees with the general and abstract question. He says in particular no more beneficial decision could be given. What has been effected? For this time forth we shall have cheap telephoning, and will get that accommodation which is becoming so very essential to men of business at a cheaper rate. Is that an argument worthy of the hon. gentleman; is it an argument that ought to have fallen from a man so distinguished; is it an argument which could have fallen from any person but one who might have something more than a public interest in the question? Surely the hon. member will hardly say it was right to present that as an argument against this amendment of the law, this amendment as regards the abstract principle, as to whether it is right that the gentleman whom I have already described should have the determination of a question of this kind. Surely it was not in any sense as a bribe that it was held out to members of the House. But I can tell the hon. gentleman—I mention this for his private information—that, perhaps, so far as that case goes, he has not heard the last of it. According to an ancient and well known jurisdiction, the Court of Queen's Bench has the right to revise proceedings of tribunals created as this tribunal is; it has a right to call on the Minister to certify to the court all the proceedings that have taken place before him, and I do not think it is a very dignified position for the Minister to occupy.

Mr. COLBY. Have you not failed to get such an order from the court?

Mr. McCARTHY. I have not failed. The hon. gentleman is not very familiar with the procedure taken. There is at present an application before the court, for the purpose of compelling the Minister to certify to the Court of Queen's Bench all the proceedings that took place before him, and it is an ancient jurisdiction of the court which has been exercised, because that court always claimed to exercise supervision over proceedings of what, according to the view of the law, is an judicial tribunal. I say if that is a proceeding which is open, it is not a dignified position for a Minister to be placed in, to be called on to certify his proceedings to a judge sitting in Toronto, St. John or Halifax, for his revision and decision.

Mr. COLBY. Then we do not need this law.

Mr. McCARTHY. I submit we do need the law. The proper way to determine such rights is by a properly constituted court of law. If such a trial is surrounded by too many obstacles and difficulties the law should be amended by the proper Legislatures. But I do not know why the law disposing of questions of patents should be different from the law with respect to rights in regard to other questions. Rights of property, of character and reputation, we are willing to leave to the courts of the land; but, forsooth, a question of patents is one which some hon. members think the courts are not capable of dealing with, simply because it involves questions of fact. I deny *in toto* that this is merely a question of fact. The Minister knows that in this very case rather difficult questions of law came up, or at all events were argued. The question was as to the importing of portions of instruments said to be patented, and it was a rather difficult question of law to determine whether the parts imported were those which involved a forfeiture of the patent granted. If, of course, there had been an importation of the instrument in whole there would be no difficulty; but in this particular case, and probably in many cases, the difficulty would arise as to the importation in part, and as to whether they were such portions as the law contemplated should be manufactured in the country, and should not be imported. I propose, Mr. Speaker, to ask the House to read the Bill a second time. I think in doing so I will only be discharging

my duty as one of the representatives of the people. It is perfectly true that my attention was brought to this subject by the case to which reference has been made; but, as I say, my own opinion is, that it would be better that the power to review the decision should be omitted from the discussion and consideration of this particular question. It should be treated, and I trust it will be treated, simply on its merits, and the merits of the question are: Should it be a matter to be disposed of by a Minister, or by a Deputy Minister, without any special training or experience, the question of whether a person's property is or is not forfeited? Hon. gentlemen will remember that my Bill is not repealing; it is assuming this right, though I would willingly accept the other conclusion; but if the Minister is to have that power ought he to have the power of summoning witnesses? That is the first clause. Ought he to have the power of examining witnesses on oath, or of issuing a commission for the examination of witnesses who cannot attend? When he decides the matter, should there be the right of appeal; or is his decision irrevocable? If the House does not care to accept the main provision, there are some provisions which the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) thinks should be adopted, and certainly the House should not say that the Bill should be read the second time this day six months, but that it should be read the second time on this occasion.

Mr. POPE. I have listened very attentively to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and I have listened to the slurs—I may say, the rather impudent slurs—which he has cast upon my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby). I do not think he had any right to say that my hon. friend was influenced by having an interest in this patent. Whether he had an interest in the patent or not I do not know, but I would ask the hon. member for Simcoe whether he did not have a large fee for carrying this matter before the courts? and having obtained that fee, whether he thinks he should not do what he can for those clients of his, and show them that he is doing his best to earn his fee? I ask him this question, though I do not suppose he is influenced in that way. I know he is far removed from influences of that kind. But still lawyers and attorneys are like other men—they are apt to be influenced. Not that I think that my hon. friend would be influenced, but still I think he would like to serve his client, and to show him that he had done what he could to support a measure in this House which he thinks would suit his client. I think he would like his client to feel that he had earned his money, and certainly he has no right to cast aspersions on my hon. friend from Stanstead (Mr. Colby), for anything he has done in this House, unless he is prepared to take the same himself. Now, what is the condition of these men who came to get this patent? Did they come here blindly? Did they come without knowing what they were doing? Has anything been forced on them? They came to get this patent under a contract between them and the State. They came here and said: We want a patent; and the Government replied: We will give you a patent under certain conditions, one condition of which is that you shall manufacture that instrument in this country, within a certain time, and that you shall not import it after a certain time. These are the conditions; and if those gentlemen had complied with them, there would have been no case of this kind; there would have been nothing of this description here. But they failed in those conditions—they thought they could dodge those conditions. It is true that they did bring in these articles, and although they failed to bring them in within the time prescribed by the Act. I did not think the accident of their not getting them in within the time was a criminal matter. But they attempted to dodge the conditions by manufacturing all the parts, by punching all the holes, by making all the bars and other parts that could be made outside, and bringing them in and putting

them together. I would ask if that was manufacturing them in this country? I say that the industrious people of this country, who give privileges to these patentees, have their rights in the matter. But that is not all. The next complaint is, that I, the Minister of Agriculture, or my deputy, for whose every act I am responsible—that I am not responsible to the people of this country.

Mr. McCARTHY. No.

Mr. POPE. "Not amenable to public opinion"—those are his words. Now, I would like to ask, Is a judge sitting in court more amenable to public opinion than I am? Is it possible the hon. gentleman means that I am not amenable to public opinion in any decision I may render? Am I not more so than are the judges who are appointed for life, who do not have to go to the people, who do not have to appeal to this House for support? Is such a man less amenable to public opinion than I am?

Mr. McCARTHY. I said the hon. gentleman was too much amenable to public opinion; that he had to come to this House—to go to public opinion, to court public opinion, and that a judge should not be in that position.

Mr. POPE. I say, in the next place, that if the hon. gentleman's Bill passes there will be no relief to the poor man; there will be no chance of his getting justice. I am not saying this in any sentimental way, or because I am crying out for the poor man's interests; but I do say that the public would not undertake these cases, as the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) has said, if they had to go to the courts for justice. And more than that, Sir; if they were to be dealt with in that way, when, do you think, decisions would be rendered? The very object of the Act is that in matters of this kind decisions shall be promptly given. Of course, there may be other questions of law, etc., arising out of the Act, in which I have no right to decide; they go to the tribunals; but these mere questions of fact between the State and the patentee I am bound to decide, and the result is, I think, that justice, and speedy justice, is done. There was another point raised by the hon. gentleman with regard to the examinations, but I would just say that in this case I had no great difficulty in getting at what I believed to be the rights of the matter. I found no difficulty in cross-examining the witnesses, and they were thoroughly cross-examined. I am certain we got at the truth; but I felt, during the investigation, that if I had had the power—if I had had power to bring before me some men who did not come there, they might have thrown some light on the subject. Upon that I do not disagree with the hon. gentleman very much; but upon the other aspect of the matter I must say I shall have to support the motion of my hon. friend for the six months' hoist.

Mr. COOK. I wish to make a few observations in connection with this matter before a vote is taken. We have now in this House the leader of the Government and the Government benches, the leader of the Opposition and the Opposition benches, the left centre in the person of the member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. Mitchell), and we have now the right centre in the person of the member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy). Well, Sir, we are getting quite a number of parties here. We find that the hon. member for North Simcoe does not agree with his friend the Minister of Agriculture upon this question, and he taunts the member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) with being interested in this telephone business. It has been said by other speakers that it might be said that the hon. member for North Simcoe was interested. Well, whether he was interested or not, of course, in his position as solicitor, this matter entered into his mind from the fact of the question coming before the courts. Now, Sir, I am entirely opposed to taking away this power from the Minister of Agriculture

and relegating it to the courts. I believe, as has been said by the Minister of Agriculture, that decisions of this kind should be speedy and inexpensive. I know, in the particular case of the Bell Telephone Company, that universal satisfaction was given by his decision to the people of Toronto. The Bell Telephone Company have not rendered good service, at all events in the city of Toronto. They have not only not rendered good service, but they have been impudent. They were a great monopoly and had the business of the whole country in their hands, and the manager of that company was really insolent to those who were using their wires. I am very glad that the question has been decided so promptly by the Minister of Agriculture, for the very reason that the officials of companies of that kind will be civil towards their patrons, and we shall also have a better service. I believe myself that that part of the Bill which gives the Minister power to subpoena witnesses and examine them under oath is quite right; but to allow an appeal from the Minister would be as bad as taking the matter out of his hands altogether, because it would be relegated to the courts; and so financially strong is the Bell Telephone Company, that God knows if we should ever have a decision. We know the gullibility of lawyers; they like money as well as any other class of men, and we know that they would like to have matters of this kind dangling before the courts, so that they could get as much out of it as possible, particularly when they have a good customer. I remember a circumstance of a man who was pretty wealthy, in a country town of Ontario. He had a case in the courts, and a lawyer in his town kept it in court for years and years, until at last the client became restless, and said he would go to Toronto and consult some other lawyers. His lawyer said to him: "If you are bound to go to Toronto and consult a solicitor there, I will give you a letter introducing you to a good firm." He gave him the letter and sealed it. On his way to Toronto the client began to feel suspicious as to what was inside of this letter. He opened and read it, and it ended by saying: "This is a good fat goose; pick him well." That is the way the lawyers act with these good fat geese sometimes—they pick them well; and I have no doubt my hon. friend would be no exception to the rule if he got a good client like the Bell Telephone Company.

Mr. MILLS. While I do not approve of all that the hon. gentleman's Bill contains, I am disposed to vote for its second reading. I know that the property in patents is a property created by this Legislature. It is under the control of this Legislature, and exists under such conditions as the law relating to patents provides, and as this Legislature chooses to attach to the continuance of that kind of property. But once the property is created it does seem to me that there is no reason for making it an exception to the general rule, and providing that a Minister, in the discharge of his ordinary administrative duties, shall sit in judgment and say whether a certain party has property in a particular patent or not. In fact, the observation made by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby) in regard to this subject, reminds me of an observation made by a Minister in this House some years ago—Sir Charles Tupper—in reference to the objections which were then being made to the patent law, that it was cheaper to steal than to buy. The hon. member for Stanstead assures the House that the country has largely profited by the decision of the Minister of Agriculture in the particular case in question, because that decision has put an end to a monopoly. In fact, the argument of the hon. gentleman, if it had any value at all, would be an argument against the existence of a patent law; because if we were to permit any person to engage in the manufacture of any particular article, and refuse him the protection

Mr. Cook.

of the patent law, although we might seriously interfere with the progress of invention within the country, it is certain that in the production of the article there would be nothing to pay for the invention itself. But, Sir, I do not think, whether the decision of the Minister of Agriculture, in that particular case was a proper decision or not, is the question that we have now before us. We are not called upon to review what the Minister of Agriculture did in that instance; but we are called upon to consider this question, whether in an important matter, where complex facts may arise, where the question as to the right of property may depend upon considerations which the Minister of Agriculture may not be the most competent man to decide, we should depart from the usual practice of protecting every man's rights and interests by the judiciary of the country. It is perfectly obvious that in questions where the dispute as to a right of property in a patent may arise, important questions of law may be involved, and it may be wholly impossible to separate the law from the facts, and the law as well as the facts must be passed upon. One feature of the gentleman's Bill—that allowing the Minister to deal with the question of right in the first instance, and giving an appeal from his decision—is, I think, objectionable. I do not think the Minister ought to be charged with judicial duties in the matter at all. He may be called upon to report; but it is an unusual proceeding, and one to which, in many instances, the Supreme Court of the United States has taken exception. They will not listen to an appeal from any but regular and properly constituted tribunals. It must be a judicial body before they will consent to consider an appeal from it. Thus, in the case of the Court of Claims, as first constituted, that court was an advisory body of the Ministers, and the Supreme Court said its action, not being final as a judgment, they would not consider an appeal from it. It does seem to me that, while it may be very proper that the Minister should make a report on the case and express an opinion, that report or opinion should have no judicial value, and that wherever a contest arises as to the right of property in any patent, that question ought to be judicially passed upon, and the claim which any one puts forward ought not to be decided, except by due process of law had before a competent tribunal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is just the present case. Under the patent law there, is a judicial tribunal, and it is by the course of the law and in the course of the law the decision is made. To be sure the judge has not been called to the bar; he does not wear a gown; still, he is a judge appointed by law and acting as a judge, and, as has been already argued by the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Colby), the question is not a matter of law but of evidence, a matter of fact, and I think the Minister of Agriculture, who has got his subordinates all around him, trained in the study of the patent law, acquainted with it in all its particulars, experts in patent law—I think they are better judges than the judge on the bench of the evidence laid before them in appeal. If this is a matter to be tried before a judge the judge should have a jury to assist him. The jury are not lawyers; the jury decide the fact, not the judge; and here we have the whole of that branch of the Department of Agriculture, the Patent Office, as a judicial authority and as a jury as well; and certainly, both as judge and jury, as competent and more competent than any judge could be, that judge not having the assistance of a jury to decide upon the fact of the credibility of witnesses. I agree with my hon. friend that that portion of the Bill which provides that the witnesses shall not be sworn, and that they should be liable to be summoned, as at any other court, and that this tribunal should have power to issue a commission to examine absent or invalid witnesses, should be passed. I quite agree that power should be given, but that is a very small portion of the Bill. This Bill attacks, in fact and in

substance, the jurisdiction of the Minister of Agriculture as a court to decide such questions.

Mr. McCARTHY. No; there is the appeal.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. He has the power to sit upon the case, but in every matter of this kind there will be an appeal. That is only one of the clauses of the Bill. I think, therefore, my hon. friend's Bill ought not to receive a second reading, and I think, also, that the Minister of Agriculture should feel himself bound to bring down an Act to give himself the powers claimed by this measure.

Mr. EDGAR. As it is perfectly evident a large majority of this House are in favor of a portion of the Bill, I do not see why my hon. friend should not move that portion of the Bill, amending the Bill by leaving out the remainder.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would ask leave, on the contrary, to move the discharge of the Order. If the Government will deal with the Bill I would prefer they would deal with it. When the Government measure is brought down it will be in the competency of any hon. member to move such amendments as he may think proper to it. I do this on the understanding that the Government will deal with the matter.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings) asked for leave to withdraw amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. McCARTHY asked for leave to withdraw the motion for second reading.

Motion withdrawn and Order be discharged.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to and the House adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 19th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

DEPARTMENT OF SECRETARY OF STATE.

Mr. CHAPLEAU moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 102) to amend the Acts respecting the Department of the Secretary of State. He said: The Bill is quite unimportant, except in one clause which provides that the Deputy Registrar General shall be appointed by Commission under the Great Seal instead of by an Order in Council. The name of the Deputy Registrar General appears in all the most important documents, and I think he should be appointed by Commission and not by Order in Council. The other part of the Bill is only to mention more particularly by name different instruments which are to be registered in the Registrar-General's Office.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ELECTORAL FRANCHISES.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 103) respecting the Electoral Franchise. He said: It is not necessary to go into a discussion of the Bill. The Bill is substantially on the lines of the Bill of last year, of which the general principles were stated to the House. I move the first reading of the Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. I suppose, after the announcement the hon. gentleman made the other day as to the proper course being to make an expository speech, with reference to a Public Bill upon its introduction, we should have had from the hon. gentleman an explanation of the principle of this Bill. The hon. gentleman says that he has not given us that explanation, because the Bill is upon the general lines of the measure of last year, the principles of which were then explained to the House. That is rather an elastic expression, "upon the general lines." One would like very much to know how far it varies from those lines. But I must say that, according to my recollection, the hon. gentleman did not give any explanation at all upon the introduction of the Bill last year. I think such explanation as it was, was upon a still more remote occasion, because if this Bill is the same old Bill, it is an older friend than of last year—I think it was in the year before last that the hon. gentleman said something, and he said then very little. For example, one of the very important proposals the hon. gentleman then made was to extend the electoral franchise to the women of the country. But he gave no reasons for that; he entered into no exposition of the grounds of his action. The hon. gentleman did give some explanation upon that occasion with reference to another feature of the Bill. He told us he was about to appoint revising officers who were also to make up the lists; they were to make and revise the lists; and he declared that those officers were to be appointed by the Government of the day, as was done in England, where they were appointed by the Lord Chancellor, a member of the Government. Well, that was an explanation as far as it went. The only difficulty about that explanation was that it was an utterly erroneous explanation, that it did not state the facts of the case as they were in England, that the fact is not such as the hon. gentleman described. The hon. gentleman is now about to make—I cannot exactly remember—but I think his sixth or seventh attempt of passing a Franchise Bill for the Dominion of Canada; he is now proposing for the third time in this Parliament the passing of the Franchise Bill. He had decided, as it appeared by the Speech from the Throne, that the time had come to press this measure again. But I think it was his bounden duty to have brought it forward earlier; I think it was his duty to have brought it forward amongst the very first Bills. We had a great display of activity on the part of the members of the Government at the opening of the Session. There were a half dozen little—I cannot call them Bills—little pellets, thrown across the House on the first days immediately after the Address was passed. We had a little Bill from the Minister of Finance about precautions as to advances from the Provinces. We had a little Bill, I think, from the hon. Minister of Railways, and a Bill, I think, from one or two other Ministers, perhaps. The hon. gentlemen look surprised; I dare say they have both forgotten.

Mr. POPE. I am surprised because you happened to hit the thing just as it was.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought I hit the right spot. These simple measures were presented amid the cheers of their followers, as evidences of their appreciation of the extreme diligence of the hon. gentlemen opposite in the conduct of public business; but it was much cry and little wool. And now at the end of the seventh week of the Session, when we are told we are to get into the serious business, it is that the hon. gentleman, takes the first step towards bringing forward such an important measure as the Franchise Bill. The hon. gentleman has not favored us with the expository speech that we certainly had a right to expect from his former utterances, and therefore he has given me nothing to reply to as yet.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CONSTITUTION OF THE TREASURY BOARD.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 104) relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board. He said: I may state to the House that the alterations proposed will make the Treasury Board consist of six members instead of four, one of whom shall be the Secretary of State. A large portion of the business in connection with the examination of candidates for the Civil Service passes through the Department of the Secretary of State, and, therefore, it has been considered desirable to add that Minister to the Treasury Board, and in order that each of the principal Provinces, at least, should be represented on that board, it gives power to the Governor in Council to appoint any member of the Government as the sixth member of that board.

Mr. BLAKE. I am sorry to hear this announcement. As a general rule it has been laid down by a person who had considerable knowledge, I think, of these things, that boards are screens, and the thicker the board the larger the screen, in my opinion. In practice I have regarded the Treasury Board as rather a useful institution, and largely in consequence of the smallness of its numbers. I think that its efficiency and its sense of responsibility will be very much diminished by the proposed enlargement of its numbers, and that the results will be less satisfactory than those results which have hitherto accrued. The hon. gentleman's statement as to the reason for the addition of the Secretary of State is, I suppose, with reference to examinations, and that sort of thing, but the Secretary of State might be made a member of the Treasury Board without enlarging the numbers of the board. Then the hon. gentleman announced that it is necessary to have a representative of each of the Provinces upon the board, and therefore he adds another. It is altogether a new idea. I had thought until this moment that we had already seven Provinces—

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I said the leading Provinces.

Mr. BLAKE. Well, who is to be the hindmost of those six Provinces, to be left out of the Treasury Board? Which Province is to receive the honor and satisfaction of being out of the Treasury Board? Are there six Provinces represented in the Administration of the day? And if they are not, how is the hon. gentlemen going to get members of six Provinces into the Treasury Board? Obviously, therefore, we have a Bill to alter the present constitution of the Cabinet.

Mr. MITCHELL. They intend to make an alteration in the numbers.

Mr. BLAKE. Ah! it is to allow the hon. gentleman to come in.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am much more likely to get in than you are.

Mr. BLAKE. I believe that, because the hon. gentleman who leads the Government knows the hon. member better than he knows me.

Mr. MITCHELL. And perhaps likes him better, because he appreciates him more.

Mr. BLAKE. He has tried him, and there is where he is.

Mr. MITCHELL. He has not found him wanting as you have been found.

Mr. BLAKE. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to understand this. If it is important that the six leading Provinces should be represented on the Treasury Board therefore we are to have another edition of them. Is it Manitoba or is it Prince Edward Island which is to stand in the rear, because at present neither is represented in the Administration of

Mr. BLAKE.

the day? Is it British Columbia? Which of these Provinces is it that is behind hand? It is too late, I think, at this time-of-day to make this suggestion. We have had great difficulties already in this country in consequence of the false principle upon which the hon. gentleman started out in 1867 with respect to Cabinet representation, laying down the rigid rule that there should be at least two members from each Province. I very well remember when the hon. gentleman defended the number of the Cabinet upon, not merely the reasonable ground that, as a rule, the public feeling of each of the Provinces should be consulted through men who had their special confidence—a very reasonable proposition to lay down—but upon the ground that these Provinces were to be represented by at least two members. That was the principle stated by the hon. gentleman. Since that time it has been found impossible to apply even the first principle, that they should be represented at all, because half of the Provinces are unrepresented in the Cabinet to-day. Still less was it possible to carry out the second principle, that each Province should be represented by two members of the Cabinet, as the hon. gentleman then declared was necessary. There are wheels within the wheels, and it is now claimed to be necessary to increase the representation of the Treasury Board. If that is the principle upon which we are to act, it is obvious that instead of the Union being greater, instead of the confidence of the people of this Dominion in their public men being greater, that confidence is diminishing, and it is becoming more than ever necessary that this wheel within wheel arrangement as to the Treasury Board should have regard to provincial representation, representation to a certain extent so far as the leading Provinces are concerned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has rather forgotten my statement in the discussion on the formation of the First Cabinet. The arrangement, I said, was absolutely necessary at the inception of Confederation. We knew there was a considerable amount of apprehension in the different Provinces, especially in the smaller Provinces, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, that they would be overcome by the weight of the two larger Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. I stated that such was necessary in the first instance, but if the hon. gentleman will look at the "Debates," he will see that I distinctly guarded myself against the idea that this would continue for all time; but at all events, for the time being, I said, it was desirable that every Province should be represented in the Cabinet. I said further, that in the early stage of Confederation it would be well that each Province should have two representatives in the Cabinet; that a single member would feel himself solitary and alone, without any one to act with from his Province against the voices of the other Provinces, it being considered at that time, though it now remains only a memory, that we were comparative strangers to each other, that the interests of the Provinces were not clearly brought together, that the public men of the Provinces did not know what would be the consequence of a certain course of action, and also because, until a very recent date, one or more of the Provinces had declared in the first place against Confederation at all. In order to oil the wheels of the carriage that was going to travel the constitutional road of Union, it was thought well that the smaller Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick should have equal representation with other Provinces in the Cabinet at the inception of Confederation. I am happy to say that the suggestion has been successful. If the hon. gentleman will look back at the "Debates," I think he will find I said, judging by my recollection of what I stated then, that in process of time those sectional feelings would disappear, and while, as in Great Britain, it was always considered that Scotland and Ireland should have

some influence in the Cabinet, yet, as in Great Britain, the principal point in forming an Administration here ought to be and would be power, influence and status in Parliament. That, I think, was the sum of my observations on that occasion, or on all occasions when the subject was brought up. With respect to this Bill I would say that the particular reason for increasing the number of members of the Treasury Board to six was not only that the number was limited to six, but to six specified officers—Ministers, and sometimes it might happen that one of those Ministers could more conveniently sit aside and allow another Minister to take his place. There is this further reason for making this arrangement that it was sometimes found that we could not get a quorum of the Treasury Board, four being a quorum, and we would have a much better chance of obtaining a quorum at all times by having six instead of four. With respect to the hon. member's remarks as to the work of the Treasury Board, I may say we have found that in its practical operation the Treasury Board operates to a very considerable extent, as their attention is directed to matters that are specially confided to them, and, like the Auditor-General, they are very efficient in the way of giving information to Council in regard to various matters brought before them. The quorum will be four, and I fancy, practically, the Board will be as it has been, composed of four members. But sometimes, as I have said, we have not been able to secure a quorum of the individual members of the Government certified by statute to form the Board.

Mr. MILLS. The right hon. gentleman has overlooked the complaint made by my hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Blake), that the Minister of Finance, in introducing this Bill, declared that it was necessary to give further provincial representation on the Treasury Board. It was to that point especially that my hon. friend directed the attention of the House. The First Minister has told us that this feature of provincial representation in the Cabinet was one which, although at the time the discussion took place he declared to be necessary, was one which would ultimately disappear; that it was necessary in the first instance because members of the House were, in a great measure, strangers to each other, and also because some of the Provinces were not favorable to Union. All that might be quite true at the time Confederation was established. But the right hon. gentleman has failed to point out to the House the necessity of giving further provincial representation on the Treasury Board. But the Finance Minister, in proposing this measure, has not declared that a larger Treasury Board was necessary; he has pointed out that some of the Provinces which are not now represented on the Treasury Board ought to be represented. That is the statement of the Minister who introduced the Bill, and in defence of that statement the First Minister has said nothing.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman has spoken about representation of the different Provinces on the Treasury Board. If any of the Provinces are not represented in the Cabinet they cannot be represented on the Treasury Board. That is quite clear. But this arrangement will give an opportunity to utilise on the Treasury Board the services of any provincial representative in the Cabinet. To show you how impartial we are in our operating of the present Act I may say that Quebec, one of the largest Provinces, is not represented on the Treasury Board at all. The four present members of that board are, two from Ontario, and two from New Brunswick; neither Quebec nor Nova Scotia has a representative on it.

Mr. BLAKE. Of what consequence then is it that the number should be increased?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not suppose it is of very great consequence.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad the First Minister says that, because I thought it was unfortunate that the Minister of Finance should have formally announced that it was the desire of the Cabinet to extend provincial representation to such a body as the Treasury Board. I am glad to find that the First Minister practically disclaims that idea, and I think he is deserving of all support from this side of the House for disclaiming the idea of extending this provincial representation further. I have heard him and other hon. gentlemen opposite again and again declare—and I agree with them—that our object in this House should be to become Canadians to a great extent—not forgetting individual Provinces, but still remembering that we are inhabitants of the Dominion of Canada, and that sentiment I most heartily agree with. I cannot, however, for the life of me, see what is the object, after the statement of the First Minister, of adding the sixth member to this board. All of us who have had an experience of this kind of thing know that a small board is generally more serviceable, and does its work better, than a large one, and even if there be a reason for adding the fifth member, in the person of the Secretary of State, I think it is a good reason for not having the sixth member. Five, an odd number, is always more convenient on a committee, as it prevents a dead lock; and I do not think, from my recollection of the attendance of hon. gentlemen opposite at the capital out of Session, that he will find it very easy to get four men together, or even three, which, I think, is the present quorum.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 105) respecting the Bank of British Columbia. He said: I may read for the information of the House a memorandum which has been given to me, in explanation of the objects of the Bill:

"The Bank of British Columbia was incorporated by Royal charter dated 31st May, 1862, and supplemental charter dated 30th August, 1865, to carry on banking business in certain portions of British North America for twenty-one years from date of original charter, or until 31st May, 1883. By supplemental charter dated 11th May, 1883, this time was extended for a year, and by further supplemental charter dated 27th May, 1884, the charter was further extended for ten years from 31st May, 1884, subject to the general banking laws of the Colonies in which its business may be carried on. The object of this Bill is to declare what banking laws of the Dominion of Canada are applicable to the bank, and the provisions made applicable are those that relate to the general conduct of banking business, viz:—those providing for returns, the limit of circulation (which is not to exceed the amount of the unimpaired paid up capital), the denomination of notes allowed to be issued and the payment thereof in case of insolvency, dividends, reserves, powers of the bank in holding real estate, etc., and the penalties for the breach of all provisions made applicable to the bank, but the internal regulations are not touched. The provisions made applicable to the Bank of British North America are made applicable to this bank and for the purposes of the Act Victoria is made the head office of the bank. The charter of the bank provides for a double liability of the shareholders, in case of the winding up of the bank. The Bill has been submitted to the authorities of the bank in England and has been approved by them."

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Do I understand the hon. gentleman aright, that all the regulations of our Banking Act shall in future apply to the British Columbia Bank?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think at present they are not required to hold any particular amount of legal tenders?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And in future do you require that they shall hold the same amount as the banks of Canada?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes, they will be brought under the operation of the Banking Act.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. From what date?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. From the date of the passing of the Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE CHINESE QUESTION.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the report on the Chinese question, signed by the Secretary of State and laid on the Table, is correct in stating that on the 12th August last, at Victoria, British Columbia, in his address at the opening of the Commission he used the following language:—"I have only to add that it is the intention of the Government to bring in legislation next Session."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. It is correct.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—GRADES AND CURVES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What is the number of grades on the Canadian Pacific Railway exceeding 90 feet to the mile, and the aggregate length of such grades? What is the number of curves on the Canadian Pacific Railway of each degree over 6 degrees?

Mr. POPE. The answer to these questions require a good many figures, but I have answers to both, and I propose to accommodate my hon. friend so long as he keeps good natured. As to the number of grades exceeding 90 feet per mile, there are nine descending the Rockies; two ascending the Selkirks; twenty-four descending the Selkirks—an aggregate of fifty-two miles. As to the number of curves, there is one of 6'15; 2 of 6'20; 23 of 6'30; 12 of 6'40; one of 6'45; 103 of 7; 10 of 7'20; one of 7'45; 325 of 8—

Mr. MILLS. Hear, hear.

Mr. POPE. No, not here; out yonder. One of 8'15; 3 of 8'30; one of 8'40; 62 of 9; 141 of 10, and one of 10'40.

Mr. BLAKE. You do not give the number of curves on the temporary line?

Mr. POPE. I have given all under six.

Mr. BLAKE. But not on the temporary line, because there was one there of 11.30.

Mr. POPE. I cannot say as to that.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—GOVERNMENT SECTION IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government section of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia is being worked for freight and passenger traffic, by the contractor for construction? Whether such working is by arrangement with the Government? Whether any tariff of tolls and charges has been agreed on between the Government and the contractor? Whether the Government has a copy of the tariff in use?

Mr. POPE. The contractor—as I believe all contractors do—is working the road for his own purposes as a contractor. I am told that he also carries any goods or passengers that come in his way, and I believe that is the case. There is no arrangement with the Government. No tariff of tolls or charges has been agreed upon between the Government and the contractor, and of course the Government has not a copy of any tariff.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH MEXICO.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant) asked, Whether the Government has taken steps towards developing trade relations between Canada and Mexico?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No official communications passed between the Government of Canada and the Government of Mexico.

ACQUIREMENT OF INDIAN TITLES.

Mr. MILLS asked, What is the nature of the title which the Government claims to have acquired from the Indians within the Province of Ontario, north and west of Lake Superior, beyond the Height of Land? Does the Government claim the fee in the land on account of their treaty with the Indians? Does the Government deny any title in the Crown or Province prior to the treaty with the Indians? Does the Government claim the timber upon the lands, the mines and minerals in virtue of the treaty made with the Indians? Does the Government claim to have a lien upon the lands for the sums paid or agreed to be paid to the Indians? Or does it claim the ownership of the soil?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Dominion has acquired, for money or money's worth, the rights to the Indian titles in considerable portions of country north and west of Lake Superior from the Indians. The Government claims to hold whatever rights the Indians had, neither more nor less. What those rights may be it is not for the Government to say, but for the tribunals to decide.

Mr. MILLS. The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. He has not stated what is the nature of the titles which the Government actually claim.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They claim whatever rights the Indians had.

Mr. MILLS. Well, what is that?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. That is for the courts to say.

Mr. MILLS. The courts cannot say if the Government do not say in the first instance.

ST. CROIX COTTON MILLS—PAYMENT OF CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. EDGAR asked, Have all the Customs Duties upon machinery, plant, and other material imported by or for the St. Croix Cotton Mills of Milltown, St. Stephen's, New Brunswick, been paid to the Government, if not how much is still unpaid?

Mr. BOWELL. The whole amount of the duty payable upon the machinery imported for the St. Croix Cotton Mills, of Milltown, St. Stephens, N.B., has not yet all been paid. There is a balance of between \$15,000 and \$20,000 still due; I do not know the exact amount. Arrangements have been made for the liquidation of the debt.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). How is that?

Mr. BOWELL. Give notice.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. gentleman refers to the machinery

Mr. BOWELL. I refer to the whole. I read the question and said upon the machinery, plant, and everything that is dutiable.

GRATUITY TO CHARLES HUNTER TERRY.

Mr. McMULLEN asked, At what date was the Order in Council passed granting a gratuity of \$600, or eight months pay, to Charles Hunter Terry, lately employed in the Finance Department?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. C. H. Terry was retired by Order in Council on the 20th of May, 1884.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. At which date the gratuity was granted?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Yes; a month for each year's service.

THE WRIT FOR LÉVIS COUNTY.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I desire to learn from the Government whether they have given the necessary information to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to enable the writ to be issued for the county of Lévis. The information has been given for the West Riding of Northumberland, but up to a little while ago the information was not given for Lévis, and it is desirable that it should be given, so that both writs should issue without any delay.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have had no application as regards the county of Lévis.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman must mean of course no personal application. We had the statement from you, Sir, the other day, that you had issued your warrant for the issue of writs both for Northumberland and Lévis in pursuance of the statute which rendered that necessary on your part, and it is obligatory on the Government to give the information in order that writs may be issued to the returning officers. The same communication which would be made to the hon. gentleman on the subject of one county would be made to him on the subject of the other; but this statement was made to him in this House, and therefore the Government as a whole is seized of the fact that these writs await, or one at any rate awaits his action, and it seems to me that there should be no delay in giving the necessary information in order that that writ should be issued.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The usual practice has been this: When the warrant is issued, it is sent to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery communicates that to the Secretary of State, and the Government acts in the regular way in appointing the returning officer, and fixing the date of the election.

Mr. BLAKE. Then I am to understand that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, although communicated with as to Northumberland, has not been communicated with as to Lévis. I will take occasion to-morrow to enquire into the matter.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I do not remember to have received that information owing to the press of business in the House, but I shall enquire about it in the Department.

Mr. BLAKE. I shall expect to hear that the writ has gone to-day, Sir.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. CASEY. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock on Tuesday, I was about to call the attention of the House to the question of the proposed increase of the duty on flour, and to the views of the millers and others in my own constituency in regard to that proposed increase, and in regard to any other means of attaining the desired object, namely, that of assisting the millers out of their present position, which they claim is an unfavorable one. Two modes, of course, are open to us of assisting the millers in this respect. One is to increase the duty on flour to such an extent as to exclude American flour from our markets altogether. The other is to reduce or abolish the duty on American wheat—at all events on American hard spring wheat, which is the only kind, I believe, that our millers care to import. I wish to state the case as presented by millers of my own riding in regard to these two proposals and will quote one or two authorities as to the views of the farmers, leaving it to the House to consider which of the two proposals

is the preferable mode, or whether either of two should be adopted. I must first quote what I may call the official utterance of the farmers of all Canada on the subject of an increased flour duty. The nearest thing we have to an official utterance of the farmers is the utterance of the Dominion Grange, a large and influential body having branches in all parts of the Dominion and who meet and carry on their deliberations with the greatest care and in the most business like manner. At their meeting in Toronto on the 6th of this month, the Committee on Legislation reported as follows:—

"That we still endorse the petitions which this Dominion Grange presented to the Dominion Parliament last year with regard to increasing the duty on flour, and are strongly of opinion that any increase of such duty would not be in the interests of the farmers, and we therefore enter our protest against any increase whatever."

I know that attempts have been made at times to lead the farmers of this country, and especially the farmers of Ontario, which is peculiarly a wheat growing Province, to imagine that the increased duty on flour would in some way improve their position, that it would enable the millers to pay higher prices, or increase the demand for wheat, or in some other way benefit the producer. Here, however, we have the opinion of a large body composed of some of the most intelligent farmers in the community, expressed at their meeting in Toronto, that the increase in the flour duty would not be in the interest of the farmers of the Dominion, and this is not one utterance only, but an endorsation of the utterance of last year, an utterance now endorsed after a year's experience.

Mr. HESSON. Have you the report of the Provincial Grange?

Mr. CASEY. I have not; but the Provincial Grange is represented in the Dominion Grange. The Master of the Dominion Grange is a resident of Elgin, and a number of the officers are residents of Ontario. I believe Ontario is fully represented in the Dominion Grange, and their opinion would receive full weight and probably carry the opinion of the rest of the grange. I have, therefore, no hesitation in putting before the House this report of the Dominion Grange as representing the opinion of the farmers of Ontario as a whole. There may be some localities where the farmers think differently; I do not dispute that, as there are all shades of opinions; but this I take to be the mature opinion of representative farmers from all parts of Canada, in convention assembled, as near as we are able to get at it.

Mr. SPROULE. Are you aware that the Provincial Grange asked for an increase in the flour duty?

Mr. CASEY. I am not; but as it happens I am discussing the opinion of the farmers of Canada as a whole, and we have been often told in this House that we must not consider one section at the expense of others. I quite agree with that sentiment; I quite agree that in considering the interests of the farming community we must take the interests and the opinions of that community throughout the Dominion, and not those of any particular section. I have taken that opinion, expressed in the only way we know of in which it can be expressed, and I argue from that expression of opinion that the interests of the farming community, as a whole of this Dominion, would not be advanced by an increased duty on flour. I am sure my hon. friends from Quebec, representing agricultural constituencies, will not deny the truth of this assertion as regards their Province. I myself, as representing a wheat growing constituency in Ontario, am unable to see that an increased duty on flour would add to the price of wheat sold by our farmers to the millers. I make that statement in full view of my responsibility as a representative of a farming constituency, as one who has always lived on a farm and who claims to know as much of farming interests as any member of this House.

With regard to the views of the millers, some of them have communicated their views to me, and in the course of the correspondence we have interchanged I have arrived at a fair idea of what they want. One of them says—I will not quote *verbatim*, but give the general drift of the letters. One of them says, in answer to the question as to whether the abolition of the duty on American hard spring wheat or the increase of duty on flour to 75 cents a barrel would be most in the interest of the millers:

"We think it would be better for the millers to have the duty removed from hard wheat or, if possible, from all grades of American wheat, for, in our opinion, the increase of duty to 75 cents a barrel will make very little difference to the millers. We think it would require a duty of \$1 a barrel to entirely stop the importation of American flour. We think it would be best to take duty off all grades of American wheat for milling purposes, but if there are serious objections against that by removing it from the different grades of hard spring it would help us greatly at some seasons."

In answer to a question as to whether wheat of a similar character to that imported was grown in Ontario, he said:

"We believe we grow better fall wheat here in Western Ontario than can be got from any American market—there is no competition in fall wheat—but no country produces so good a quality of hard wheat as the American North-West, except Manitoba. Nothing better can be grown in Ontario than fall wheat. It is far better for flour than any spring wheat raised here."

I asked if they could not import Manitoba wheat of the same character as the American wheat more cheaply than the American wheat and paying the duty, and was told:

"We have never yet been able to do so (import Manitoba wheat) and compete with the American flour made from the same quality of wheat (nor do we here especially in the west of Ontario ever expect to do so) as freights and other things are against us. Some of those millers who are situated so they can get Manitoba wheat by water might do so at some seasons, but even then it would not help the milling of the choice fall wheat of Ontario by our own mills."

I think this makes it very clear that, so far as our millers in Western Ontario are concerned, the duty on wheat does not inure to the benefit of Manitoba by inducing our millers to use Manitoba wheat; because, even with the discrimination against American wheat afforded by the duty, it does not pay our millers to import Manitoba wheat instead of American wheat. In answer to another question in respect to the effect the abolition of duty on United States wheat would have on the prices paid for Canadian wheat he said:

"At certain times the abolition of the wheat duty might affect the price paid to farmers for home grown wheat, but it is quite impossible that it should affect it permanently, as all are now aware that prices are regulated by the Liverpool market. We should only use American wheat when other wheat could not be got, as was the case last season."

They had explained in a former letter that the impossibility of getting wheat enough to keep their mills going compelled them to close them for part of the year.

"Ogilvies and some others may arrange to run their mills on Manitoba wheat, but the great majority must depend on the wheat that they buy at their mill doors. In regard to the views of the farmers on the wheat duty, they would hardly notice it. They look at the matter very much in this way, namely, that wheat is generally higher across the river or lake than in our own markets."

Bearing out the figures I produced to the House on the last occasion on which I spoke.

"We have very little faith in increase of duty to an extent to do good, and would sooner have the wheat duty off. It might often make things better for millers here."

Then he goes on to refer to certain improvements in freight rates that have been lately given to the western millers in the States. I will give also the effect of another letter from another firm of millers, which puts the case very clearly. They say:

"We do feel a great injustice is done the Canadian millers under the present duty and bonding arrangement on wheat, probably more grievous to some millers who are not so well situated for obtaining wheat as we are."

"You will see by this that the duty on wheat handicaps us in such a way that we find it very hard to obtain wheat and keep the mill running on full time, and require to stand still. It is utterly impossible for us to purchase wheat in Detroit or Chicago (which we would like to do

Mr. CASEY.

at the present time) even without the duty, and export the flour and make anything more than a living out of the transaction. Take for Example No. 2 Red Winter which is same wheat as raised here in Chicago is worth to-day 78½c, 77½c., and 78c., per bushel. We cannot expect to have it delivered here for less than 7c. per bushel, that will make the cost delivered here, say 85c. per bushel. We are paying the farmers here from 80c. to 85c. per bushel. Now add 15c. per bushel duty would bring it to \$1 per bushel. We could not ship any flour at such a cost of material, so the result is we stand still when we cannot purchase wheat from the farmers."

Now, this is a remarkable statement of practical men, engaged in milling and wishing to import wheat for milling purposes. They evidently did not take the duty into account at all when comparing the rates between Detroit and my constituency. They say it is as dear in Detroit or Chicago, with the freight added, as it is in my own neighborhood, so the duty has not raised the price of wheat in that part of the country, though it has prevented the importation of a certain amount of American wheat. It has had the effect of shutting down the mills for a certain time in the year without increasing the price to Canadian farmers, and appears to be mischievous to the manufacturing class in that part of the country without being of the slightest use to the agricultural class. They say:

"The expression of the duty benefitting the farmers is a fabulous theory, and won't hold water, for, when wheat gets over a certain cost, we do no business unless there is a general advance in breadstuffs. We have noticed the markets very particularly since 1878, and we have never yet seen the price of wheat in this section exceed the prices of wheat figuring the price in Chicago with freight to this point."

I gave you some figures the other afternoon for the past autumn. These gentlemen have watched the markets since 1878, and have found that to be true during all that time which I found to be true during last autumn.—

"This," he says, "I believe to be universal."

Then he goes on to point out the reason why they cannot compete in the eastern provincial markets. He says:

"As for perfection in machinery, the most of the mills in Ontario have the latest and best improved machinery, and can manufacture and finish the flour equal to anything in the United States, and those millers who could not would soon advance. There is a grade of flour known as strong bakers and high grade Minneapolis flour, which is meeting with purchasers in our cities, and it is used by the bakers. Now, if we could obtain the Manitoba wheat at a reasonable price, we could supply this trade ourselves. The cost of the wheat delivered here is too much."

They feel the pressure of heavy freight rates on Manitoba wheat as much as the Manitoba farmers do.—

"We do not believe much American flour has found its way into this market"—

This is, the Western Ontario market.—

"since the harvest of 1884. The writer did not approve of the Millers' Associations idea of an advance of duty on flour of 50 cents per barrel so as to make it \$1. . . . Now we feel the greatest boon to the millers would be, get the duty on wheat removed, and you will soon find there will be no American wheat find its way into Canadian market, as the millers would arrange to supply this trade."

Then he goes on to point out that there are six first class mills in that county, with capacities varying from 150 to 350 barrels for every 24 hours, making a total production of 1,200 barrels daily, which are now running on half time, and hardly that for the last three months, the cause being that they cannot obtain wheat. He afterwards states that they employ an average of fifteen men each, so that ninety men are thrown on half time, and that there is a capital invested amounting to \$270,000 in these mills, which is lying idle half the time. I think this is not a pleasant showing. It shows beyond doubt that the millers have grievances, it shows that the way in which the tariff is arranged is not favorable to their industry, and that something ought to be done for them. In what direction this something ought to be is a question for the Government to decide. It is for them to say whether they will remove a tax that does not seem to do much good to the farmers, or will reduce it, or whether they will increase the duty on flour. I do not know what the feeling of the farmers of

Western Ontario would be in regard to the removal of this tax—they have not yet been consulted on the subject—but, as one of them, speaking only for myself, I do not believe it does us any good. I believe the only use of the wheat duty has been as an excuse to induce us to submit to other taxes which have been very burdensome to farmers as a class throughout the country. If it had not been for the bait of the wheat duty and the barley duty held out to us in 1878, we would never have submitted to allow ourselves to be taxed for the building up of large manufacturing concerns in other parts of the country. It was only these two taxes that induced the farmers to accept the other taxes. It was only the promise that was made that we would obtain benefit from these two taxes that induced us to accept the National Policy. We have found, from a long experience of six years, that this policy has not raised the price of grains. The price of grains has, since the adoption of the National Policy, gone down almost continuously; at any rate, it is lower now than ever before; and we believe that, as far as that tax is concerned, the policy has been a humbug and we would suffer very little from its abolition. I have no doubt that, after the subject has been further debated in the House, the farmers will express some opinion in regard to it, and that will deserve the fullest consideration; but, speaking for myself, I do not believe it does us any good whatever, or that we would lose one cent a bushel by its abolition.

Mr. HESSON. What is the price of wheat in Chicago to-day?

Mr. CASEY. I have not a newspaper by me from which to make the quotation. Perhaps the hon. member when he follows me, will give the prices in Chicago and the prices here to-day, and then he will have a comparison. I want to say something about the most remarkable document which has ever been laid before this House, the report on the manufacturing interests in existence in Canada by Mr. Blackeby and Mr. Willis. I find that the enquiry originated in a memorandum by the hon. the Minister of Finance dated in May last, saying that he had long considered "the desirability of procuring reliable information"—reliable information, remember—"as to the manufacturing industries in existence in Canada, as regards the number of persons employed, the amount of capital invested, the output thereof, the date of establishment and the progress of the several factories, and, in fact, all particulars that will be of use in aiding the Government in legislation with reference thereto." It seems the Government intended to propose some legislation in regard to these industries during the coming year, and they wanted information to base that legislation on. Of course they wanted full and accurate information. He recommends that Mr. Blackeby be appointed because he is a man "who has shown himself fully qualified for the work." We will see how full and accurate the information is, and how fully Mr. Blackeby has shown himself qualified for the position he undertook. He occupies about 40 pages of a pamphlet of 200 pages, in dealing with the industries of Ontario and Quebec, the rest being taken up with the industries of the Maritime Provinces. Now, Mr. Speaker, this may give us a hint as to the fullness of the information obtained by Mr. Blackeby. One-fifth of this book is occupied by statistics regarding Ontario and Quebec, the two great manufacturing Provinces of the Dominion, the two Provinces which outweigh the others as greatly in manufactures, almost, as they do in population. One-fifth of the report only is taken up with these two great Provinces, while four-fifths are given up to industries in the Maritime Provinces, principally in the city of St. John and neighborhood. It is clear, then, that the information obtained about Ontario and Quebec cannot be as full as that obtained about the industries in the other Provinces.

Now, Mr. Blackeby begins by a sort of general observation on the country. He admits, to start with:

"It is true, that in some industries, the privilege of supplying the Canadian market for manufactured goods with the produce of our own mills, has been too largely taken advantage of by capitalists, anxious to put their money to a profitable use, and in this way the market (which, although a growing one, has its limits), was, for a time, unduly stocked with these classes of goods."

This is a very pretty and polite way of putting it. They were too anxious to take advantage of the privilege of supplying our people with home manufactured goods at high prices, and they overstocked the market; in other words he admits there was an unwholesome boom in manufactures which produced a plethora, and which is the cause of the depression now. This information is thoroughly reliable, of course, because it is the Finance Minister himself who has transmitted it to us. He goes on to say:

"It is now a question of a very short time when, having a thorough knowledge of the requirements of the people, manufacturers in Canada will be prepared to supply, through the labor of our own mechanics and operatives, all the demands of the market, at a profit alike to themselves and the districts in which they are located."

It must have been from Mr. Blackeby that the right hon. Premier obtained his now celebrated expression "ere long." Why, Sir, when the National Policy was first adopted we were told its effects were to follow immediately; that we were to have manufactures the day after, that the tall chimneys were to spring up, manufactures were to boom, and everybody was to make increased profits. But, now Mr. Blackeby says "it is a question of but a short time" when all this will take place. We have had the National Policy in force for six years and now "ere long" we are going to get the benefits of it. Then he tells us something of his methods. He says:

"It must not be supposed that the statistics given are the total figures of any particular class of work or any particular section of Ontario or Quebec."

He has been appointed to get full and thorough information upon which to base legislation, and he says it must not be supposed that his statistics are full in regard to any section. Oh, no. And then:

"In the limit of time given only sufficient factories could be visited to give a proper idea of what the general state of trade was in the several classes and the various districts."

Of course, the factories that he visited in order to get a "proper idea" of the state of trade naturally would not be those which were not doing well. In order to produce a "proper idea" he would visit those which were doing very well, and which have increased their products since 1878:

"Many towns having large industrial works have not been visited at all."

There is his own confession, the confession of the Government's agent:

"For instance, Almonte, which may almost be considered as the seat of the woollen trade in Canada, was not visited owing to lack of time, and other large industrial towns do not figure in this report."

The seat of the woollen trade in Canada was not visited! Would it not give a "proper idea" of the state of that trade if the seat of the woollen industry had been visited? I am inclined to fancy it was that reason and not lack of time, which prevented its being visited. It would seem from the terms of this report that the woollen trade in the seat of that industry cannot be as flourishing as it was some time ago, or Mr. Blackeby would have found some time to visit it. Why, Sir, he has been to Aylmer, Simcoe, Tilsonburg, and various other small towns in my county and neighborhood that are not the seat of any particular industry. He has been to all sorts of places in Ontario and Quebec. He has been everywhere he thought there was anything flourishing, but he had not time to go to Almonte, which was "the seat of the woollen industry of Canada," and he goes on to confess to us:

"Factories which were in existence some years prior to 1878, but were closed down in 1878, are given as new industries."

The man confesses that himself! He gives as new industries in this list, factories that were in existence previous to 1879, but were then temporarily closed down:

"Such for instance as the sugar refineries in Montreal, the bridge works and rolling mills at Hamilton."

And yet, Sir, the supporters of the Government will be quoting these figures throughout the country showing the great increase of prosperity, the increase in the sugar business, and in regard to these works at Hamilton, and others, without telling the people that Mr. Blackeby himself confesses in this report that these industries had been in existence years before. Why, Sir, he does not even pretend to give full information of the industries which were in existence in 1878. He gives a list of each town and what industries were there in 1878, and what have been established since, but he does not pretend to tell us how he got at those that existed in 1878; but judging from the cases in which we can track him I believe he has only put down, of the industries existing in 1878, those that are in existence now. If there were in a town in which eight existed in 1878, and still exist, he would put down eight in 1878; but he made no effort to find those that were in existence then but have failed since. I know that must be so with regard to St. Thomas, the county town of Elgin. We find that he groups together Aylmer, Simcoe, St. Thomas, and Tilsonburg, and he says the whole four towns had only five industries between them in 1878. The statement is perfectly absurd. It is a statement that he must have known would seem absurd, on the face of it, to any resident of that county. The Town of St. Thomas at that time had, to my knowledge, at least twelve or fifteen establishments which must be classed as industries. I do not pretend to know the names of all of them, but I am sure there were that many that I know of myself, and there must have been more that I do not know. But he returns the industries in the whole of these towns now as only thirteen. Why, St. Thomas alone had more in 1878 than he returns for the whole group now, and I am sure the whole number now is considerably greater than he states. He does not know how to make the best of his case. He has not returned the towns now as being as prosperous, some of them, as they really are, though he has taken good care to put them down as much less prosperous in 1878 than they really were. Take all the western part of my constituency; take the towns of Ridgetown, Highgate, Duart, Rodney, Dutton, Bismarck and Fingal, which do a large milling, manufacturing and foundry business; he has not visited them at all. He has tried to make out the case he was sent to make out, but he has not known how to do it. In the Town of St. Thomas again he puts down a foundry and iron works as having started in 1882, whereas it was in operation before 1878, but the property changed hands in 1882, and therefore he put it down as a new industry. That is enough, perhaps, of Mr. Blackeby's report. If the Government wanted to obtain correct statistics of the industries why did they not adopt the plan which has been followed with such success in Ontario? Why did they not establish something like the Bureau of Industries which is in constant correspondence with every industry and every farmer throughout the Province, collecting from month to month, as well as from year to year, careful statistics of the progress of the country. Why, Sir, the hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran) the other day paid these statistics the compliment of quoting them in preference to the statistics of the Dominion Government because they were fuller, and more accurate, and more straightforward, I must say, than the returns from which I have just been quoting. I shall refer, perhaps, to these returns at a later period. In regard to the prosperity spoken of in Mr. Blackeby's

Mr. CASEY.

report I am reminded of an article which appeared on Monday last in the *St. Thomas Times*, a Conservative organ; and I must pay it this compliment, that it is one of the ablest Conservative papers published west of Toronto. It ranks among the first Conservative papers for independence, honesty and straightforwardness. It is a strange coincidence that this article appeared in the next issue after the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), visited St. Thomas. I can only hope that he had a conference with the editor of that newspaper, and that the very correct ideas as to the state of the country which are expressed in that article were inspired by the hon. member to whom I refer. If so, it shows that he acquired a truer opinion of the state of the country than he had when he addressed the House. The *St. Thomas Times*, of March 16th, says:

"We read, from time to time, in American papers, of large numbers of men in manufacturing districts out of employment; so of miners in the coal mining districts. We are told that there has been over-production and hence mines and factories have to be closed and hands turned out of employ. While this has been largely the case in the United States it has been the case in some districts in Canada. * * * It does not, however, appear so plain why tens of thousands of the people of the United States should remain in idleness while they have millions of acres of untilled lands in the south and in the west and in the north. * * * The same is true of Canada; we have room for millions and support for millions in the North-West. We employ immigrant agents and send them to Europe. We offer inducements to get men to take our lands for nothing, or at prices within the reach of the poor. Why should not means be taken to get the poor and the idle from our own cities to occupy the land that would afford the industrious at least a comfortable living?"

Here is a Conservative paper, a well informed newspaper, published in a city which has, perhaps, retained its prosperity during the present depression better than any other in Canada, declaring that it is a very strange state of things that people should be lying idle in cities while we have millions of untilled acres of fertile land. It continues:

"Why should not the unemployed be assisted to go and cultivate the soil? Why should they spend months doing nothing, waiting for the fitful employment that the factories afford?"

This is a very strange contrast to the report of Mr. Blackeby, who says that men are earning higher wages, that more men are employed, and that each man is getting a fair day's wage for a fair day's work. Does this mean that our workingmen are getting a fair day's wage for a fair day's work? Would a Conservative organ confess to such a state of things existing if it were not satisfied that there are thousands idle, and that there are men who cannot get a fair day's wage for a fair day's work? It continues:

"If some of the means spent on immigration agents to the old countries of Europe were applied to helping off some of the unemployed in our cities, it would be quite as good an investment, perhaps better. There should not be want and destitution in countries that possess millions of acres of productive lands lying waste."

The editor admits there is want and destitution. He says there should not be. Again:

"It is not necessary that thousands of a reserved force of workmen should remain idle in our towns for three or six months of the year, waiting for a boom in the factories."

Are we not told that the factories are booming all the time? Can we believe there is a boom among the factories at the present time? The *St. Thomas Times* says there is not. The article continues:

"That is how the dangerous classes are manufactured. Let as many as can find regular work stay, and let the others be assisted to go where they will become independent."

If you read this in connection with some of the promises and pledges I heard the other day from the lips of the hon. Premier about the coming prosperity, independence and riches of the workingman, of the coming time when he would be able to pay far higher prices for everything the farmer had to sell, you cannot help smiling; but I confess it is a sad smile, not a smile of pleasure, but a smile of pity for those poor men who have been duped by those promises into voting for the introduction here of a so-called national

system of finance, which has brought them to the condition in which they now are, as it is described by one of the hon. gentleman's own organs. I say, then, that on the whole, by the admission of Conservatives themselves, the National Policy has been a failure. It has failed to produce the results promised to any single class in the community. It has failed to secure continuous prosperity for the manufacturers. It has failed to procure continual employment for the workingman. It has failed to procure good prices for the farmer. It has failed, last of all but not least of all, to procure reciprocity. I has failed, I say, to procure continuous prosperity, even for the industries which the Government most particularly desired to protect. Perhaps the most specially protected of the industries is the cotton industry. We all know there was a boom in that industry. It is shown in this report that the amount of capital invested has about tripled. What has been the result? Is that trade prosperous? If you look at the stock lists for the last few years you will find that the stock of the Canada, Hudon, Cornwall, and other mills formerly stood at 137, 190, or 200. In some of the companies the stock was quoted at twice the amount invested. Now these stocks range from 25 to 65. I think the Canada Company stock, that sold three years ago at 190 odd, now stands at 45, or about one-fifth of what it was three years ago. The stock of some of the others is at 25, or about one-fourth the capital paid when the company was first started. Is that a state of prosperity? I received Oswald's circular, which I believe is sent to all of us from Montreal at the opening of the year. I could not find from it that any of these companies had paid dividends during the last year. Here, then, are eight or ten millions of capital invested, which is not paying any dividend. There are no dividends paid to shareholders, no wages paid to operatives, and the stock of the companies has gone down, in some cases, to a quarter of the amount originally invested. Can that be called a state of prosperity? I am sure there are many, including some members of this House, who most loudly advocated, and most strongly supported the National Policy in the interest of this very manufacture, who have found that the protection of the cotton industry has not secured its prosperity.

Mr. HESSON. Where are the cotton lords?

Mr. CASEY. An hon. gentleman wants to know where the cotton lords are. They are now where a good many Irish landlords are—they are pretty hard up. They lorded it nobly during the time of the boom, so long as they could lord it over us; but now rates have fallen, their property has depreciated, and they are finding out that even a lord may sometimes find himself hard up, even though he be a cotton lord, and has all the influence and power of the Government at his back to try and make his property valuable. But their fall was inevitable. So long as there was only a certain number of mills, the boom continued. But when the home market was supplied, and over supplied, the boom had to stop. It is not a temporary depression. There are more cotton mills and machinery in Canada than will be required to supply the needs of this country for years and years to come. They are burthened not only with actual manufactures of cotton but, as this newspaper (*St. Thomas Times*) states, with the facilities for making more goods. The facilities for production are too great for the size of the country, and we are destined either to continued depression, or continued short production by the mills which are now in existence.

As to the farming class, the National Policy has been a special failure. It gives them no protection. The claim that they are given protection is now given up by almost everybody who discusses the subject, and although their's is almost the only unprotected industry in the country, agriculture is the only industry in Canada which has shown during these years an unabating and constant rate of pro-

gress. Agriculture has progressed steadily during these years; it is progressing steadily now, and I believe, taking it all around, apart from the low prices, it is in a fairly prosperous condition. The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who spoke the other day, quoted the statistics of the Ontario Bureau of Industries, to show that the price of farm land had gone up in Ontario. I believe he quoted them correctly, and I believe from my knowledge of the gentleman who collects those statistics that they are as correct as they can be made. I believe that the value of farm property in most parts of Ontario has gone up.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. But to what do we owe that? Is it to the National Policy?

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). To the Mowat Government.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman has taken the word out of my mouth—we owe it to the Mowat Government. He has taken the word out of my mouth, for we do owe it to a large extent to the Mowat Government; but above all to the enterprise, the business ability, and the general vigor and push of the farming community themselves, and of those classes of shippers with whom their prosperity is so closely bound up. We owe it to the development of the export trade in cattle and beef, in sheep and in cheese; to the improvement in the production of cheese and to some extent to the improvement in the character of our butter, though that improvement has not been so great as we would like. Besides all this we owe it to railway development, to the drainage of the land by open drains and tile drains, and to many other agencies of this kind entirely distinct from the National Policy, and for which we have not to thank this Government here in the slightest degree. I say that the farmers' own industry and energy have done a great deal, but without the aid given by the Government of Ontario these would not have accomplished as much as they have done, and I am glad that the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. White) has confessed his agreement with me on that point. I say that the increase in the value of land is owing partly to the development of railways, and our railway system has been developed tremendously by the assistance given by the Provincial Government. It has sent local railways, competing railways, into all parts of the Province, and it has assisted municipalities to build their own roads—it has done everything possible to promote the construction of railways. It has in the second place given facilities to farmers to borrow money at low rates of interest for open and tile drains, and any one coming from my section of the country will know that in those two respects alone, the measures of that Government have added more to the value of land in Ontario, and to the profits of Ontario farmers, than this Government could ever hope to do, by any National Policy they could bring down, or by any other policy they could establish. As a matter of personal experience I can say that tile drainage often doubles the value of lands and almost invariably pays a larger percentage on the money invested than could be got out of any other investment. The profits are frequently estimated at from 25 to 35 per cent, and the Government lends money to farmers at 5 per cent. interest for the purposes of tile drainage. Is it not a direct benefit to the farmer to have his land doubled in value, or his profits increased from 25 to 35 per cent. a year, and that at a cost to himself of only 5 per cent. on the money he borrows, if he has not the money of his own to spend? The improvement in the making of cheese has had a great deal to do with the increased value of land. How has that been brought about? Has this Government done anything to bring it about? The Ontario Government has assisted cheese making by assisting dairymen's institutes to which learned specialists in that line are brought

to instruct the dairymen of Canada. By this means, and by distributing literature bearing on dairy work, cheese-making has been improved to such an extent in Canada that we are now almost confessedly at the head of the world. A few years ago we were nowhere compared with the United States; now we are ahead of that country in the English markets, and it is an actual fact that Ontario cheese-makers have been taken home to England and Scotland to teach the dairymen of that country how to make cheese.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Will the hon. gentleman permit me to give one reason why Canadian cheese has gone up?

Mr. CASEY. Certainly; state it.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds). Previous to the introduction of the National Policy the Americans shipped inferior American cheese through Canada as Canadian cheese, thereby lowering the reputation of our make, but now they must make themselves responsible for their own cheese or else pay the duty.

Mr. CASEY. This shows just about how much hon. gentlemen opposite know of the effect of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman attributes to the National Policy the fact that bad American cheese has ceased to be marketed as Canadian cheese, and he is not aware apparently that the National Policy has not increased the duty on cheese at all.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds.) I know we had two cents a pound before the National Policy.

Mr. CASEY. Two of the articles with which the National Policy has not interfered at all are butter and cheese, and I have, therefore, taken those two articles as illustrating, most particularly, the fact that wherever the Government kindly leaves an industry alone it prospers, and that wherever they do interfere they injure. No, Sir; I say the National Policy, as regards the farming industry, has been a huge and gigantic failure, and that the improvements which have taken place in agriculture—and they are great—have been due to the industry and enterprise of the farmers themselves, and to the assistance of the Local Government of Ontario, and perhaps the Governments of the other Provinces, though I am not so fully posted with regard to them.

But, Sir, the National Policy is only one of the many failures of which the present Administration has been guilty; and I say "guilty of failure," though we would not ordinarily say that, because when they came into power they professed that they were going to be always successful, that Providence was with them, and that they were sure of being successful at all times, so that if they failed it has been by some wrong doing of their own; they are "guilty of failure," and have not merely been unfortunate. There has been a superstition that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government has a talisman which makes him always successful; and I do not know anything which has contributed so much to his success as the widespread opinion that he always would be successful, that everybody believed in his star. But that superstition is rapidly becoming obsolete; if not, it shows that those who once enter on the service of a leader—those who follow the fortunes of a prophet—cannot detach themselves from him no matter how severely they are admonished by facts that his star is no longer in the ascendant, and that the continuous success which they hoped for is failing him. It must shake the belief of those gentlemen in the right hon. gentleman's success—in his talisman—his star—to find that in regard to the liquor question, in regard to the boundary question, in regard to the disallowance question, he has led them into courses which have been disastrous to the party.

Mr. CASEY.

In regard to the liquor license question, first of all, he was wrong in policy in attempting to get control of the liquor business in the different Provinces. It was not a thing he should have desired as a matter of policy. It was a troublesome thing. It would give him a little patronage; but the trouble it would cost him would be greater than the good he would get from the patronage. But, Sir, actuated by a feeling of personal rivalry against the Premier of Ontario, whom he described as a "little tyrant," and to whom he was going to teach good manners, he determined to get control of that business. In doing so he was doubly wrong—wrong in policy, and wrong in the means he adopted for carrying out that policy; for after having one Act after another, we know that at present, by the decision of the highest tribunal to which the question has been carried, the McCarthy Act is not the law of the land in any of the Provinces, and we do not believe it is going to be. He has made enemies amongst the temperance people, and amongst the liquor dealers as well. That one blunder has cost him more votes than he could have hoped to obtain if the means he used had been successful. With regard to the boundary question, his blunder was equally great. He refused to accept the decision of a fair tribunal as to where the real boundary of Ontario was; he has fought for years against accepting that decision; and now we have the decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire, that the territory of which he tried to deprive Ontario, always did belong, and now does belong, to that Province. Now, I want to emphasise that he was not only wrong in contending as he did in reference to that matter, not only mistaken in law and in equity, but that he was committing a gross blunder in the way of policy. He could not have made a grosser blunder in policy than in setting the sentiment of Ontario against him as he did in the boundary matter. He has dashed forever the hopes of his lieutenant in the Local Legislature to lead a Government in that Province, by compelling him to follow him in that policy. Whatever hopes that gentleman had previously entertained, when he was compelled to follow the mistaken line of policy of his leader in this House, he lost his hopes in Ontario. Blunder upon blunder, not only in the nature of the policy to be pursued, but in the method of carrying it out! But now we come to the greatest blunder of all, the blunder of the Canadian Pacific Railway policy. I am not at present discussing whether the action of the Government in regard to that work during its whole history has been a crime or not, but I wish to show that it has been what is much more reprehensible than a crime in the opinion of many people, and that is a blunder. I am not going to give my own authority, but the authority of the official organ of the Government itself. The *Toronto Mail* in February last, said:

"A mistake was made at the threshold of the undertaking in supposing that the line could be constructed for 30,000,000 acres of land and \$30,000,000. This blunder was perpetuated in 1881, when it was assumed that the road, as it then stood, with 426 miles from Lake Superior to Winnipeg, and 215 miles from Kamloops to Port Moody, under construction by the Government, could be completed for 25,000,000 acres and \$25,000,000. If the land subsidy could have been sold for two dollars an acre within the period occupied in construction, both the first and the second estimates might have sufficed for the work."

Why could not the land subsidy be sold for that price during the progress of the work? Simply because the railway company, the creatures of the Government, followed the example of the Government itself, and blundered too. They blundered by constructing the road twice or three times as fast as was necessary. They were told, time and again, by the best minds of the country that this was a blunder, but they went on blundering as the Government had done in the first instance; and after unnecessarily increasing their expenses, and building faster than the country could be settled, they found their land subsidy left on their hands comparatively valueless. Then the *Mail* goes on to

depreciate our country—to do that which the *Globe* has often been untruly blamed for doing—to say that our land is not worth as much as that across the line :

“ If our land subsidy of 25,000,000 acres be worth two dollars an acre, the Northern Pacific lands must be worth much more. For while the population of the whole Territory through which the Canadian Pacific runs, from Callander to the Pacific, does not at this hour exceed 200,000, the smaller and more compact region traversed by the Northern Pacific is comparatively well settled. * * * If it be said that the mountain section of the Northern Pacific was more costly than the mountain section of Canadian Pacific Railway, and that in the case of the Canadian Pacific the heavy work on the Pacific slope has been assumed by the Government, the answer is that the Northern Pacific had no rock division, 650 miles long, such as that which stretches in unbroken desolation between Port Arthur and Callander.”

Six hundred and fifty miles of unbroken desolation in Canada ! It is the *Toronto Mail* that is saying this ! Six hundred and fifty miles of unbroken desolation on the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway ! Why, Sir, if the *Globe* said that, it would be paraded through the country ; it would be shouted from every Conservative platform, and copied in all the papers, to the ends of the Dominion, as an instance of the virulent and libellous assertions of the *Globe* with reference to Canadian land. It is bad enough to have the *Mail*, the official organ of the Government, calling it a blunder ; but it was not alone in that. Shortly afterwards we had the *Gazette* of Montreal, which is credited with being the organ of the gentleman who is to be the next Finance Minister or Minister of Railways, or whatever he is to be, stating on February 20th :

“ Rumor has been busy for some weeks past with the affairs of the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company is reported to be seeking further assistance from Parliament, to have incurred a floating liability to a considerable amount, and to have failed to raise a loan in the money market, and it is no longer a secret that these reports are substantially correct.”

The *Gazette* says that the company has failed to get along so far with the money it has had. That is a confession of failure, a confession of blundering.—

“ The company has been compelled to obtain the money for these purposes on its credit and that of its directors, and has in this way created the floating liability now existing. But the expectation entertained by the company of being able to borrow in the open market such money as might be required to properly equip the property has been disappointed. Twice during the year means were sought for the extension of the branch lines in the North-West, but, though liberally subsidised with land, though promising to be profitable from the outset, capitalists have declined to invest in these enterprises, principally because of the arbitrary mortgage on the whole property of the company held by the Government.

Is not this a confession of failure—a confession that the credit of the company has declined ? Perhaps it is an attempt to destroy the credit of the company ; at all events, it is a confession that the scheme of relief devised last year was a blunder, because it did not succeed in relieving the company. The money given last year evidently was not sufficient ; and yet the security taken from the country by the Government was of such a nature as to prevent the company borrowing the money elsewhere. There is a failure on the part of the company to do what they expected to do with this money ; there is a blunder on the part of the Government in their policy with regard to the company, a blunder which has been fatal to the company's credit in the markets of the world. But that is not all. We have again in the *Mail*, of March 7th, a more determined attack on the credit of the Canadian Pacific Railway :

“ It is to be regretted that Mr. Stephen was unable to deal with the Opposition assaults upon the financial standing of the company. The *Globe* the other day produced a heap of figures to prove that the members of the syndicate had made and were making millions out of the work. The same tables were exhibited a year ago when the company was applying for the loan of \$22,500,000 and the country was asked to believe that Mr. Stephen and his associates could not possibly require more money for the honest purposes of construction, inasmuch as by the *Globe*'s figuring they had amassed colossal private fortunes even then. It was subsequently learned that, at the time that loan was hanging in Parliament, the leading members of the company stood indebted on their personal guarantee, as well as by the obligations of the road, to the extent of many millions, and that if the loan had been refused they would have been ruined and hundreds with them. If the truth could be

told just now—I do not know why it could not—the same state of affairs would probably be exposed.”

The *Mail* thus says that probably the condition of the Canadian Pacific Railway is as bad now as it was last year before they got their loan of \$22,500,000 ! If that is not a confession of failure on the part of the railway, and of bungling on the part of the Government, and of something worse, perhaps, on the part of both, I do not know what would constitute such a confession. They say they were in a desperate condition last year when they got \$22,500,000, and are just as badly off now as then. Where have all the millions been sunk ?

“ If the truth could be told just now, the same state of things would be found to exist, but, as the Opposition well know, the company cannot lay their books before the world, nor by showing their sores claim exemption from illusage.”

Poor company ! They are covered with sores, these “ sores ” appear in the books ; and if they show the books to the world, the world will know all about them ? The metaphor is a very mixed one, and the only meaning I can get out of it is that there is something very rotten in the state of the company, which would be seen by the public if only the books were shown, and for that reason they cannot show their books. Talk about showing their sores and claiming exemption for ill usage ! What more could an exhibition of the books do to damn the credit of the company and make it utterly impossible for them to obtain loans in any part of the world than these revelations ? Was it the intention of the *Mail*, in making these revelations, to create public sympathy for the company just as mendicants create public sympathy by showing their sores to the public ? Or is it possible that after all they may only be artificial sores, as is sometimes the case with mendicants' sores, got up to create pity, and which can be washed off with soap and water as soon as the sturdy tramp gets his pocket full of alms and goes off with his companions to enjoy them ? Is it not possible that this plaint of the *Mail* is a mere pretext to excite pity, and that the case is not quite so bad as represented ? But, Mr. Speaker, this is a digression. The principal object of my quoting these expressions was not to discuss the Canadian Pacific Railway policy, but to show that, according to the *Globe* and the *Mail*, nay, on the confession of the *Herald* itself, the credit of the company is gone, and the policy of the Government has failed in making the company strong and prosperous, or even in enabling it to borrow money. The *Herald*, on March 9th, said :

“ Even the Government guarantee has not availed to provide any capital from private sources, even the credit of the company, backed by the Government, has not been able to provide the money needed.”

If the credit of the company is worth nothing, and the credit of the Government which backs them is worth nothing, is not that as thorough a confession of failure as can be imagined ?

But, leaving the question of failures of Government policy, I want to call attention to the fact that we have not merely our own experience to go by in dealing with Customs matters, in dealing with tariffs and expenditures, but we have also the experience of a great nation beside us. We all know that the favorite argument used for the National Policy in 1878 was the prosperity of the United States under a highly protective system. It was useless to tell the people that the circumstances in the United States were different, that the United States had practically free trade over half a continent, and that it was the internal free trade and not the external protection that built them up and caused them to prosper. The great facts stared the people in the face that the United States had protection, and that they were prosperous, and it was useless to argue that the one was not a consequence of the other. What is the state of things to-day ? We all know that the last presidential election turned on the great question of the tariff, and that the triumph of the Democratic party was the triumph of the

revenue tariff principle. I have here a quotation from the speech of Mr. Hendricks, the Vice-President elect, which he made after the election. He was asked what was the Democratic policy of taxation? He said it was expressed in four propositions:

"First, taxation shall not exceed the needs of the Government—that was borrowed from President Arthur. Secondly, taxation shall only be for public purposes and not for private gain and speculation."

The declared object of taxation in this country for years has been private gain and speculation, and has led to commercial speculation as wild as any "wild-cat" boom in the North-West or elsewhere.

"Third, in the adjustment of the taxation care shall be taken not to hurt or harm capital. Fourth, taxation shall be heaviest upon articles of luxury and lightest upon articles of necessity."

We do not apply that rule, we put articles of luxury on the free list and tax the articles of necessity. I may say these four articles express approximately, that is having regard to the different circumstances of the two countries, the doctrine of the Reform party in Canada on the subject of taxation; and the triumph of that platform in the United States is the omen of a similar triumph in Canada for a similar policy. But that is not all. That comes from a man who is a supporter of a revenue tariff. Let us hear the opinion of a member of the outgoing Administration, the Administration which was elected as a protective Government, to hold office as such. The nearest corresponding official in the United States to our Finance Minister is the Secretary of the Treasury. His Report which corresponds to our Budget Speech was made to Congress on the first of December last, and in that statement after pointing out that after the war stimulus was given to the growth of protected industries, he said:

"Stimulus was found in railway building and in extravagant expenditures induced by superabundant currency, and the time has now come when the manufacturing industry of the United States is in dire distress from plethora of manufactured goods. Some manufacturing companies have been forced into bankruptcy; others have closed their mills to escape it."

Just like the position in Canada:

"Few mills are running on full time, and as a consequence a very large number of operatives are either deprived of employment or are working for wages hardly sufficient to enable them to live comfortably or even decently."

This is the utterance of the protectionist Finance Minister of a protectionist Government:

"Nor are manufacturers and their employes the only sufferers by the present depression of our manufacturing industry."

He admits they are the principal ones. He goes on then to point out that the only hope is the development of foreign trade, that to develop foreign trade a readjustment of the tariff will be necessary, that a commission should be appointed to consider what that readjustment should consist of, and he says:

"In the commencement of its work the commission should, I think, regard the following points as being settled:—First, that the public revenues are not to be in excess of what may be required for the support of the Government and the gradual reduction of the public debt."

This protectionist Finance Minister has given up the whole theory of protection, and lays down as the first principle to guide the commission in the United States that the tariff should be for revenue only! That, I consider, to be a triumph for the theory of a revenue tariff greater than any achieved for many years, because this is the utterance of a man who was in office because he had been a protectionist.

Mr. HESSON. That is the theory; what is their action?

Mr. CASEY. Their actions has not been anything, because they have gone out of power, but the revenue tariff Government, whose platform I have just read to the House, is in power now and will undoubtedly readjust the tariff in that sense. He goes on to say:

Mr. CASEY.

"That the existing duties upon raw materials which are to be used in manufacture should be removed, and that the duties upon the articles used or consumed by those who are the least able to bear the burden of taxation should be reduced."

So much for his ideas on tariff. The theory of protection was abandoned even before the new Government came into office. He goes on to deal with the shipping interest, and I must read a few lines in regard to that which will be my last quotation from Mr. McCullough:

"In direct connection with the condition of our foreign trade is the condition of our merchant service. The causes of the decline of our shipping are so well understood that any remarks on this point are quite unnecessary."

I think they are. I recommend this view of the case to my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Burns), who thought shipping was so greatly improved by the National Policy:

"The humiliating fact stares us in the face that, while the United States not many years ago led all nations in shipbuilding, and was second only to Great Britain in ocean tonnage, it has almost ceased to be recognised as a maritime power; that nearly all of our agricultural productions and manufactured goods which find a market in Europe or South America and the articles received in exchange for them are carried in foreign ships; that the many thousands of Americans who annually visit Europe on business or for pleasure go and come in European steamers; that large foreign steamship lines are in fact supported by the people of the United States. All this is not only humiliating to our national pride, but it stands in the way of the improvement of our foreign trade."

That is the declaration of the Finance Minister of the United States in regard to shipping, and the effects of a protective tariff for 25 years on that industry. He goes on to say that there is no hope for the shipping trade except in bonuses from the Government:

"The let-alone policy has been tried for many years, during which our ships have been swept from the ocean, and we pay every year many millions of dollars to foreign shipowners for freights and fares."

He says they must give them subsidies:

"The amount of necessary aid would be insignificant in comparison with what has been granted to manufacturers by protective duties, and nothing would be paid until the services were rendered."

He admits that protective taxes are a subsidy to manufacturers:

"It is admitted that all protective duties and subsidies are inconsistent with the teachings of political economy, but, true as these teachings may be in the abstract, they are disregarded by all nations when they stand in the way of national welfare."

He admits they are true, but says "you must follow a false course sometimes in the interests of the country." They have been following that course for many years, and they have not found it to pay, and even the outgoing protectionist Government of President Arthur was forced to give up its protectionist theories and adopt a revenue policy before it left office and the Democrats took its place.

In general, our review of the state of the country is not reassuring. We have found failure upon failure. We have found the leader of this Government led into repeated rivalries with the leader of a Provincial Government and led into new failures in consequence of each of those rivalries. We have found him worsted in every one of them and bringing failure upon himself and embarrassment upon the country by these repeated blunders. We have found that the policy, by the promise of which he induced us to return him to office, has become a failure like the rest. He and his associates, when they left office in 1873 and for years afterwards, were discredited politically, I might almost say they were discredited personally as politicians, by the events which led to their exclusion from office. By the promise of this policy, which was to make us happy and prosperous all round, they induced us to return them to power again in 1878, hoping they would make us rich by the National Policy, and that the punishment they had already received would prevent them from falling again into the evil political courses to which they were formerly addicted. But we have been sold in both directions. Notwithstanding the punishment they then received, we have the same

extravagance, the same corruption, the same degradation of political sentiment throughout the country, that characterised their former appearances upon the stage. We have all that repeated over and over, and we have in addition the fact that the price they were to pay us for returning them to power has turned out to be valueless—that the policy which was to make us all rich has made some of us a great deal poorer and cannot justly be credited with making any considerable class in the country richer. This cannot continue. The country is beginning to see that it has been sold in both directions. The indignation is growing through many sections of the country. It will not be denied that there is disaffection in Quebec, that there is disaffection in Ontario, that there is disaffection in New Brunswick and in all the other Provinces among the right hon. gentleman's own supporters. The difficulties he has created by his evil courses are coming upon him. The chickens are coming home to roost—whole flocks of them—some as members of deputations, some in the form of his own supporters in the House asking for impossibilities to be done to carry out the promises made to them and not fulfilled. The end cannot be long deferred, the end of broken promises and falsified hopes, the end of the reckless course of policy into which he has been betrayed. It may be postponed till the next election, but, unless that is brought on very soon, it is very probable that the disappointment of the hon. gentleman's own supporters with the lines of policy he has introduced will lead to a breaking up sooner, as happened once before when he had a large majority in the House and it melted away like snow in the sun.

Mr. RYKERT. What a pity. Would you not be sorry?

Mr. CASEY. The right hon. gentleman (Sir John Macdonald) laughs. We have seen him laugh before, when charges were made against him, but we have seen also his majority melt away from him.

Mr. RYKERT. When?

Mr. CASEY. In the autumn of 1873.

Mr. BOWELL. What did it cost you?

Mr. CASEY. They claimed a majority of 36, but the Government was defeated before it went to the polls, and, when it did go to the polls, it was defeated so crushingly that it was clear to every one that the people had pronounced a verdict of general condemnation against that hon. gentleman and his associates. I say that verdict was temporarily suspended in consequence of promises made to us which have not since been fulfilled. That verdict must now be carried out, and the hon. gentlemen, who have been out on bail, so to speak, must be called up for sentence and must suffer that punishment which they have so richly deserved.

Mr. STAIRS. Though it is rather a late stage in the debate, I desire to make a few remarks upon the subjects which have been discussed during the last few days in this House. I shall not reply very directly to any of the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, because I consider that he has been replied to most fully in the course of the debate by the different gentlemen who have spoken on this side of the House. I hope the House will bear with me if, in the course of my remarks, which will be more directly connected with the Maritime Provinces, and especially Nova Scotia, I dwell upon some of the general subjects that have already been treated. Several subjects have been touched upon during this debate in which we in Nova Scotia are very deeply interested indeed. The hon. member for South Huron (Mr. Cartwright), I think, in reply to the Finance Minister, made some aspersions on the prosperity of Nova Scotia. I desire to reply to these; and I also desire, with the permission of

the House, briefly to touch upon the question of the sugar tariff, and the sugar trade, in reply to the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson). But in the first place I wish to refer to some statements of the member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies), in regard to the shipping interests of Nova Scotia and the Dominion. I think, Sir, that the hon. gentleman did not do himself justice in his remarks upon that subject. That I may not misrepresent what he said I would refer the House to his remarks upon that subject, as found on page 582 in *Hansard*. The general tenor of his remarks was in the direction of blaming the National Policy for the decrease in the shipping of the Dominion which has taken place during the last five years; and at the same time he claimed credit for the Government of the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) for the increase which took place in the shipping during the time he was in power. Now, Sir, I need not point out to the House how untrue such a claim is. Every hon. member knows that the Government in power at that time had nothing whatever to do with the prosperity, or want of prosperity, of the shipping industries of Canada engaged in the foreign trade. I have gathered some statistics which show that nearly every country in the world engaged in shipping has suffered a decrease during the last four or five years greater than the decrease in Canada or Nova Scotia, or even in Prince Edward Island, from which that hon. gentleman comes. I regret that I shall have to weary the House with a few figures, but still in a case of this kind it is impossible to reply to the hon. gentleman's statements without making use of figures. Now, I think his comparison was very unfair in one respect and that is when he compared the shipping of the Dominion of Canada with that of the United Kingdom. Everyone knows that the shipping of the United Kingdom at the present time is largely composed of iron steamships. It is well known, too, that the increase in the shipping of that country has been in iron steamships, and not in sailing vessels; and I shall be able to show that not only has there not been any increase in the sailing vessels of the United Kingdom during the period to which that hon. gentleman referred, but there has been in reality a decrease to a very much greater extent than has taken place in the Dominion of Canada. In the list which I shall read the tonnage refers only to sailing vessels, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to note especially the percentages of decrease or increase:

Country.	1878.	1882.	Decrease.	Per cent.
Hamburg.....	144,821	138,462	6,359	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Germany.....	949,467	915,446	34,021	3 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Finland.....	293,921	272,147	21,774	7 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Prussia.....	457,620	378,824	78,796	17 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Holland.....	299,522	217,517	82,005	27 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Belgium.....	10,319	6,750	3,569	34 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
France.....	730,075	566,786	163,289	22 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Italy.....	666,137	885,285	80,852	8 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
United States—				
Registered...	1,458,209	1,137,724	320,485 inc.	21 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
Licensed and				
Enrolled..	1,586,878	1,672,332
United King-				
dom.....	4,238,692	364,650	617,042 dec.	14 $\frac{1}{2}$ %
		1881.		
Norway.....	1,475,017	1,454,777	20,238	1 $\frac{3}{8}$ %
Sweden.....	454,491	450,368	4,123	$\frac{1}{2}$ %
Denmark.....	204,586	191,983	12,603	6 $\frac{1}{8}$ %

In the case of the United States, I admit there was a slight increase in the shipping engaged in the home trade that is called the licensed or enrolled, and which is engaged in the coasting trade. In the case of the United Kingdom there was a decrease of 14 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. But in the comparison instituted by the hon. gentleman, he said there was an increase in the shipping of the United Kingdom. Of course I do not say that he said there was an increase in the sailing ships of the United Kingdom, but he said there was an increase in the shipping, and then he made a comparison of the sailing vessels of Canada, and the sailing vessels and

steam vessels of the United Kingdom, which everybody knows was not fair.

Mr. DAVIES. In all sailing vessels and steam vessels of Canada. I included the sailing vessels and steam vessels in my comparison.

Mr. STAIRS. I accept the hon. gentleman's correction, but I am certain it does not affect the case at all, because every one knows that the steam vessels of Canada are in such small proportion to the steam vessels of the United Kingdom that really his correction does not mend the matter for him at all. I would be perfectly willing to revise the figures to suit him, and still I would be able to prove my position. Nova Scotia was estimated in 1878 to possess 553,368 tons of shipping; in 1882, 546,778 tons, or a decrease of $1\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. only, which I claim is a very favorable showing considering the condition of the shipping trade throughout the world. Canada possessed in 1878, 1,330,000 tons of shipping, as against 1,260,000 in 1882, or a decrease of $5\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. The figures taken by the hon. gentleman included both sailing vessels and steamships; but as the number of steamships in Canada is small the difference will not have much effect on the calculation. Prince Edward Island in 1878 possessed 54,250 tons of shipping; in 1883, 49,446, or a decrease of $8\frac{1}{10}$ per cent. In 1882 the shipping was not so large; there was a very big jump from 1882 to 1883, and there must have been some exceptional circumstance in 1882 which reduced the shipping unnaturally. I think I have proved that the cause of the decrease in Canadian shipping during this period of four years cannot be ascribed to the National Policy or to anything connected with it. It has been due to something outside of Canada altogether. I believe the portion of the shipping of the Dominion in which there has been a decrease is that engaged in foreign trade, crafts which leave our ports on long voyages and seldom come back to our shores again. What is the competition which has caused this small reduction? There is no doubt but that it is the large increase in the iron ships of England and of some few other countries. It is due to those iron freight steamers which are now going all over the world, which are taking freight to all parts of the east through the Suez canal, which trade many years ago was done entirely by wooden ships. It so happens that it has not been so much a case of iron against wood as a case of steam against sail, and I am very sorry to say that Canadian sailing ships have not been able to compete in many important trades with the steamships of England. This change is noticeable in our own harbors. Take Montreal. Year by year more of the products of Canada are taken away by steamers, and more and more of our imports are brought to this country by steamers. So it is that our sailing vessels are not able to compete with steamships. We hope and trust, however, that in time Canada may be able to compete with England or any other country in building iron steamers, and that is the only way we shall be able to continue that increase which we made for many years, from 1867 down probably to 1878. It is very difficult for us to compete with the iron steamships of England. It is not only difficult for Canada but for every other country in the world; and therefore, if we are not able to do it here I am sure under the circumstances we need be ashamed of ourselves; nevertheless we must endeavor if possible to attain that end. I should not like to say, or even to hint, that the hon. gentleman's remarks on this subject were made with the intention of deceiving the House; but I think when he came down with figures respecting shipping he should have looked a little more closely into the subject before he presented them to the House and sent them through the country, endeavoring to make Government liable for something entirely beyond their control. A brief remark was made by that hon. gentleman in regard to the export trade of England,

Mr. STAIRS.

and he dwelt upon it, and upon the large increase made in it during the last few years, and also on the value it was to that country. I want to point out here that I think there is something in this export trade of England which we must not overlook. When we observe that it has been holding its own during the last few years we must remember that it is very generally acknowledged by many men in England who are well qualified to judge, the export trade of England during the last few years has in very many important articles been maintained at a loss, or if not at a loss at a very heavy reduction in profits. The people of England have been holding their own, they have been exporting their goods to very many countries of the world, and in very many cases have been sending them in against protective tariffs; but the manufacturers have been obliged, in order to do so, to sacrifice their profits. Is it not a proof that in a large number of important manufactures in England, cotton and iron notably, there are very many of the manufactories idle. This, I believe, is the result: That protective tariffs, which they have been endeavoring to meet, have obliged them to bring down their prices so that in cotton and other particular industries it is now impossible to manufacture at a profit; and the effect of it, I believe, will be that in a few years we will see that English manufacturers will feel still more keenly, than in the past, outside competition.

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

After Recess.

Mr. STAIRS. When you left the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I had been showing that the statements of the hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) with respect to the shipping of the Dominion were totally inaccurate. I had shown most clearly that the causes to which he had attributed the decline of shipping from 1878 to 1882 were not the right ones, and that those causes were entirely beyond and outside the control of the Dominion Government, or in fact of anything within the Dominion itself. I had also shown in the course of my remarks that the hon. gentleman's claim that the increase in shipping from 1874 to 1878 had been caused by action taken by the Government then in power, was altogether inaccurate and not borne out by facts. Both of those things had occurred for reasons altogether beyond and outside the control of the Dominion Government and the people of Canada. I will now go on, with the permission of the House, to take up another question of very great importance to the whole Dominion, that is the question of the effects of the tariff on the sugar trade of the Dominion. This question was argued a few nights ago by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), and in reply to him I am glad to be able to assure the House that it only needs careful consideration of that hon. gentleman's own figures to allow every one to see the fallacy of them. And in treating the question this evening I shall not go out of his figures at all, but shall proceed entirely upon the data he has put before the House. The hon. gentleman in opening his discussion on this particular subject said:

"I think I can make the matter sufficiently plain and can give figures that any hon. gentleman can work out for himself, and ascertain the accuracy of the statements of the Finance Minister, that under this tariff of his the people are getting it as cheaply as under the Mackenzie tariff."

Now I would point out that his first comparison on this subject was made between the price of sugar in bond and the price by retail in a small town in the interior of Canada. His comparison at this time was made at a public meeting, held in the town of Belleville, not long since, I think, and I presume he imagined that perhaps his audience might not see fully the fallacy of his statement. But I can hardly think that any intelligent audience such as is brought

together in a Canadian public meeting should have heard his figures without seeing wherein he was wrong. What did he do? In the first place he took the bond price and compared it with the duty paid price, and when I get along a little further I shall elaborate more fully how he did this. He compared the bond price, or the wholesale price, with the retail price, and he compared the prices in the larger town of Kingston with the smaller town of Belleville. The hon. gentleman must see that such an attempt to arrive at any true opinion of the state of the sugar trade of Canada was erroneous and wrong, and that it was unfair to go before a public audience and take the bond price, the price at which sugar could be laid down in bond at Kingston, and compare it with the retail price in Belleville. With reference to a conversation he had with a dealer he says:

"He said: I have sugar, No. 9, Dutch standard, that I bought for 8s. 3d. sterling per 100 lbs."

I presume he means 112 lbs. He went on:

"I then suggested we should make a calculation of the cost. We sat down and made a calculation; we added the commission, the freight, and all charges incurred before the sugar could be placed in bonded warehouse, and the result was, that we found the sugar cost him, laid down in his bonded warehouse, \$2.15 per 100 lbs. You can sell that, I said, for 2½ cents per lb. and do well. He answered: Yes, I wish I could sell all the sugar I can shovel out at that profit for a year, and then I would soon retire. At the meeting, in the course of my speech, and after referring to the way in which this sugar question had been placed before the people the previous night by a Conservative speaker, I asked the audience, at what price can you get your sugar to-day? A gentleman in the audience—whom, I presume, was a friend of the Government, because, as he replied, there was a ring of triumph in his tone—said, I can get 20 lbs. good yellow sugar to-day for \$1. Yes, I answered, sugar is very cheap; I believe you can, but all I have to tell you is this, that here, on this platform, is a gentleman, well known in Kingston, with whom many of you have traded, and he is prepared to-morrow, if you will go to Kingston, to give you 40 lbs. of sugar for \$1, provided you will pay the duty."

Now I say that in that comparison he endeavored to lead that audience to believe that it was fair to take sugar at 40 lbs. for the dollar or 2½ cents per pound, and set it against sugar at 5 cents per pound, the retail price in Kingston. He said further:

"If you have faith in that, and if it be true, you will find that you can get 40 lbs. for \$1, but I fancy before you can get it out of the bonded warehouse Her Majesty's officers will demand from you a very large sum per lb."

Now I say again that where the hon. gentleman erred in this case was that he endeavoured or wished the meeting to assume that under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite they could get their sugar out of bond in Kingston without paying the duty at all. The hon. gentleman laughs, but if he did not intend that, his remarks had no point at all.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant.) Did I not say that they paid the duty?

Mr. STAIRS. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. How could they get it without paying the duty?

Mr. STAIRS. Yes, but your comparison was to show the difference in the price of sugar under the present tariff, and the price under the tariff of the preceding Government.

Mr. PATERSON. No; it was not.

Mr. STAIRS. Then there was no point in what you said. In proceeding with his remarks he went on to argue that Conservatives have professed that the duty in all cases does not add to the price. Now we know that in one class of duties that proposition may be true, but there is another class in which it is not true, and it has never been claimed by Conservatives in this House or in the country that it was true. If the duty is a revenue duty, such as it is on raw sugar, we must add the duty to the price, and it was never otherwise claimed. Let us see how the duty stands in this particular class to which the hon. gentleman alludes. Taking his own figures, he says that it may be

bought for 8s. 3d. sterling for 112 pounds in Glasgow. That was the estimate in his own figures and those of his friends, according to which landed in Kingston it would be \$2.15 in bond. I assume that to be correct, as it probably is. Now what duty is paid upon that sugar under the present tariff? The duty which would be paid on that sugar if it graded between No. 9 and No. 14 would be 75 cents per 100 lbs., or ¾ of a cent per pound; and 30 per cent. on 8s. 3d., or 54 cents, making \$1.29 per 100 lbs. So that sugar could have been laid down in Kingston duty paid at \$3.44, and the selling price would probably be in Kingston as he estimated it, \$3.79 per 100 lbs. He should have compared sugar which cost \$3.44 per 100 lbs., landed duty paid, in Kingston, against a price which he said was 5 cents per lb., or a selling price of \$3.79 per 100 lbs. against a selling price of 5 cents. Now let us see what would have been the cost under the tariff of the late Government. Under that tariff the sugar would have cost to sell on the same basis which he fixes, \$3.70, or landed, \$3.35, which is only 9 cents more per 100 lbs. which the people of Canada are now paying for that sugar under the present tariff than they would have paid under the tariff of the late Government. So much for this aspect of the case as applied to yellow sugars. Let us now apply it to the case of granulated sugars. He accepts the price of that sugar as given in the *Mail* at three and one half cents. Now, I do not mean to say that that is a correct statement of the price at which granulated sugar could perhaps be bought, or the correct price at which granulated sugar can be entered for duty; and I did not claim so. But I claimed that the people of Canada can get sugar at 3½ cents a pound, which is very nearly equal in quality to granulated sugar; and let us see what that sugar, costing 3½ cents in Glasgow would cost landed in Canada. The cost would be 3½ cents, to which add 1 cent per pound, and 35 per cent. on 3½ cents, or \$2.22 per 100 pounds, making the cost of the sugar \$5.72 duty paid, against the least 6½ or 6¼ cents per pound which the hon. gentleman claimed was the cost in Canada, or from 87 cents to \$1 per 100 pounds more than sugar of the same quality could be imported for. Now, it may be said in reply to this, that granulated sugar could not be imported at this price. The hon. gentleman has erred in the latter part of his speech respecting the import price under the present tariff. I wish to point out that granulated sugars form but a small proportion of the consumption of sugar by the people of Canada. It may not be amiss here to say that the hon. gentleman's figures prove a great deal too much for his case. If the people of Canada choose to pay 5 cents a pound for sugar which they could import from Scotland and retail at 4 cents, I am sure the hon. gentleman will not complain that it is through the fault of the tariff or the Government; I am quite certain that he will not make either the House or the people of this Dominion believe that it is. Then, Sir, I think the hon. gentleman very much exaggerated his case when he talked about the increased cost of sugar to the people of Canada under the present tariff. After giving the total consumption of sugar in the Dominion as 170,000,000 pounds, he said:

"The 170,000,000, allowing for the waste, would make about 150,000,000 pounds of sugar; 150,000,000 pounds at \$1.28 cents per 100 pounds would be just \$1,920,000, the export price for a year's consumption, if it were all granulated sugar."

Now, as I said before, not more than one-fifth of all the consumption of sugar is granulated. If we take the sugar, on his own showing, at 3½ cents, the difference in the cost of that sugar from Scotland under the present tariff and under the tariff of the late Government is exactly 35 cents per 100 pounds, or 10 per cent. on \$3.50. But take the Glasgow sugars, the yellow sugars, which are the cheapest—take the grades costing 8s. 6d. in Scotland, and what we pay under the present tariff more than under the tariff of hon. gentlemen

opposite is only 9 cents per 100 pounds. Now, the hon. member has said an increased duty of 9 cents per 100 pounds has cost the people \$1.28 per hundred pounds. Such a claim is too extreme to command any attention from moderate men. But let us see how he makes it up. The increased duty on the sugar he claims would be on about 30,000,000 pounds of granulated at 35 cts., or \$105,000, and on 120,000,000 pounds of yellow sugar at 9 cents per 100 pounds \$108,000 or \$213,000 altogether, instead of \$1,920,000 at which the hon. gentleman estimated it. We know that if Canada were buying yellow sugars from Glasgow, they would on the average cost more than 8s 3d per cwt., but double that cost would only make \$100,000 a year more than my figures above given, which the people under this tariff have to pay more than under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. But even that is more than offset by the sugar being made in our own country, and by the competition which is now so general among the sugar refiners of the Dominion in keeping down the price. It is utterly impossible then, as said before, that the tariff of the present Government could have increased the cost of sugar to the people of Canada to the extent claimed by the hon. member for South Brant. I am rather inclined to think that instead of the hon. member's figures proving that there is too much duty on sugar, they rather prove the reverse, and show that the protection to the sugar refiners is not sufficient. As I am talking on the question of sugar, I will, before passing to anything else, touch briefly upon some remarks which were made by the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) on the same subject. The hon. member, referring to the Minister of Finance, says:

"The hon. gentleman boasts of his success in dealing with the sugar question, and in establishing the West India trade."

Thereby implying that the tariff has not improved the West India trade. Now, I will prove later on that the tariff of the present Government has done very much indeed to improve that trade. The hon. member says further:

"Whereas in Glasgow to-day you can buy a fair quality of sugar, I am informed, for \$2 per 100 pounds, in Canada we have to pay \$5 per 100 pounds for sugar of the same quality."

In this statement the hon. gentleman has made exactly the same error as the hon. member for South Brant. He says a little further on:

"Why, from the importation of a little over 100,000,000 pounds in my time, we got a revenue in excess of that which the hon. gentleman now receives from 170,000,000 pounds. True, that is not of first class quality; true, about 20,000,000 pounds of that is wasted in the process of refining; but even so, we are probably to-day importing the equivalent of 150,000,000 pounds of refined sugar. Now, that sugar stands us at least 3 cents a pound more than it could be bought for in the open market."

Now, the hon. member for South Huron terribly exaggerated his case, for if he does not there intend to imply that this 3 cents per pound is in addition to the tariff put on the sugar by any Government in this country, there is no point in his remark against the National Policy at all. But we know that the price of sugar has not increased to the extent of 3 cents a pound over what it was under his own tariff. The difference in the cost of yellow sugars under the two tariffs, as I have already pointed out, is not more than 9 cents per 100 pounds in the cheaper kinds, and perhaps from 12 to 15 cents per 100 pounds in the better kinds that would come from Glasgow. Possibly, under the present tariff, we may be paying from 9 to 15 cents per 100 pounds more than we did under the tariff of hon. gentlemen opposite. But let us look for a moment into some figures in connection with the trade in sugar during the last few years. In 1878 there was imported into Canada 101,000,000 pounds of refined sugar. There was imported into Canada sugar coming from the countries of production raw sugar 7,900,000 lbs., of which 92 $\frac{7}{10}$ per cent. was refined and 7 $\frac{3}{10}$ per cent. raw sugar. In

1880 a great change took place in these figures. Only 26 $\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. of refined sugar was imported and 73 $\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. of raw. In 1882 10 $\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. refined was imported and 89 $\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. raw; in 1883, 6 $\frac{4}{10}$ per cent. refined and 83 $\frac{6}{10}$ per cent. raw; in 1884, 9 $\frac{5}{10}$ per cent. refined and 90 $\frac{5}{10}$ per cent. raw. I rather imagine that of this 9 $\frac{5}{10}$, some raw, might have crept into the returns which I have been obliged to assume as refined, coming from certain countries, probably England, and which is likely raw beet sugar. These figures prove beyond doubt that the policy of the present Government has not only stimulated the refining industry, but has also very much assisted trade between the Dominion and those countries in which sugar is produced. But they show something more; they show an increased consumption of sugar in Canada from 109,000,000 lbs. in 1878 to 171,000,000 lbs. in 1884, and that the people in 1878 paid a larger sum of money for 109,000,000 lbs. of sugar than they did in 1884 for 171,000,000 lbs. In case it should be said in reply that sugar at present is much lower in price, I would also point out that we paid out in 1880 for 116,000,000 pounds of sugar about \$2,200,000 less than we did two years previous for 109,000,000 lbs.; so that much less money went out of the country for sugar in 1880 than did in 1878. These figures further prove that our trade with the countries of production has been very much encouraged, but I want to draw also the attention of the House to a phase of this trade in which the people of the Maritime Provinces are much interested, that is the amount of sugar that comes from the West Indies. In 1878, of all the sugar imported into the Dominion, 7 per cent. came from the West Indies, including British Guiana; in 1880, two years later, under the fostering policy of this Administration, this quantity had increased to 62 per cent. In 1881 it was 60 per cent; in 1882, 60 per cent., in 1883, 58 per cent.; and in 1884 it had fallen to 44 per cent. It will be worth while, I think, to enquire into the causes of this falling off in 1884. One of the causes undoubtedly is the very great production of beet sugar in Germany, Austria and some other of the European countries which have been competing very heavily with the cane growing sugar countries of the world and besides this the tariff, as arranged at present, operates, to a certain extent, against our trade with the West India Islands. The beet root sugar trade, as it injures for the present the West India trade, deserves the consideration of the Government. The tariff at first accomplished the purpose for which it was intended; it encouraged our West India trade, and a larger portion of our importation of raw sugar came from the West India Islands, but during the last few years a great change has come over the sugar trade of the world, sugar being produced in different ways and handled in different ways; it is being bought and sold in different ways; and these facts—the facts connected with the beet root sugar especially—affect our trade in sugar with the West India Islands. The East Indian archipelago has also been competing heavily with the West Indies; but if our West India trade suffers, no doubt this Government will seek a remedy, for if we are certain of one thing it is that there is now in power a Government who, when a case is clearly put before them and they are convinced that any particular trade in the Dominion is suffering, are not only willing but able to take steps to remove the difficulty. I am convinced hon. gentlemen on this side will take the proper steps. Can that be said to be the case with gentlemen opposite? It is known all over Canada that during the time they were in power numberless deputations waited upon them, numberless petitions were sent to them, in matters of trade, praying that they should do something to remedy the difficulties under which our manufacturing and other industries were laboring, but all the representations were unheeded by the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard

Cartwright) and his colleagues. There was one way, I believe, in which it was thought some stimulus could be given to our West India trade, and that was by enforcing a heavier duty on our beet sugar; but it was soon seen that would not have been in the interest of the West India trade and that it would at the same time injure the refining interest of the Dominion. Into this question I need not enter, as it has already been dealt with by other hon. gentlemen. What the remedy is for this state of affairs I am not going to point out; I have simply given these figures to show the state of the West India trade, to show the improvement which took place in this trade during preceding years, and the falling off that it has exhibited during the past year; and I simply ask the Government to give the question that attention they are always prepared to give every subject connected with trade and commerce which comes before them; and I have no doubt that once they are convinced of the facts, they will apply the proper remedy. With regard to the adoption of the polariscope referred to by the hon. member for Cardwell in his remarks, I wish to correct a slight inaccuracy into which he fell. I understood him to say, respecting the wishes of the people of Nova Scotia, as regards adopting a change in the mode of collecting sugar duties, that the adoption of the polariscope, as a means of collecting sugar duties, would be prejudicial to our trade with countries of production other than the West Indies. I want to remove that misapprehension. The present position of the West India Islands, as regards the duty collected on sugar from these islands, is that they have to pay a little heavier duty than the sugar from the more distant countries, on account of the greater value of sugar in the West Indies, owing to the lesser distance they have to traverse to get to market. What the people of Nova Scotia, who are engaged in the West India trade ask is, not that any differential rates may be made to operate against our trade with other countries, but that our trade with the West India Islands may be put on a fair basis. The present contention of these gentlemen is that the islands are at a positive disadvantage, and it is well known that it is more to the interest of the people of the Dominion to cultivate trade with the West India Islands than with a part of the world ten thousand miles away. Not only, therefore, is it in the interest of importers of sugar in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick that if possible some remedy should be applied, but also in the interest of the whole Dominion, because we want to build up a trade between the West India Islands and the Dominion, not only in sugar but in a great many other articles which the Dominion of Canada can manufacture and is now as well able to supply to those islands as the people of the United States, who have a large proportion of the trade at the present time. Having dealt for a few moments with the question of the sugar trade, I will take up some of the matters referred to in the speech of the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) in relation to the Maritime Provinces, and especially in relation to the Province of Nova Scotia, I will quote a few lines from his speech:

"When I come to the Maritime Provinces what do I find? Their's, I must admit is a hard case. They were brought into this Confederation by distinct promises on the part of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues which have been ruthlessly violated. It was at least a tacit understanding that no such tariff as that we now labor under should be imposed upon them."

I do not need to answer this point, because it was most ably answered by the member for King's, N. S. He distinctly explained that the question of the tariff was the issue before the people of Nova Scotia in 1878 and that a large majority of the representatives from Nova Scotia came here pledged to support the policy of the right hon. the leader of the Government. He also pointed out that the bye elections between 1878 and 1882 resulted on the

whole in a continued support being given to this policy. He pointed out as well that in 1882 the policy was still sustained in the Province of Nova Scotia, and that since that time the bye elections which have taken place have not only shown no loss but have resulted in a gain of one member to support the policy of the present Government. In the face of this, I do not think it needs that any supporter of the present Government from the Maritime Provinces should get up and give any other reply to the charge made by the member for South Huron on this point. If the people of Nova Scotia have accepted this tariff, if they pronounced upon it in 1878, if they supported it in the bye elections since that time, and again in 1882, and if they still support it since that date, he needs no other answer and the people of Canada need no other proof that the people of Nova Scotia by their vote at the polls have supported and continue to support the policy of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. He does make some brief references to the resolutions laid upon the Table of the Nova Scotia House of Assembly a few days ago. It is not necessary in this House that I should seriously attempt to answer this. I would not waste the time of the House by making a speech upon it. The question has never assumed a serious phase in Nova Scotia at all. The hon. gentleman who moved the resolutions in the Legislative Assembly of Nova Scotia I believe is sincere in the policy he then promulgated. He has been a consistent supporter of repeal since 1867, or at least since I have known him in public life, but I assert here that he finds very few to support him even among his own friends. The organs and the members of the party to which he belongs will not go so far as to advocate repeal in Nova Scotia, and that being the case, his reference to this question needs no serious reply from any member from Nova Scotia. The hon. gentleman from South Huron, a little further on in his speech, refers again to the position of the Maritime Provinces, speaks of our languishing industries, says the people are not profiting in the slightest degree by the National Policy, "but are earnestly looking forward to see whether the hon gentlemen are taking any steps whatever to ensure them reciprocity with the United States." And then he goes on to criticise the policy of this Government in the way in which they have handled the question of reciprocity. I am not going into that at all. I believe that reciprocity, if we get a fair treaty, would be a very good thing for Nova Scotia, and I believe as well that the hon. gentleman on this side of the House are not only perfectly willing but have also shown most fully by their legislation of years ago that they are prepared to meet the Government of the United States whenever that Government and people are willing to come forward and meet us, but I am thoroughly convinced, judging by the experience of the past, that the talk of a reciprocity treaty with the United States is only words thrown away. But, though they attempt to charge us with something on this question of reciprocity, I think we are very well able to show that the difficulties in the way of obtaining a reciprocity treaty are not altogether on our side of the House. Just let us see. Here it will not be amiss to refer to a short remark which was made a few moments ago by the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Casey), who criticised the member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns) for his remarks upon reciprocity, and the Government for not having made any announcement whatever on that point, and assumed that, because they had not made any announcement, therefore they had not taken any steps at all to secure reciprocity. Such an assumption was altogether unwarranted. In fact, it is quite certain that, no matter what the Government has done in the matter, they are not going to take that hon. gentleman fully into their confidence; but I have the best authority to say that every step is being taken to secure a reciprocity treaty that can be, I have here a report of an interview which took place

with Mr. S. J. Ritchie, of Akron, Ohio, President of the Central Ontario Railway, and I will read you a few lines from it:

"In conversation with one of our reporters Mr. Ritchie stated that, while at the United States Capitol, he had met a great many representative men with whom he had talked about Canada, its resources and possibilities. Touching upon the question of a policy of reciprocity between the two countries, he found that the general feeling prevailed, based upon the bad character which Canada received from some of its public men, that a reciprocity treaty was hardly necessary, as, in the course of a short time, the country must come to the United States Government for relief from their present condition."

Now, if we can turn to the utterances of some of these hon. gentlemen and show that they really have made them to the effect that is there described, I think it will show that the contention I just made, that the hon. gentlemen opposite are themselves to blame, at least in part, for the difficulty which is now found to rest upon the present Government in securing a reciprocity treaty, will be proved. I will take a very short extract from a speech of the hon. the leader of the Opposition at New Glasgow. He is reported in the *Eastern Chronicle* as follows:—

"If you had not liberty to exchange your property you would find it useless to continue to produce more than you required for your personal wants, for you could not get rid of it. To restrict or prevent you from exchanging what you desire to exchange would be a restriction against which you would rebel. Restrictions which have a tendency to divert trade from its natural channels are injurious to the many. Your natural channel of trade is with the neighboring Republic; your exports will find the best market there, and your imports should come from there."

Now I will read from the speech made by the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) in Charlottetown:

"Now I believe that free trade is best for all sections of our community. But look at your present interests, your agriculture and fisheries. How are they helped? Can it be said they are protected? If it is a good law that some men should be protected, why should not all be protected? But can labor be protected? There is no law to prevent an employer from looking where he will for labor."

Now I acknowledge that does not touch the question of reciprocity, but I want to remark that if there is no law to prevent the employer from looking where he will for labor, there is no law to prevent the employee from looking where he will for employment; and if the policy of this country increases the number of employers, it will therefore increase the number of employees. That is a proposition which is just as true as the proposition of the hon. gentleman:

"You want the free exchange of productions with other countries. You want free access to the markets of the world. What prevents you having these? The hand of man debars you by legislation. Your natural market is the United States, but by the laws of both countries free exchange of productions is prevented. That country would be a market for your potatoes and a large number of other articles, if their laws would allow it to be so."

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that assertion of the hon. member is not borne out by the facts. I think it cannot be claimed, even at the present time, that the laws of both countries prevent the exchange of the natural products of Prince Edward Island with the United States. There is a law at the present time, as every hon. member knows, which will compel the Government of the Dominion, just as soon as the Government of the United States are willing to enter into a reciprocity treaty, to take off the duties on those articles which the United States would admit free from our side. I think when the hon. gentleman made that assertion he forgot that law, and was not quite correct in claiming such was the law in both countries. The difficulty that affects the people of Prince Edward Island in their trade relations is not owing to the Government of the Dominion, but entirely to the Government and people of the United States. I have read these extracts to show the difficulties which lie before the Government of the Dominion in obtaining a reciprocity treaty. They not only have to contend with enemies from without but they have to contend with speeches which are not made in the interests of Canada by our own people. Now, Sir, to return to the question of

Mr. STAIRS.

the prosperity of the Maritime Provinces and of Nova Scotia. The hon. member from South Huron does not object, in running down the Dominion Government, to include the Maritime Provinces; but if he says anything against the Maritime Provinces in an assembly where I am present, I shall endeavor to disprove his statements and show they are not correct. I contend the picture he has drawn of the condition of Nova Scotia is not a true one, and I am prepared to prove it. If I can prove that the country has continued to gain in wealth from 1869—as I could not get the statistics from 1867—to 1878, that it has not only gained absolutely in wealth, but has gained relatively with other Provinces of the Dominion, I shall have proved that during the period the National Policy has been in operation that Province has improved even more rapidly than previously. If I can prove that the capital in the savings banks has increased to a large extent I shall have proved that the prosperity of the country has increased, a proposition which I defy any hon. member to dispute. On the 31st December, 1869, the paid-up bank capital of Nova Scotia was \$1,890,000—perhaps a little more, as the returns at that time were not very complete. On 30th June, 1884, the paid-up bank capital of the Province of Nova Scotia was \$4,858,000 or an increase of \$2,967,000, or about 154 per cent. The deposits in the chartered banks not bearing interest on 31st December, 1869, were \$1,157,853; and on 30th June, 1884, \$2,000,000, or an increase of \$844,000, or about 73 per cent. Then the deposits in these chartered banks bearing interest, which I think will more clearly show the saving of the country, were, on 31st December, 1869, \$1,366,000; and on 30th June, 1884, \$6,518,000, an increase of \$5,151,844, or 377 per cent. Now we come to the savings banks. On the 1st July, 1869, the deposits in the Dominion savings banks—we have no post office savings banks in Nova Scotia, but we expect to have them soon—were \$722,000; and on 30th June, 1884, they were \$6,493,000, an increase of \$5,770,000. I have not calculated the percentage, but if the hon. gentleman from Digby (Mr. Vail) wishes to reply he can make up the percentage; it is somewhere in the neighborhood of 600 or 700 per cent. Now, Sir, I submit these figures show that there is an absolute gain in the capital and prosperity of that Province from 1869 to 1884. The sum of all these figures shows that the increase in what you might call the available capital and savings of the Province of Nova Scotia during those years was \$14,735,000; at the same time all the ordinary investments of the country and all the ordinary improvements went on as usual. During the last few years there was a very much larger sum than ever before invested in manufactures, and in the improvement of the farmers' houses and outbuildings throughout the whole Province. No one who knows Nova Scotia from one end to the other but must admit that amongst our people generally there has been a very great increase in their prosperity, and they are now living much better and in a more prosperous manner than they were in 1867. Now, Sir, let us see how the increase in these particulars in the Province of Nova Scotia compares with the increase in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec. The paid-up bank capital in Ontario and Quebec on 31st December, 1869, was \$30,727,000; on 30th June, 1884, it had increased to \$55,063,000, an increase of \$24,336,000, or about 50 per cent., as compared with the increase in Nova Scotia during the same time of 154 per cent. The increase of deposits in chartered banks not bearing interest was, in Ontario and Quebec, on 31st December, 1869, \$16,849,504, as against \$41,541,195 on 30th June, 1884, an increase of \$25,691,691, or 148 per cent., compared with Nova Scotia's 73 per cent. In that particular class of deposits I am prepared to admit that those Provinces did go a little better than Nova Scotia, but I will show that in some other particulars we went a little better than they did. The deposits in chartered banks bearing interest,

in Ontario and Quebec, amounted, on 31st December, 1869, to \$26,283,248, and in June, 1884, to \$45,800,382, or 74 per cent. increase compared with Nova Scotia, 377 per cent. The House will see that, as compared with the increases in Ontario and Quebec, the increase in Nova Scotia has been not only equal, but I believe superior. Not only did I say I was prepared to prove that there had been an increase from 1869 to 1884 in Nova Scotia's prosperity, but that the increase had been very fair indeed during the last five years of this period as compared with the previous ones. Before I go into that proof I will just say that the increase in the paid-up capital of the chartered banks, in deposits bearing interest, in deposits not bearing interest, and in deposits in the savings banks in Nova Scotia was from \$5,137,069 to \$19,822,084, an increase of \$14,725,000, or 286 per cent., as against an increase in the same classes of deposits and bank capital in Ontario and Quebec of 128 per cent. I have shown there has been a steady increase in the available capital savings from 1869 to 1884, that the increase compares favorably with that of Ontario and Quebec; and I will now establish that during the period, 1879 to 1884, the increase was quite as great as during either of the previous periods. The paid-up bank capital in Nova Scotia was, in 1869, \$1,890,696; 30th June, 1874, \$3,466,931; 1879, \$4,295,878; 1884, \$4,858,207. The House will see from the total figures that the increase during the last period has been a very fair one.

Mr. VAIL. Not so large as before.

Mr. STAIRS. It was very much larger from 1879 to 1884 than from 1874 to 1878. I admit it was not quite as large as from 1869 to 1874, during which time hon. gentlemen on this side of the House were in power. If that argument will suit the hon. gentleman he is quite welcome to it. Deposits not bearing interest in 1869 amounted to \$1,157,853; in 1884, \$2,002,677; increase, \$844,824, or about 73 per cent. I notice in the bank returns something exceptional in the deposits not bearing interest in 1879, because there was a very large falling off in one of the banks during one or two months, showing that there was some special cause in operation. From 1874 to 1879, however, there was a decrease in the deposits not bearing interest from \$979,164 to \$841,488; from 1879 to 1884 the increase was from \$841,498 to \$2,000,677. We now come to deposits in banks bearing interest, and if the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) can obtain any consolation from these figures, he is welcome. Here are the figures: 1869, \$1,366,734; 30th June, 1874, \$2,177,100; 1879, \$2,990,310; 1884, \$6,518,582. The savings bank balances in Nova Scotia were as follows: 30th June, 1869, \$722,419; 1874, \$1,530,981; 1879, \$2,499,406; 1884, \$6,493,277. Hon. gentlemen will see that the last figure shows an increase within a fraction of \$4,000,000.

Mr. VAIL. Give us the dividends.

Mr. STAIRS. I want hon. gentlemen opposite to know that the enormous increases, as I have shown, have taken place in the deposits in the chartered banks, bearing interest, and in the deposits in the savings banks, a class of deposits which show most quickly and clearly the increased savings of the country. If it be said that those increased savings took place at the expense of the business of the country, I deny it emphatically. I say that the available business capital of the country was increased; that the business of the country absorbed the usual capital, besides which there was a very large expenditure of capital for the ordinary improvements going on through the Province generally. I have endeavored to prove that the people of Nova Scotia at the present time are, as a whole, much better off than they were in 1867. To those who know the Province well it needed no proof at all. Anyone who has travelled from one end of it to another is aware that improvements are constantly going

on. The markets for the farmers are much better than formerly, and the return I have given shows that all classes are very much better off. If this be the case, what is the reason of the depression of which we hear so much? There must be some reason, and I will endeavor to explain what I think is the cause of it. Whereas, throughout the whole of Canada there has been a great increase in the prosperity of the masses, still we must admit, and all who are acquainted with business will admit, that during the last ten or twelve years a very great change has taken place over the whole world in trade and business. All who have engaged in active business know that whereas twenty years ago it was very easy for a man in any ordinary community to make a good living with care and economy, at the present time competition is so great that it is a very difficult matter indeed. We have had over-competition, over-trading. It seems now-a-days that people are in such a hurry to get rich that they fail to get rich at all. If you admit this is the case, you cannot show that there has not been at the same time a steady improvement in the condition of the mass of the people throughout the whole country. The trader may not be as well off as formerly, the wholesale merchant may not be so well off, and is not so well off as formerly. But at the same time the working classes are a great deal better off. The difficulty is not that the men are not well able to buy articles and pay good prices, for they are buying more goods every year; but the difficult is in the merchants themselves, though not from causes over which one merchant could have control, but from causes that are affecting the whole mercantile community throughout the world. Now it has been said that Confederation and the abrogation of reciprocity has something to do with the dulness of the times in Nova Scotia. No doubt the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty was a disadvantage to Nova Scotia. No one who knows anything about that Province will claim to the contrary, but I hold that it is not the main reason of the difficulty that is troubling us in Nova Scotia just now. I believe that the people of Nova Scotia have largely got over the trouble which was experienced when that treaty was abrogated. They have settled down to new modes of business; they have found new markets, and they are prospering fairly well. The difficulty with regard to the prosperity of the trading community is that it is now impossible for merchants, out of the larger businesses they now have, to maintain the profits which they had twenty years ago, and I regret to say in some respects that condition of things applies more to Nova Scotia than to any other part of America. Nova Scotia is a small Province; the trade of our dealers is confined pretty much within the Province, and it happens, from our geographical position, that every town there is a port of entry—every town of any size is a sea port, and it is as easy for the merchants in these towns to import as it is for the merchants of Halifax. This condition of things is much to the disadvantage of the merchants of Halifax, but no gentleman should complain of that, because it is to the advantage of the merchants of Nova Scotia. From the position and size of Halifax—this is the ground for many of the complaints of the Halifax wholesale merchants about the state of business—we cannot do much of the business that we used to do, or rather the business cannot realise the profits which it used to realise. A large portion of the import trade of the United States goes through New York; so in Montreal, in regard to the Canadian trade. If the goods are not bought in Montreal they must pass through Montreal to go to their destination. That is not the case in Nova Scotia. No doubt, in the course of time, these things will settle themselves; but at the present time business is undergoing a change that has produced disadvantages for many of our people, but these disadvantages are ascribed to causes which are not the right ones. Some com-

plain that Confederation affected the merchants of Nova Scotia very injuriously, but I must say that these are generally gentlemen supporting the opposite side of the House; and no matter how much they may suffer from the competition which comes from Canada, no free trader can legitimately complain of any competition which gives the purchaser cheaper goods. I am quite confident, in reference to the Province of Nova Scotia, and the city of Halifax—and I believe the remark applies to a very large number of the dealers throughout the country. I believe they are to-day doing a larger business than they did in 1867. I do not think there is a prominent wholesale business house in Halifax that is not doing a greater volume of business than in 1867, but I regret to say that on account of those circumstances connected with the change of business to which I have alluded, they cannot make the same profits out of the larger business as they previously did out of the smaller ones. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to take a little more time in making some replies to hon. gentlemen opposite, but as I see the hour is getting late, as I do not wish to weary the House, as I have been giving a good many figures, which are always wearisome to listen to, and as the debate has gone on for some time, I think it is better that I should conclude. I would just say, in concluding, that I have faith in this tariff; that I have faith in this country, in spite of all the criticisms of hon. gentlemen opposite, from their leader downward; I have full faith in the prosperity of the country in the future; I have faith in the policy of the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Government, and his colleagues; I have faith in our North-West, in the Canadian Pacific Railway, and I have faith that in the future they will, as they have in the past, carry out those measures which will best conduce to the prosperity of this great Dominion.

Mr. GILLMOR. I, Mr. Speaker, sympathise with you when a debate of this kind is before the House. I am sure you often feel that of making many speeches there is no end, and much listening is a weariness to the flesh. I am not your right hand man. Other things being equal I might prefer it, but I am the next to it, your left hand man. I do not propose to criticise the speech of the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs), who has just taken his seat. He may have made an able argument in defence of the policy of the Administration, but I failed to appreciate it. It reminded me of a story I once heard of a Negro preacher who attended a meeting. He gave out a hymn and they undertook to start the tune. They tried "Old Hundred," but failed, and then they tried "Coronation," and they failed in that. They tried some other tunes unsuccessfully, and then they sat down. The preacher turned round to them and said: I thank you; because I think you did the very best you could. So I think that whether this hon. gentleman succeeded or not, he tried hard enough and, therefore, he should be thanked, for he did the best he could. One thing I can promise, with regard to the remarks I am about to make, and I am sure you will be pleased with the announcement, that is, I have not any figures to present; I have not looked into the Trade and Navigation Returns for the purpose of presenting statistics. I know they have been perused from end to end and that the House will be sick of statistics. This is the twelfth Session in which I have listened to the debates in this House, and I have never missed an important debate, or any important speech in a debate. You would hardly think that, because I am not strong, but I think that very few men can say that in twelve Sessions they have not missed a day in Parliament. I have sat here a great many days when I did not feel very well, but I prefer, during the sittings of the House, to be in my seat. I have listened to the speeches which have been delivered in this debate and I have enjoyed

Mr. STAIRS.

them, though there has been just one interruption which I have sometimes felt like making—though, of course, it would be out of order—when some hon. members were speaking. I was often tempted to get up and shout "Ananias and Sapphira." I do not mean that I was disposed to shout "Ananias" when a mistake is made, or when a man is really making an error. But when I hear a statement made after study for weeks, and it does not exactly accord with my ideas of what is proper, I want to shout "Ananias." I have had occasion thus to do very frequently, although I have thoroughly enjoyed their speeches. Now, it must be apparent to anyone who observes closely, that there is a great difference in the style of speeches now with regard to the policy of the present Administration compared with those of last year and the year before. Then, there was great exultation; now we hear an apology; things are not quite as bad as they might be, and even the little deficiency in the policy is not chargeable to the policy, or to the authors of the policy, or to the party, but to the Opposition. If it had not been for the Opposition, who opposed the policy in season and out of season, in the House and in the country, and said it was bad; if it had not been for their opposition, there would have been no failure at all in the National Policy, or in any other policy of the present Administration. Now, Sir, there is no reason why the Opposition should favor the policy of the Government. The Opposition have opposed that policy because they thought it was bad. The Government were warned by our leader and by other gentlemen on this side of the House, night after night and day after day, that their policy was bad. Their policy is not our policy; their ways are not our ways, and their thoughts are not as our thoughts—they are as different from ours as light is from darkness. Therefore we are not responsible for their policy. We did not desire that the country should suffer, but we were satisfied that it would, and I am satisfied that it has. They are hunting around now for some crumbs of comfort, some spots where prosperity exists. If their policy was a success, it has now been five years in operation, and prosperity would be seen everywhere. In order to find some little prosperity somewhere, they sent commissioners all over the Dominion. I think it was Diogenes who took a lantern and went out to see if he could find an honest man. Diogenes would now require two lanterns if he went through the country to find the success of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. We find depression everywhere; everybody knows that business is depressed. I do not mean to say that any policy could be devised to prevent depression; but when these hon. gentlemen were on this side of the House they were continually holding the Government of that day responsible for the depression in business. That was their policy, and therefore they ought not shirk the responsibility that now rests on them, from their own standpoint. They told us that their policy was going to make the country prosperous—that steady, upward, progress was to be the effect of it. That has not been the case; but the platform on which they based their promises of prosperity has been an utter and entire failure. Now, I do not intend to deal particularly with each branch of what they term their policy. You know my attention has been directed more to the protective tariff than to any other part of their policy; I think that is more important than any other part. Any mistakes hon. gentlemen may have made in any other respects will be more easily remedied than their mistake in adopting a protective policy, because the evils it entails gain strength as they roll on; they fix a burden on the country which the longer it lasts the more difficulty it will be to remove. Therefore, I look on the National Policy as the worst part of their policy. Now, in looking amongst my papers I find a memorandum book containing some sentiments which I

gleaned, some from essays on political economy, some from newspapers, and some from my own thoughts; and before commencing my speech, I will read them:

"It is as much a law of our nature to exchange with one another those things we have to sell for those things we have to buy as it is to breathe. It was clearly the design of our Creator for the benefit of the race. Notice the different articles in a household which we cannot produce or sell, but can produce something else and purchase them. Society is one vast hive of buyers and sellers, every man carrying something to the market and bringing something away. Everybody exchanges. You do something for me, and I will do something for you. The farmer brings the fruits of the field; the mechanic brings his skilled labor; the laboring man brings his strong arm; the fisherman brings the various products of the sea; the school teacher brings his knowledge; the merchant, the physician, the lawyer, the clergyman, all exchange their abilities and skill for something that other men have to give them. It is impossible to divest ourselves of the fact that this desire to exchange is a universal law of our nature and of society, and any system which interferes with the fullest freedom of exchange is wrong. Freedom of exchange is as much a natural right as the right to think or breathe. Every man has a natural, self-evident right to put forth efforts for his own well-being; and whenever two men find that by exchanging efforts with each other they can add to their own happiness, they have an indisputable right to do so; and it is a high-handed infringement of natural rights when any authority interferes to restrict or prohibit the freedom of exchange, except that act is justified by solid proof that other private or public rights are infringed which are as well founded as the right of exchange. All the restrictive laws which have ever been made overlook entirely the mutual benefit to the parties of every act of exchange, without which benefit the exchange clearly would not take place at all."

These are words of wisdom; these are like apples of gold set in pictures of silver; these are principles which the National Policy controverts; these are the rights which the National Policy seeks to deprive the inhabitants of this Dominion of; these are the fundamental principles of political economy. Now, I always listen to the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) with a great deal of interest. He is, evidently, an able man, and I listen to him with great pleasure for the ability he displays and the eloquence he possesses. We are never disappointed in a speech from the hon. gentleman. It is always well prepared and well delivered, but there is no man I have ever listened to who understands how to make error appear interesting any better than does the hon. member for Cardwell. Of course, that is not exactly the word or the phrase that I would prefer to use, but I have not the command of language sufficient to find any term to express my opinion of his speech better than that. In that speech he said:

"We have been enjoying for some time past the free traders' paradise—a cheap country to live in. The real trouble has been that articles have been too cheap, and that very thing which hon. gentlemen opposite have been arguing we should endeavor to bring about is the very thing which has produced the difficulty from which, to some extent, we have been suffering during the last twelve months. Go to a merchant and ask on what his hopes rest for a revival of business. He will tell you, in the fact that prices are beginning to stiffen, as he expresses it, and there are likely, therefore, to be better times."

I accept the paragraph in so far as the free trader's paradise is concerned. I know that this is not the best world of which we have any knowledge, but it is next to the best, and to be able to procure what we need to make life pleasant, adds much to make our journey through it agreeable. The desire to live in a cheap country and to have a cheap market is universal, and that sentiment marks the difference between the Government and their opponents. They believe in having a dear country to live in; we believe in having a cheap country to live in; they believe in high prices for the necessaries of life, and all we require; we believe in low prices. I am always happy when in an open, free market—I can get what I want at the lowest possible price, and I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite think the same way. Despite their professions they themselves have the same feeling, for it is a universal feeling. Nobody goes out to find where he can buy at the highest price; everybody wants to buy at the lowest price; but of course it makes greater difference to the poor man than to the rich, whether they can buy at the lowest price or at a higher price. I know how

much a dollar is worth; I am a workingman myself; I have earned my bread by my toil; I know what it is to earn a dollar in the woods, in the mill, with the spade and the shovel and the hoe, and when I have so earned a dollar I ought to have the right to spend it in the cheapest market, and the Government has no right to enact laws to make that market dear when it would otherwise be cheap. Another expression I have heard in this debate is "cheap and nasty." I believe the hon. gentleman, the leader of the Government, has the credit for that saying. I do not agree with him; I do not consider that anything nasty can be cheap. Everything nasty must be dear, and we ought not to have it at all. With regard to the Ministers, I tell you, Sir, those who are in Government employ, those who rule the country, do not know the value of a dollar. They get their dollars quite differently from those who toil for their livelihood, and those who toil are the great mass of the people, for whom these hon. gentlemen ought to legislate. They out to legislate so that the people may get as much as possible out of their earnings. Of course the hon. member for Cardwell does not know what it is to be poor, and I am not anxious that he should ever know it; it does not make much difference to him whether a barrel of flour costs \$5 or \$10, but it makes a great difference to the mass of the population. It is very important for the poor man who has earned \$5, whether he can get a barrel of flour or only half a barrel of flour for it, and many a time have I seen a poor man struggling to sustain his family, after he had accumulated sufficient to get a barrel of flour, express the wish, over and over again, that he had enough money to get a bag of meal as well, so as to stretch out the flour until he could earn enough to get another barrel. Of course I will be told this is mere sentiment; that I am only trying to curry favor with the poor. But, Sir, I do not want to curry favor with the poor or the rich; all I want is to express my sentiments here fully and freely, and I only wish I had more ability, more power, with which to urge the claims of the people. However, I do the best I can, and that is all any one can expect. With regard to purchasing in a cheap market, I have never been a Minister of the Crown, I have never been on a mission to England, but I venture to say that the very best apparel in the wardrobes of hon. gentlemen opposite have been purchased in England at the people's expense. I venture to say that the West of England broadcloth and everything else they wear, and they have the best, was bought when they were on the other side. There was nothing wrong in that; they were in a country where goods are cheap and where it is cheap to live; they found cheap goods and purchased them; they arrayed themselves in purple and fine linen at cheap rates and brought them home. There was nothing wrong in that, but if any one of these hon. gentlemen forgot to open his trunk on his way back, and let the Custom house officer examine it, that would be rather nasty. I do not know whether any one of them did forget or not, but if he did it would be a nasty matter. Of course, in this country, there are not many people who are very poor, and for them there are fortunately institutions of benevolence where their wants can be supplied. This idea of a dear country being a good country for any body to live in is a mistake; and it is now re-acting. Dear coal means less coal, and less coal means want, and cold, and suffering. Dear bread means less bread, and it means hunger for a great many when it is dear, and want and suffering. Dear clothes means less clothes for the poor, and in some cases it means rags. And dear blankets means less blankets and suffering to be endured by the poor in consequence of the high price of blankets. I remember reading a little story in some book, of a poor woman with a large family, who was in very destitute circumstances. She got her little ones ready for bed at night, and had very little to keep them warm. It was a cold night, and she piled over them some

straw and some rags, and last of all she got an old door and laid that upon them. After she had got them covered up, she asked one of them: "Do you think you will be warm?" "Oh, yes, mother," said the little one, "we shall be warm and comfortable, but what will the poor children do who have no old doors?" There was more heart in that little child, that will live and shine when all those who want to increase the cost of living for the poor have gone to their reward. I never think of that without feeling for the poor, and feeling that the gratitude of that poor thing under those circumstances it would be well if some of us felt when we are enjoying the blessing and comforts of life. This idea of dear things, this curse of poverty, this curse of hunger and of rags, travels right back through society. These rags go back to the manufacturer. Dear clothes means less clothes, and that means less business for the merchant, and less business for the manufacturer, and so the rags travel right back through all the industries. Dear bread means hunger for the poor, but it also means less sales for the grocer, and that means less sales for the miller, and that means less sales for the farmer; and so we cannot violate a natural law without feeling the effects of it somewhere; and, therefore, it is best for all concerned that everybody should be allowed to buy in the market as cheap as can be found. There is not so much difference between the rich and the poor at last. The rich and the poor must lie down together, and God is the Father of us all, and therefore we ought to remember that as we journey through life, and no class of men ought to consider it more than those who are at the helm of affairs. I think the National Policy ignores all that; I think it is opposed to all these benevolent and humane principles. In this Dominion we are blessed with abundance of coal. That is a gift from our Creator. That is intended to be cheap, that everybody may participate in the bounty of the Giver of all Good. In this country we have vast wheat fields, for which we ought to be thankful. That is intended for the good of the race, for the good of the country, and these gentlemen propose to make that dear for the people. The Creator intended that it should be cheap for the people, and plenty of it. We have great herds of cattle and flocks of sheep, in order that we may be fed and clothed, and this we ought to be thankful for, for "the cattle on a thousand hills are His," and all comes from Him; but we are trying, by our legislation here, or at least the gentlemen on the Government benches are making all things dear, trying to fix taxes upon them and to make it difficult for the people to be comfortable and happy. A cheap country to live in—if that is not the Grit's paradise, it is mine. Take it all in all, England, with all her faults, is the greatest, and the wisest, and the best nation the world has ever seen. England has led the way in art, and in arms, and in commerce, and in freedom, and I hope she may long continue to lead the van; but, in all that England has ever done, there is no part of her history that shines out more brightly than when she fought out the battle against protection and made England a cheap country to live in. The statesmen and the philanthropists of England saw the millions of starving poor. I was there myself once when a boy. The agitation was going on at that time for the repeal of the corn laws, and I took occasion, in my rambles through the cities, to talk with the poor, and I went into those bazaars which were situated all over England, in the towns and cities I visited, and gave my small contribution to help that work. They succeeded in removing that curse, and I did not think that, forty years after I was there as a lad, I would be standing in Parliament trying to combat the evil under which that nation had groaned from generation to generation. But that is the fact, and as they had had to struggle many a long year, I fear that that is a fight still before us, and that many a man is to fall before this incubus, this evil, this

Mr. GILLMOR.

curse is removed from this Canada of ours. I know that perhaps it is expedient for some men, and may be for many, not to express their opinions, because the combined influence of Governments, and manufacturers, and monopolies, is almost more than a man's election or position is worth if he ventures his opinions, but timid as I am constitutionally, when I feel it my duty to express my opinion on a great question of this kind, I shall do it, no matter what the consequences are. That battle has been fought out in England, and no statesman, whether he be Tory or Liberal, will ever reverse that verdict. You do not hear this agitated in England; and why should they? Do they want to go back to rags? Do they want to go back to hunger? Do they want to go back to depression? Do they want to go back to the condition in which they were before they arrived at the conclusion that people in England should live as cheap as the world could give it? They should have bread as cheap as the world could give it; they should have meat as cheap as the world could give it; they should have every necessary of life as cheap as the world could give it, from the hat on their head to the shoes on their feet. Do you suppose they would ever undertake to go back to that condition? No, never. But we have gone back, and we are in the position they were in before that change was made. I will read an extract from the speech of the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White):

"Ask any commercial traveller who has been in England buying goods what condition he found there; ask any one who has an opportunity of testing the feeling of the commercial circles in Great Britain; look at the records of people out of employment, and at the record of failures, and you will find the statement is absolutely accurate, that for a quarter of a century no such depression has existed in England as that which has existed during this last year."

I have no doubt that is correct. I dare say that there is great depression in England, and that the commercial traveller was correct in his statement. I have not seen any commercial traveller that has been in England, but I have seen a good many commercial travellers that have been in Canada. He did not see them, and I did not see the gentleman he saw; but I have seen a good many commercial travellers, and I have talked with them in regard to the condition of commerce in the country. Some of them have been on the road for twenty years, and they have told me that they have never seen such commercial depression during their time as there is at present: such a stagnation of trade, so hard to dispose of their goods, and especially in the Maritime Provinces. I know that to be the fact myself, although I am not away much from home, but I have correspondence, and I am aware of the fact that commercially the country has not been so depressed for a great many years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not charge the Government with this depression, except so far as increased taxation has helped to produce it; I do not refer to it because I think they were the cause of bringing it about. But let them remember when the Liberal Government was in power what they used to say. I can see a face here and there that was here at that time. I remember their faces; I remember their speeches; I remember their voices, and I remember their unreasonable demands, and their unreasonable charges against the Government, of being flies on the wheel, of letting the people leave the country, of allowing business to become depressed, of getting a small revenue, and all that sort of thing. And that gives rise to much of the speech-making that there is at this time—it is just to bring to the recollection of those hon. gentlemen how they treated their opponents then. Now, I am not silly enough to suppose the Liberal Government could prevent a depression; and I am not silly enough to charge the present Government, seriously, with having caused this depression; but I can say they told the people they could do it. They told the people that if they were in power they could bring back prosperity. I ask them now to do it; I ask them to fulfil their promises now. I ask them by

their policy to create such a prosperity that they will not have to go about with a lantern to find it.

Mr. WHITE (Hastings). Take a lantern to Lennox.

Mr. GILLMOR. You had better take some light into your own noddle. I will read another extract from the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) where he says :

"Now, Sir, times have been less active, perhaps—that would be the better way to put it—less active recently than in 1882 and 1883, and there are reasons for it altogether apart from the question of the Government's policy, or any policy that might be adopted. We had first a large withdrawal of capital from legitimate enterprises to put into speculative enterprises in the North-West. In Toronto, for instance, when the North-West Land Company, which had bought a large amount of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, opened their books, I am told there was almost a riot in the effort to get into the room to subscribe for the stock of that company, so valuable was it supposed to be. People were anxious to go into all these new enterprises. The tendency of the age, I am sorry to say, is a gambling tendency, in commercial as well as in other matters."

He might have added politics.

"There is an eager disposition to make fortunes rapidly. People may sit down and play draw-poker—that is an innocent game, for draw-poker, in its practical sense, is to play for quarters; and the people who play draw-poker for quarters would object to being regarded as gamblers. We know that there was an idea that in the North-West there was a remarkable opportunity for making rapid fortunes, and people took money from their ordinary legitimate business and put it into North-West enterprises and lost it, to the great injury of the credit and business of the country at large."

Now what a humiliating position. "Less active;" "a little depressed," the hon. gentleman says: it never was so bad in England for twenty-five years; commercial travellers tell him so; everybody knows it; there never was such distress there for a quarter of a century; times were horrid in the United States, but here in Canada they are less active. Now there is where the skill of my hon. friend comes in—just a little less active here. Oh! no depression here, but it is not quite as good as it used to be. It is not quite so good as we could desire, but it would have been fully as good if it had not been for these terrible Grits, if it had not been for the opposition to the National Policy. Well, now, with regard to the evils. I do not know anything about draw-poker; I never played the game; but I agree with my hon. friend that it is not a very serious matter. It is not half as bad, even if everybody was playing draw-poker, from British Columbia to Halifax, as the National Policy is. Now, about this boom. I wish I had the ability just to describe this boom. What brought about this boom? These gentlemen are responsible for all these things, so far as that is concerned. They lauded the North-West to the skies. They told the people: There is a chance there for great fortunes. They wanted their predictions to be fulfilled, and they encouraged the people to go there. They started the lottery, and told them there were great prizes to be drawn. Only invest your money, said they, and become rich. The people took the tickets in this lottery and invested their money, but the hon. gentleman never cautioned them. He heard there was a great rush in Toronto to invest in lands in the North-West. Did he go up there, in the kindness of his heart, for fear they would lose money, and did he crowd in and raise his voice, and tell them not to invest in the North-West, not to invest in Winnipeg; that the prospects were illusory, and that the result would be bad for them? He says it now—he is very wise, after the thing has happened, and he wants to shirk the responsibility of having encouraged that speculation. I charge the loss upon them. They encouraged it. And the Finance Minister himself—what more could he say? He said no more than the rest. He told the people all over the land: Now is your time, boys. Seven years of plenty, seven years of prosperity before you. Start out now, and make your fortunes. About the end of the seventh year I would advise to take in sail. And here is a gentleman making this able speech and throwing the responsibility off on to other people. From week to week, and from

month into month, did not our ablest men on this side of the House raise a warning? Did they fail for a moment to caution hon. members of the mischief that would result? But I never heard one of them detract from the country. However, I am satisfied the country was lauded very much above what it deserved. I am satisfied, if the truth was known, that there are not 150,000 persons in the North-West, including Manitoba. They told the people in their speeches there was nothing but sunshine up there; that it was a paradise. Now, the settlers have been disappointed. You have been taking the people's money to bring them here, and pay the expenses of many of them, and they have gone into the neighboring Republic. I charge the responsibility upon the hon. gentlemen opposite, and the men who have lost their money have a right to charge them with having encouraged this gambling speculation, with having established this lottery; and when the drawing has taken place the prizes are not there, and the country is suffering for it, and is depressed in consequence. Many have taken tickets and have lost their all, and have cursed the National Policy.

Mr. IVES. Still they vote all right.

Mr. GILLMOR. Yes they do; and that astonishes me more than anything else. I have no more extracts to read from the hon. member's speech; but I really am not joking when I say that I think he is one of the ablest men in this Parliament, and he makes excellent speeches; but I was really amused when I saw the laudations of that speech in his own paper. I was a little amused, and it brought to my mind a little circumstance which happened down near the border. There was a Sister White, who was a member of the church, and very egotistical and conceited, but still she was an able speaker and very attentive at prayer meeting. She was at prayer meeting one night, and on the way home called at Brother Jones'. She said she was sorry he had not been at the meeting; that Sister Cartwright had been at the meeting and she was a very good speaker, very able and very orthodox; but some way or other she was so harsh in her expressions, she had had so much vinegar about her, that no one could enjoy religion when she spoke. She also told Brother Jones that Sister Paterson was there; that she had a good voice and was a good speaker; but she was at the other extreme—she had so much sugar about her that there was a reaction the other way. Then there was Sister Charlton, a good speaker, perhaps the best of all; but she was a new convert and people have not much confidence in them. And, therefore, she failed to get up a good feeling. And right here comes the simile. Sister White said to Brother Jones: I wish you had been there to hear me. When I addressed myself to the sinners I made them open their eyes; I made them feel they were right on the verge of destruction; but when I turned to the saints and described the future for them, they shouted, Glory, Hallelujah. Indeed, Brother Jones, I tell you, I spoke most beautifully. I do not vouch for the names in this story, for I have forgotten them; I vouch simply for the circumstance and the occasion. The evils of this protective policy are coming back sooner than I expected. I never expected to see the National Policy succeed. But fortune favored the Government for a time; but retribution is coming on them now; they have shown it all through this discussion, in their countenances and in their speeches, and no one can fail to understand that they were being punished for their folly. I feel like saying to them: Bear in mind, gentlemen, that you have had a good deal of prosperity, many years of rejoicing, but remember the days of darkness, for they will be many; you are getting whipped now with the lash, but before long you will be chastised with scorpions. My prophecies will prove more true than yours, unless

I am very much mistaken. If it does not there is no use in having a devil. The country is this year having the first spasm. Desperate diseases require desperate remedies. If the spasm will cure the country and defeat the Government I am willing to stand the spasm. I am willing to run the risk. That reminds me of a circumstance that happened to a man who became unfortunately addicted to drinking, and who became a drunkard. He suffered a great deal from the indulgence and had to endure the awful horrors of delirium tremens, and other effects that follow. At last he resolved to knock off, and he did it suddenly. The consequence was that the reaction was so great he became very sick and had a spasm. His friends went for a doctor. The doctor came and said he has stopped drinking too suddenly. You must take a little liquor; if you have a second spasm you may get over it, but if you have a third spasm you will die. The man replied: I want to live, doctor. These spasms are dreadful; but I know what it is to suffer the effects of drunkenness, and much as I want to live, I think, doctor, I will try the second spasm anyway. I feel just as that man did as regards the Government. As far as this country is concerned, I will try another spasm, if that will cure the evil. I read, during the recess, in some paper, the following:—

"A meeting of the manufacturers of white cotton was held to-day in the office of Messrs. David, Morrice & Co., for the purpose of deciding the best means to relieve the market of surplus stock, which keep prices depressed and checks the demand. Some days ago the manufacturers of grey cottons had a meeting, and, it is understood, decided to export the surplus stocks of grey cotton to England. Two courses are to be considered to-day by the manufacturers of white cotton. The first course is to close down the mills altogether for some months. This would involve the scattering of operatives some distance, and cause a depression and also some injury to mill machinery, which gets out of order when not in use. The alternative is to follow the example of the manufacturers of grey cottons and export goods, at a great loss, to some market, probably England. How great a loss such a course would involve may be gathered from the fact that cotton dealers are protected in the home market by duties amounting to about 30 per cent., besides the protection which the cost of freight on English goods gives. The loss would probably amount to about one-half of the actual costs of the goods. The result of such a course would be to immediately relieve the home market of the surplus stock and a consequent sharp advance in prices here."

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this policy was being inaugurated, when it was being lauded to the skies, and we were told what it was going to do, we were assured that competition would always keep the prices low. Now, what have we here? How have they carried out this promise? We find that as soon as stock accumulates and prices are likely to go down they immediately propose to send their surplus abroad, to slaughter their goods in a foreign market, and supply them cheap to the people of another country. While the poor of this country are buying their cotton goods and paying them good prices, whenever competition arises they want to slaughter their goods in a foreign market, and thus always keep the prices high for the poor people at home. That is my hon. friend's idea of a good country to live in. I do not agree with him. I think it is a bad country to live in, and I think a policy which has that effect is a bad policy. It will not do for them to have competition and keep prices low; they have to get rid of their goods somehow. The first thing they should do, and the Government should do, if they are lovers of their country, if they wish to benefit their own people, is to give their cotton cheap to the poor people of this country. But if they did that they would not make money; and so, in order to keep the prices high for the home consumer, they send their goods abroad and give the foreigners instead of their own people the benefit of low prices. If they can manufacture here so as to send their manufactures abroad and sell at a profit, they are always sure of the home market. If you manufacture anything cheap enough to go abroad you will never allow the foreigner to come into the home market, whether free or taxed; they will always have this market, for they have protection enough in freights and commission to give a profit, anyway, if they can only do that. Now, what-

Mr. GILLMOR.

ever hon. gentlemen may say, there is a great commercial depression in the Dominion. I am glad to say that I have seen the time when it was harder for people to live. Fortunately for the Government the prices of the necessaries of life are low, notwithstanding the protective policy. Bread is cheap; sugar is cheap—no doubt about it—and many other things which the people have to use or wear. If they were not I would not want to take a risk on your lives. If those things were not cheap for the people, notwithstanding your tariff, I tell you you would look a good deal bluer than you do to-day; and you deserve no credit because these things are cheap. What is troubling the Government now? The National Policy has been five years in existence and why are these delegations coming here? The protected industries have had five years of a fair chance, four of them very prosperous, and yet they are still coming; they are never satisfied. Scripture tells us that there are three things which are never satisfied, but if that Scripture were to be written now-a-days they might have added another—the manufacturers. They are never satisfied; they are here day after day: one delegation about this thing, and another delegation about that; some wanting a little more duty on flour; others wanting a little more duty on something else. The truth is, your policy is not, and it never can be perfect. But I notice that there are no delegations coming up here from the farmers, from the lumbermen, from the fishermen—three classes that compose a large majority of the people of this Dominion. They do not come to this Government or this Parliament asking for any favors on that score. They are depressed; they suffer from the depression in commerce in common with others, but they know that they need not apply here—they know that no lumberman, no fisherman, no farmer, need apply here. They must grin and bear it. There was once a poor woman who was in deep affliction, and a minister called in to comfort her in her distress. He said, "My dear woman, do you rest on the promises?" "Yes, I do," she replied. "Please tell me," he said, "what promise you rest upon." She said: "I find most comfort in that blessed promise, 'grin and bear it.'" That is the promise that the fishermen and the farmers and the lumbermen have to rest upon; they have the blessed comfort of grinning and bearing it. I hope they will not have to grin and bear it for a great many years, but I am afraid they may. It may be asked why are these manufactures so depressed, after all the advantages which have been given to them? If they have the right to take so much money out of the consumer why are they so depressed? It is a natural question. Now, that is very possible, too. A law may be so enacted that a great many people can be fleeced and yet nobody be made the richer. That has been the effect of the National Policy. Inducements were held out to manufacturers and capitalists to go into manufactures, to invest their money, in order that they might become suddenly rich. They took the bait; they invested their money; but, instead of going on reasonably fast, instead of going on moderately and cautiously, as they should have done, they have invested millions in these enterprises; and what is the result? They have invested their money, and it is idle, if not entirely lost; and, I think, the Government and their policy are responsible for that loss. They told a story when I was a boy, which illustrates the idea that misery loves company. A sharp Yankee came to the town with an extraordinary kind of an animal in a box. You paid a quarter of a dollar and you looked through a little glass into a box, and got a view of this wonderful animal. First one came, paid his quarter, saw the animal, and went away. Another came, and then another, and so on, until the whole community had paid their quarters, and got a view, and the last man let out the secret and told them that the wonderful animal was only a common house cat, with a very long tail, which the man had turned up over her

back and fastened to her ears. These gentleman have all been looking at the wonderful animal. They have lost their money and you do not hear so much grumbling as you would under other circumstances, for the reason that misery loves company. They were anxious to get rich too fast, and they overloaded, and they went down. I remember, and some others here will remember, the time when the steamer *Royal Star* was taking a circus from Eastport, to Boston. She had a menagerie on board, and in their company was the American giant; I remember him very well; he was a very large man. The steamer took fire, and a great many lives were lost, and a great deal of property. In the coffers of the circus was a good deal of gold and silver. This man, being a very strong man, and a good swimmer, thought he might get rich on the occasion, and make a grab. He filled his pockets with gold and silver. He had only a short distance to swim to the boat from the burning ship; he jumped over the side, and went to the bottom as quick as lightning. He was greedy, and wanted to get rich at once out of the spoils, and that was the result of his greed. He took his riches down with him; he had that satisfaction; but those who rested on the advice of the Government cannot even do that. I come now back to the tariff question. Direct taxation, is the most equitable, and decidedly the best system of raising a revenue that can be devised, if you could only make the people believe it; but I do not expect anybody for some time to come to venture on that mode of raising a revenue in Canada. Up to the time of the adoption of the National Policy we had what might be called a revenue tariff, although there was a great deal of protection in that tariff. Under it, for every dollar that went into the Treasury, the people I think paid half a dollar or perhaps 75 cents into the pockets of the manufacturers. That was a very large protection under that system. Now, my idea of the correct policy for raising a revenue is that prevailing in Great Britain. They put taxes on nothing that is produced in the country. To illustrate what I mean; the duties are here taken off tea and coffee, and the Government claim that they have done very much for the people in removing these duties. Well, if they wanted to help the people, it is not from tea and coffee that they would have taken the duty, but from flour and meal something that is produced in the country. If there was a tax to-day on tea and coffee every cent of that duty would go into the Treasury, and the country would get the benefit of it, because it is not produced in the country. Now, with regard to the taxation of the people under this policy, I am not thoroughly informed about it, but I have thought of the subject; and I believe that for every \$20,000,000 collected from the people under this National Policy, we have paid more than \$20,000,000 into the pockets of the manufacturers of this country. Now, that may astonish hon. gentleman; but I say, in order to raise \$20,000,000 for the Government of the country, you take \$40,000,000 and more out of the pockets of the people. I may be extravagant in my estimate; but I think I am under rather than over the mark. Here is the way I illustrate it, as I have done before. I go into into a merchant tailor's shop in Ottawa to buy a pair of tweed pants. I ask him to show me a piece of Scotch tweed worth about \$1.50 a yard. He shows it to me. I ask him to show me a piece of Canadian tweed about as good as that. He does so, and I ask him: What is the price of that? That is \$1.50 a yard, too. Now, you will understand that there is about three times as much Canadian tweed, taking all the grades, used in Canada now as there is of Scotch tweed. I take the Scotch tweed for my pants, and the duty I pay on that goes into the Treasury; the merchant paid it when it was imported, and I pay it back to him when I purchase the goods. But, suppose I took Canadian tweed of the same value, where does the extra price go? Because the duty raises the price of

the goods manufactured in the country as high as that of the imported article, or it is worth nothing; then the extra price I pay for the Canadian tweed goes to the manufacturer. The thing is plain, to my mind; there is no doubt about it; and as we use three times as much Canadian tweed as imported tweed, I say for every \$100 we pay into the Treasury on imported tweed we pay \$300 to our manufacturers. Well, you ask, why do they not get immensely rich at once. There are a good many reasons. They may not be able to make tweed to compete with Scotch tweed, therefore they have to tax the people to enable them to make it, or they may go into other investments. But the greatest loss, I think, is in trying to manufacture articles which they cannot manufacture successfully, and so they have to tax the people; and if there is anything that will cause depression it is that. Whenever you take so much from the people that they cannot buy the luxuries of life as freely as they could under other circumstances, if they had the money you take from them, that I believe, to a great extent, causes depression. I have here a table which I copied from some magazine, showing what amount of taxes goes into the Treasury, and what amount to the manufacturers on certain rates of duty. These tables are made from statistics gathered in the United States, and I believe the principle they are based upon to be correct. The proposition is, that the sum of \$100 is to be raised on imports, and of course the amount may vary under different circumstances.

Tariff of 100 per cent.	Manufactures Receives	Treasury Receives
100 gives.....	99-60 per cent	40 of 1 per cent.
95 "	99-20 "	80 "
90 "	98-40 "	1-60 "
85 "	97-20 "	2-80 "
80 "	95-60 "	4-40 "
75 "	93-60 "	6-40 "
70 "	91-20 "	8-80 "
65 "	88-40 "	11-60 "
60 "	85-20 "	14-80 "
55 "	81-60 "	18-40 "
50 "	77-60 "	22-40 "
45 "	73-20 "	26-80 "
40 "	68-40 "	31-60 "
35 "	63-20 "	36-80 "
30 "	57-60 "	42-40 "
25 "	51-60 "	48-40 "
20 "	45-20 "	54-80 "
15 "	38-40 "	61-60 "
10 "	31-20 "	68-80 "
5 "	23-60 "	76-40 "

If this estimate, however, is correct, and I have no doubt it is and if people understood the real nature of this tariff, or any other protective tariff, they would not tolerate it for a moment. But so many fallacies can be made to bolster up this protective theory that it is hard to make people understand it. The illustration used by the hon. member for South Brant (Mr. Paterson), with regard to sugar was a very good one. A gentleman offered to sell 40 lbs. of sugar to some one for \$1, if he would only go to the warehouse to get it. He takes his order for the sugar, the customer goes down to the warehouse and asks for the sugar. Oh, yes, he is told, you can have the sugar, 40 lbs. for \$1, but you must first pay \$1 duty. That gives him an idea of what the tax is. In my county we have perhaps one of the best cotton mills in the Dominion, a mill which turns out the best goods of the class manufactured of any mill in Canada. I will give the National Policy credit for having started that industry, and the report of the Government commissioner with regard to our industries shows that there are four or five hundred hands employed in that mill. I wish that mill success, as I wish every other enterprise success; it is not pleasing for me to see any body lose his investments; but that mill has been in operation for a year or two; I do not know particularly about its financial condition; I know that there were large bonuses given it and that a very large sum of money in stock was subscribed and paid up; and if I am creditably informed that stock, though not valueless, is very

low, and if placed on the market would realise very little. I am satisfied to-day that if the thing was to be done over again the stockholders would be very shy of making an investment. I do not know that any body is to blame for this, but there is no doubt that it is due to the encouragement given under the National Policy to investments of that character. I believe that any man who chooses to open his eyes and take one honest and earnest look at protection will see that it is dishonest and selfish in principle. I do not mean by this that everybody that advocates it is dishonest or that everybody that profits by it is dishonest; but I believe that it is very difficult to make any one think that a policy is wrong which gives him some advantage over his neighbors. It is the hardest thing in the world to convince a man a law is not good which gives him an advantage over others; but the policy, I contend, is wrong in any case. The best way to judge of this policy is to individualise it, to take it separately and alone, not connected with any other industry. Take, for instance, coal, and imagine for a moment that we have no protective policy. Supposing the representatives from Pictou were to ask this Parliament to enact a law which would give them 50 cents protection on coal. They might make all the arguments in favor of that proposition that they can now; they might give the output of coal, the number of men at work, the large capital it would set afloat, the great good it would do the farmers of Nova Scotia by giving them a home market for their produce. All these arguments, under these circumstances, would be just as proper as under other circumstances. Let them then submit a proposition to this House to put a duty on coal; what would be the result? The two gentlemen from Cape Breton, where the coal deposit is, would stand alone on that proposition. Other members would fail to see that it was in the interest of their constituents to put a duty on coal for the purpose of enriching the people of the coal mines in Pictou county. They would say it would be robbing our people, we cannot afford to give you a protection of 50 cents on coal and make it dear for every other industry and every other person who uses coal in the Dominion. People would think it was robbery if only the coal duty was proposed; but you go to the flour men, and the flour men and the coal men come into Parliament together and propose a duty on flour and coal. The flour and coal men would then stand alone. Other hon. members would say again: We cannot afford to protect flour and coal, because that would be robbery; that would be making dear bread and fuel to all the people of the country; we could never do that—and there would only be the coal men and the flour men to vote for it. But you go on and get the cotton and the woollen manufacturers, and the iron manufacturers, and a host of other manufacturers, and you get them all to put their heads together and carry the whole thing. That which was robbery when you proposed the coal duty separately has become quite a different thing now; that which was robbery when you proposed a duty on flour, and thus proposed to make dear bread for the people, becomes quite a different thing. You have to put this thing in its naked deformity; you have to show it up in all its hideousness, to make the people understand it. Hon. gentlemen opposite laugh; but if Robin Hood had too many highway robbers in his company, if all the population were enlisted, it would be no use to take the trouble of robbing, as there would be no victims. There must be victims, and the moment you have enough robbers you stop. You could not carry on this game for flour and coal alone, because the people would not stand being plundered, but you get all these interests combined—you carry your protective policy. But you must stop at a certain point, for it would not do to protect all; you must have somebody to skin or you will have to go on skinning yourselves, and there is no money in that. That is why you carried protection and continue it; there must be victims in the country whom you must plunder. The

Mr. GILLMOR.

victims are the great classes of farmers, fishermen, lumbermen and laborers. These are the men you have to fleece, because your protection is of no use if you have not victims. You must have victims, and therefore when you have enough spoils to be able to divide up something, you stop and do not go further. Hon. gentlemen opposite may pretend to laugh, but they don't feel like laughing all the same. When you get all these in, is it any less robbery? Is it any less unjust than it was when the coal men first came and asked protection? Does that alter the case? It only increases the evil, separately none of you would vote for a duty on coal. Why would you not vote for protection on coal if there was no protection on any of these? I see the member for Perth laughing. Why would you not? I wait for an answer. Why would you not? You would help the men in Pictou, and you would help the members for Pictou to be popular and get elected, and you would help it to make a market for the produce of the farm, and all that. And why would you not do it? You would not dare do it, because it would be unjust to your constituents to do that for the benefit of the coal men.

Mr. HESSON. Correct.

Mr. GILLMOR. Correct; yes. Is it any less unjust because you get more in? No; but there are more of you to divide the spoils and more to help on the system, which is legalised robbery—that is my opinion of it. No; this protective system will not work without victims. Somebody has to suffer under protection—no doubt about it. I find on my notes here a reference to the hon. the Minister of Marine. It is not my purpose, I never wish to criticise gentlemen's speeches—I try to make the best I can out of my own material—but I was surprised at the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It carried my mind back twenty years. I remember, when the question of Confederation was being discussed in the Lower Provinces, I was opposed to that measure, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was of the same opinion; he was opposed to Confederation. I remember having received a speech from the hon. member—I do not know whether he sent it, or somebody else—but it was a speech made by Mr. McLelan, of the Nova Scotia Legislature, and that speech I read with a great deal of satisfaction. It was witty and able, and I derived a great deal of pleasure from reading it, and it afforded me a good many valuable arguments and strong arguments in opposition to Confederation. When I noticed by the press that that hon. gentleman was elected to the first Parliament in Canada, I wished him success, and I felt that if anything would induce me to offer, it would be to be in Parliament with a gentleman with whose views I could coincide and that I endorsed so fully, and I really wished him success and wished I could be here to act in concert with him. Of course, the battle had been fought and we had failed; but I never heard that there was any change in his opinion, I never heard that he had changed his views in regard to that, and you will not be surprised that I was astonished to hear the speech I heard from him the other night. The speech I heard from him the other night was just the kind I had to meet from those who were in favor of Confederation. I remember one opponent of mine who was continually talking about a railway starting from Nova Scotia in a gold field, and passing up through Quebec, and through the wheat fields of Ontario, and out over the broad prairies, and landing in a gold field in British Columbia; and that was the beginning of his speech, and that was the end of his speech. We had to meet just such hifalutin', extravagant speeches all over the Province of New Brunswick, and my hon. friend's speech the other night, when he talked about the iron band which was about to cement the Union, reminded me very much of the speech of the person to whom I allude. I do not believe there is any more feeling in

favor of Confederation now than the day we entered the Union. I believe a majority of the lower Provinces, if they were out of Confederation now, would not enter the Union. There can be no bond of union under the policy of the Government. The only bond of union that cements us—no, I will not say cements us, that holds us together—is a debt of \$250,000,000, which has been rolled up since Confederation, and we have to grin and bear it, for we cannot get out of it, I suppose. The Lower Provinces have suffered most; their trade relations have become so altered that they suffer exceedingly with regard to this matter; and I believe now that, although of those who were opposed to Confederation in those days, many have gone to their reward and others have deserted their post, a few are left, and I believe to-day, that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, the majority of the electors of those two Provinces are with them. I have never heard the hon. gentleman speak in reference to this matter of Confederation until the other night, and from his laudation of Confederation one would think he was always a convert when he talks of this bond of union that cements us together, as the shuttle in the loom weaving us together and cementing us. Where is the cement now? Is there very much harmony in British Columbia? The Chinese war with the whites and the whites war with the Chinese, and a commissioner is sent at the public expense to try and reconcile things there. There is not very much harmony there; they pay per head two or three times as much to the Dominion Treasury as any other part of the Dominion. There is not much harmony. There is a volcano at the bottom; and were it not for the enormous amount of public money being expended there, you would see a different state of things in British Columbia. Is there harmony in the North-West and Manitoba that is binding and cementing the Dominion together? It may be more or less exaggerated; there may be more or less party in the matter; men are not perfect; but have you harmonised that Province by your legislation and by your National Policy? Is not everybody convinced there that your National Policy is wrong? And your policy with regard to the disallowance, and preventing these people from getting local railroads by local taxation, has not that been a bad policy? And in Ontario is there harmony, in view of your interference with the Streams Bill and disallowance of it, which was unjust? I understood that question, and there never was a more righteous and just law than that. No one was injured by that Bill that was disallowed. You failed in that, and that did not cement them. And, in regard to the boundary between the Provinces, did you not have the two Provinces in hostile array with each other in reference to your management of that question? There has been discord by your mode of action, whether owing to the policy or not, all through. And, in regard to Quebec, I do not know that there is much discord there. They have got it all their own way; they may get to fighting among themselves, which I hope they will. I have understood that they are. I have seen the combatants looking at each other like two cats on a rail fence, both wishing to spring but both afraid, because they thought the result might be that they would both fall off. Is there harmony in New Brunswick? Look at St. John. We imported the year before Confederation \$10,000,000 worth of goods. At that time warehouses were well filled, the wharves were lined with ships, and there was activity, business and prosperity. But ever since Confederation St. John has been declining, and to-day it is much worse off than it could possibly have been out of Confederation. That revenue tariff, that low tariff of 15 per cent. that we had, maintained our institutions, and we were in a prosperous condition. I know depression will come from time to time under any system of taxation. But your policy since Confederation has not tended to cement this Union. There are not 5,000,000 of people on earth who

are more at variance with each other than in this Dominion. This Dominion is one of the hardest countries in the world to govern. Its location, its trade relations and its necessities are very difficult to harmonise; they are such as any Government would find it very difficult indeed to satisfy, and no Government can expect to satisfy all. If Confederation is to be a success, that success has got to come in the future, for it has not come yet. The policy of this Government has been a failure, so far as I am able to judge, in almost every particular. Their measures have failed. Is there harmony amongst the licensed victuallers throughout the Dominion? That was an interference, an unjust interference, with provincial rights. Their law has been upset since. Their knowledge of constitutional law seems to be defective. The License Act also comes into conflict with the Scott Act. There is a large class of people throughout the Dominion who want to see the Scott Act have a fair trial, but this License Act comes in and makes that unworkable, and the Government will not remedy it. The License Act itself does not work, and there is nothing works harmoniously in their policy, from beginning to end. Then, down in Nova Scotia, are the people contented? Do you suppose, if there was not a great deal of discontent in Nova Scotia, that any man would lay upon the Table of the Local Legislature the resolutions that have been recently laid there? I do not believe they will carry. I do not believe there is any wisdom in doing it; but that evidently shows there is a great feeling of discontent in Nova Scotia. Take it all in all, Confederation is not a success. I think that picture out in the lobby was quite premature. I think, if the memory of the authors of Confederation is to be handed down to posterity, they ought to wait until they see a little more harmony in their work than can be seen at present, so far as I can observe. The hon. gentlemen opposite promised that every workingman should be employed—well, perhaps not in so many words; but the people were leaving the country for want of work, and they said the Government were flies on the wheel because they could not give them work. Parties in the country were leaving it to find work, and to find a home in a foreign country. But you have not found very much work for the workingman. You have taken a great deal of the workingman's earnings away to bring competitive labor into this country, and I am glad to know that that policy is changed now, and that you do not intend to pay the passages of immigrants to this country in future. There is really too much stress put upon this cry about finding work for men. I know it is a good thing to have a chance to get work when you want it. But men naturally do not want to work just for the fun of it. They want food, clothing and comforts; but they want to get them with as little work as possible. Now, I wonder how much of a compliment the hon. gentlemen on the Treasury benches would take it if somebody proposed to find them work. Just suppose that such a proposition was made to them; they would not take it as a great compliment. They do not have to work. They toil not, neither do they spin, and yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like some of these. Men want a chance to earn their bread and to advance in life, to make their condition in life better, to have something for a rainy day, and something for old age, but they cannot get it under this policy. You are taking all their surplus earnings from them, and you think they are in a good condition because they are not starving, because they have from day to day that which they can barely subsist upon. You have a great many people in this country who have worked from generation to generation, and yet they have got nothing to the good. If you would tax them less and give them an opportunity to get the necessaries of life cheaper, they would have a surplus; they would have something with which to indulge in some of the luxuries of life; they could educate their children; they could have some luxuries in

their houses; they could have many advantages that they cannot have when you take away their little earnings by increased taxation. Mr. Speaker, the Government certainly have done their duty with regard to finding employment in this Parliament building, and in the different Departments. I give them credit for having carried out their promise to find work for men here. When you come in at the lobby you will find two men at every door, a Frenchman and an Englishman, one to open the door in French style, and another in English style. You have to pass about fourteen men before you can get into this House. I would like to know how many doors there are in this House, and if you will tell me how many doors there are, I will multiply that by two, and that will give the number of doorkeepers. The messengers are in proportion; and in all the Departments it is the same. Perhaps I am a little extravagant in this; I may be coloring it too highly, but I am satisfied that it is pretty near the truth. I believe the Departments have a great many more servants than the business of this Dominion requires, or the people of this country are willing to pay for. I believe there is a great deal of extravagance. The Government can fairly congratulate themselves with having found work for a great many men here, and they have found work for a great many people away from here, to pay these men for standing here doing nothing. Now, with regard to the exodus, Mr. Speaker, I think there has been a great deal more said with regard to the exodus than there is any necessity for; and I think there was a great deal more said when the Liberals were in power, about the exodus, than there was any propriety in saying. It is not a pleasant thing for any of us to see people going away from this country. But you cannot help it; no Government can help it, and no policy will help it very much. People will come and go as they like; whenever they think they can benefit their condition they will go. I think Canada is a very good country to live in. We make a great fuss about people going, and we try to ascertain how many have gone by this mode of calculation and by the other; by school statistics, and so on; but we do not arrive at anything very definite. I think, however, we have arrived at this conclusion, that while the late Government were charged with permitting this exodus, it appears from the same sources of information that four times as many people have gone since hon. gentlemen opposite were in power than went before. But I do not blame hon. gentlemen opposite for that circumstance. How can they help it? Some go whom we should like to have here; sometimes men go whom we are glad to get rid of; but unfortunately many young men leave us. In the New Brunswick Legislature a young lawyer once rose and started to deplore the exodus, mentioning that thirteen journeymen tailors had left St. John a week before. An old farmer got up and said: It is a great pity those thirteen journeymen tailors did not take thirteen lawyers on their backs. I do not want to be personal; but if this exodus is going on, and we could get thirteen strong fellows to take the thirteen Ministers on their backs, I think it would be a good thing. I know it might be asked, with great propriety, how is it, if my views are correct, or at all correct, that this Government has gone twice to the country on their policy and been sustained each time by so large a majority. It has been said by some persons that they did not go exactly squarely to the country in 1878. But I think the people were not uninformed; they knew what the policy would be; the Government might not be just as outspoken as they would be under some circumstances, but the people were told what might follow. If the people were not informed what the policy would be it was not the fault of the Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite went to the country and were returned by an overwhelming majority. They brought in the National Policy boldly; they submitted it to Parlia-

Mr. GILLMOR.

ment and carried it through and made it the law. That policy was tried for three or four years, and in 1882 they went back to the people. The country returned them by nearly as great a majority as before. Those are arguments sufficient for hon. gentlemen opposite. I admit that they went fairly before the country, and the country knew what their policy would be if the Government was sustained. I know that a Government always has a very considerable following. David, at the Cave of Adullam, collected all in debt and all in distress, and all who were discontented, and made a goodly number. The Government influence. In their case we might add office holders and office seekers, and contractors, sub-contractors, and all the sharks that always follow a Government ship, in order to get some of the offal thrown overboard. But all that does not satisfy me as to why the Government obtained so large a majority. There must be something else which I cannot find out, some secret which the Government will not tell. I remember a story told about Lincoln. When he was a practising lawyer in Illinois, this case was placed in his hands. A man was indicted for stealing hams, and Lincoln had to defend him. At the outset Lincoln wished to know whether the man had stolen the hams or not, so that he might know how to conduct the case. The man said, I did steal the hams. Then, said Lincoln, you had better acknowledge your guilt and throw yourself on the mercy of the court. No, said the man, I have engaged you to defend me, and I will let the case go to the jury. The case went to the jury, and after a little while they returned with a verdict of not guilty, to the surprise of the court and council and every one else. After the court had closed Lincoln asked the man: How did you get a verdict in the face of such evidence? Why, replied the man, I wanted to go before the jury, because every one of the jury got a ham. I do not know whether every one of this jury got a ham, but they got something, or it would be impossible for the Government to return with such a majority. I want the Government to fulfil their promises. They have utterly failed to do so. In all ages there have been false prophets, men who have humbugged the people and promised to do things they could not do. There were the prophets of Baal, who kept continually humbugging the people, and making the people think they could do something they could not do. But at last came the test, and Elijah called on them to show their power. He told them to call on their Gods, and cry out to them; either the Gods were talking, pursuing, or peradventure asleep, and must be awakened. The prophets cried aloud, and cut themselves with knives and lancets till the blood gushed forth. Hon. gentlemen opposite have given us promises, and told us what they could do. They have had a trial and failed. Will they do as the prophets did, when they are asked to put the country in a prosperous condition? Elijah gave the prophets every chance, and taunted them a little, which was very naughty. Hon. gentlemen opposite never prayed more earnestly for anything than for the success of their policy. They have cried, and cried in vain. It is not in their power to carry out what they promised. The prophets of Baal cried until midday was passed, and on until the evening sacrifice; but there was neither voice nor anyone to answer, nor anyone that regarded their cry. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely the position they are in. They have been crying, and hoping, and praying, and wishing, but no blessing comes down. And Elijah said: Take the false prophets; let not one of them escape. And they took them, and brought them down to the Brook Kishon, and slew them there. And that is what the people ought to do with our false prophets.

Mr. WOOD (Brookville). At this late period of the debate, and the late hour of the evening, I shall not attempt a defence of the principles of the National Policy.

It must appear very strange to the people of the country that in the year 1885 we are still in this House defending on the one side the National Policy from the attacks made upon it on the other side of this House. But, Mr. Speaker, if that be the state of things, it must be conceded on all hands that the fault is not ours that this debate is being prolonged. Hon. gentlemen upon the other side, as was truly said by an hon. member on this side a few days ago, are like the Bourbons of old: they forget not, nor do they learn. Well, Sir, it seems most remarkable that notwithstanding that in 1878 the country pronounced so unmistakably and emphatically upon this issue—the only issue before the people at that time—that issue which restored to the First Minister the confidence of the people of Canada, which for a brief period they, much to their sorrow and regret, had withdrawn from him, and that again in 1882 they most emphatically re-affirmed the verdict they then gave—I say it is strange that notwithstanding all this we find hon. gentlemen opposite more pronounced in their opposition to this policy than at any period since its adoption by the people of Canada. I am sure, Sir, that we, speaking from a party point of view, and speaking also with a view to the best interests of the country, have no reason to regret the position which hon. gentlemen take in this respect, provided they were just a little more temperate in the language they use. I am aware, Sir, that when I make use of that language I am stating that which has been made use of by many hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I am aware that leading members on the other side of the House, hon. gentlemen who have been raising their voices, not only inside of this House but outside of this House, on this subject, affect a grievous tone—a tone of deep-seated injury, when they refer to the fact that we on this side have occasionally stated that their remarks laid them open to the charge of not being just as patriotic as they should have been. But if you take the remarks of the last speaker, the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick, when he comes out flat-footed, not only as a free trader—that, he has a perfect right to do—but against the principles of Confederation; when you hear him make use of that statement openly to this House and to the country, we can gauge the extent of the affection which that hon. gentleman entertains for what they appear to think so much of—the autonomy of this whole Dominion. Mr. Speaker, I am very much amused when I see hon. gentlemen affecting this tone of grievous injury when we make use of language of this kind. Why, Sir, we, the Conservative contingent of the right hon. the First Minister, who reside in the Province of Ontario, have been stigmatised by hon. gentlemen opposite, and by the press of their party, as traitors to the Province in which we live. They have not hesitated to brand us as such, and still they affect the tone of grievous injury when we on this side of the House use very moderate language to describe the utterances they employ in speaking of this our native country. Sir, I was very much struck in the references which have been made so far in this debate to the so-called exodus from Ontario; and it is simply because these remarks have been made concerning Ontario that I have risen to address a few remarks to this House, and ask your indulgence for that purpose. At the very outset of this debate, when the ex-Finance Minister was making his lengthy criticisms upon the speech of the Finance Minister, he led off in the strain that the population of Ontario was decreasing, in consequence of this National Policy, and that seemed to be the cue which was taken by almost every hon. gentleman who followed him, down to the last interesting and highly amusing address to which we have just listened from the hon. gentleman from New Brunswick (Mr. Gillmor). Sir, it always appeared to me that the school reports from which the ex-Finance Minister drew his

inferences and obtained his facts, and which he first made use of in Montreal, in the address delivered by him during last summer, must be wrong; and at the time I first read his address I had nothing more than other hon. gentlemen in this House have to guide them. I had simply the evidence of my observation of the locality in which I live. I knew that in my own town, and in the county I have the honor to represent, the population was increasing; the value of real estate was increasing, and general prosperity reigned. Well, Sir, I do not know but I might challenge hon. gentlemen in this House to get up and state whether or not the population in the constituencies they represent in this House is not increasing. I believe, Sir, if I threw out this challenge to hon. gentlemen opposite, not a single one, especially from the Province of Ontario, would dare to get up and state that the population in the county he represents was being decreased. Now, Mr. Speaker, if those statements are wrong, if the facts so carefully compiled by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) are true—and I believe they are, because they are borne out by the evidence of our senses, if not by the census to which hon. gentleman object—if these are true, who are the traitors to Ontario? Are they the men who, following the leadership of the First Minister are endeavoring to work out the legislation of this country in the lines and upon the principles laid down by the fathers of Confederation; or are they those who, if they studied the facts carefully, must know they are wrong, will yet persist in publishing to the world that the population of this their native Province—of which they pose as the special champions—is rapidly decreasing; that our sons are going to a foreign country and are turning their backs on the homes of their fathers and the flag that sheltered them? Who are the traitors to Ontario, if these facts are wrong? Now it is a strange commentary on the language of the ex-Finance Minister, and of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), both of whom stated, almost in the same words, that in their belief, taking the facts they alluded to, the population of Ontario was continuously decreasing—I say it is a strange commentary on the truthfulness of that statement that, almost at the very time the ex-Finance Minister was making use of that remark, there were proceedings going on in the Legislature of Ontario, having in view the idea of coming to this House for an increase in the subsidies granted to the Province under the British North America Act. During the course of that debate the Provincial Treasurer, in discussing the subject, made use of the following remarks, as reported in the *Globe* of 4th March:

“The increased population has brought to us an increased expenditure, but to the Dominion Government only increased revenue. So I say that if we are forced to look for a new basis on which the subsidy is granted, let it be on the basis of population, and give us an increased subsidy, say every ten years.”

Now, Mr. Speaker, who is right, the ex-Minister of Finance or the present Treasurer of Ontario? But that is not all. Another member of the same Government said:

“So, as Ontario grew in population, and the expenditure increased, it was seen that more money was required to carry on the affairs of the Province.”

In other words, we find the present Opposition in this House, for the sake of making some capital against this Government, crying out, to the injury of our Province, that its population is decreasing, that our sons are leaving our shores, while for the same reason, that of gaining a little party advantage or perhaps annoying this Government, in another Parliament the Provincial Treasurer says just the reverse. For the purpose of making party capital they are willing to ride two horses at the same time, and to take any position, however contrary it may be to the facts. I am aware, Sir, that it is a very bold thing in any man to say anything against the Mowat Government; I am aware that any one of the members of Mr. Mowat's

Cabinet must be more nearly right, according to the views entertained by hon. gentlemen opposite, than the ex-Minister of Finance; therefore, I conclude that the Provincial Treasurer is right, and that the population of Ontario is increasing; and, as an additional fact in support of that, I would allude to the evidence furnished by the report of the Bureau of Industries in Ontario, which is most damaging to their utterances on this subject. I would request hon. gentlemen to look to the information supplied by that report, as to the population in their own counties, before they undertake to publish to the world that the population of the Province is decreasing to such an alarming extent. I would specially suggest to the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) to look into that report, by which he will find that, under the operation of the National Policy there has been a very large measure of prosperity in the county of Norfolk. Of course, it is a fact that we cannot expect him to admit in this House; but we can expect these hon. gentlemen not to state what investigation on their part would prove to be untrue. Now, there is another question to which I wish to allude. I am aware that when any resident of the Province of Ontario declares that in this country the consumer does not pay the import duty charged upon coal he is sneered at by the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite; but, Sir, I am one of those who believe that the consumer in Ontario does not pay the duty on coal, and I will tell you why. I listened with a great deal of attention to the argument used by Sir Charles Tupper in this House two or three Sessions ago on this subject. The idea was new to my mind, and though not altogether converted then to the fact, I believe to-day that the consumer in the Province of Ontario does not pay the duty on coal. In support of this, I wish to refer to what occurred during last summer in the city of Philadelphia. The inhabitants of that city complained that though they were on the brink of the mining district, they had to pay 65 cents a ton more for their coal than the people of Boston, hundreds of miles away, and quite as much as the inhabitants of Canada, whose coal was subject to heavy freight charges, and to a duty of 50 cents a ton. In Philadelphia the coal companies have no competition and they charge as they please, while in Boston and other eastern cities they are compelled to keep their prices low, to meet the English coal and that from Nova Scotia. It thus happens that notwithstanding the distance of 800 miles, which is against us as compared with Philadelphia, and in spite of the duty, we secure our coal at as low a figure as do the Philadelphians, whose nearness to the mines should be a point in their favor. Now, Sir, in the month of June last a committee of the Philadelphia city council was appointed to investigate the charges of discrimination of rates made against coal and coal carrying companies by one of the city papers. The enquiry is of interest to the Canadians, chiefly because it elicited evidence sustaining the view I have expressed. President Roberts, of the Pennsylvania Railway, in a letter dated 20th June, to the committee of investigation, says:

"The rates that are now charged by our company for carrying soft coal are made for the purpose of meeting the competition in the various markets in which coal is introduced."

And he defends this discrimination by saying:

"Pennsylvania does not suffer by it, but on the contrary is benefited by it, because without it coal would be no cheaper to local consumers, while with it a large force of coal miners and other operatives are added to the wealth producers of the State."

Mr. James H. Gowan, one of the managers of the Reading Co., also wrote to the committee, and this is what he says:

"It has been customary, for the past thirty or forty years, to allow drawbacks on coal bought for exportation. I cannot say to what extent the custom prevails now, but I can say that only for it Pennsylvania coal would not have been introduced at all into many places where it now is. The price of coal is regulated by competition, and we have to do business like other people; no man is in business who does not do the best he can for himself, and companies exist to make money."

Mr. Wood (Brockville).

Now, one of the strongest arguments against the National Policy made use of by the free traders in the Province of Ontario, is that the poor man has to pay 50 cents a ton on the coal he uses, and as coal is one of the necessaries of life, that is to the workingmen of this country a very strong argument against the National Policy. But it is a fact in proof of what I have read, that in towns along the River St. Lawrence, which are separated from the United States only by the river, the people pay no more for their coal than do the people of the towns in the State of New York, on the other side of the river. Last Saturday coal was \$6 a ton in the city of Ogdensburg, and the same price in Prescott, just across the river. I mention this to show that in these matters, which are constantly alluded to by hon. gentleman opposite, the facts do not bear them out; and I bring forward this evidence with pleasure, as it is in strict confirmation of the very elaborate argument made use of by Sir Charles Tupper in this House. Now, there is another matter about which hon. gentlemen opposite have made a good deal of capital. They pose now as the friends of the workingmen. Well, Sir, it did occur to me that whatever might be the assumption of hon. gentlemen opposite as to the stand they have taken with reference to any particular class, they could hardly have the "cheek," if I may use the expression, to stand up here as the friends of the workingman. My opinion is that the workingmen of this country have a very lively recollection of the kind of affection hon. gentlemen opposite entertained for them in days gone by. It is within the recollection of every one in this House that the working classes, between the years 1873 and 1878, were in a state approaching poverty. It is a fact that they were crying aloud for assistance from this Government. It is a fact that the associations of workingmen throughout the country were pointing out, as did the manufacturers and agriculturists, and the representatives of all the industrial classes, the remedies which they required. But that Government turned a deaf ear to everything they said, and very arrogantly gave them to understand that they knew not whereof they were speaking. Now hon. gentlemen opposite say: You told us you were going to restore this country to prosperity. You told us that your leader would exercise his magical wand, of which the people at that time knew nothing, if they would only restore him and his friends to power. Have you done it they say? Have you been able to straighten out this difficulty under which this or the other industry is laboring and restore prosperity to it? There can be nothing more absurd than this. During the period of depression previous to 1878, it was not the representative men of the Conservative party who alone were making these statements. They were but giving voice to what emanated from the people. But at the present time there are no representations of that kind coming to the Government. This is a distinction which I wish to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite. From every place in which there was an industry of any kind previous to 1878, there came down to the city of Ottawa, to the Finance Minister of the day, deputations and petitions, representing to him the particular grievances of which they complained and telling him all they wanted was simply the opportunity of laying before him their case; but in no single instance did he accede to their wishes. It was in that state of things, upon that case, that the present First Minister took the position that these people should be heard. We were then simply giving voice to the wail that came up from the people all over the country, and the sympathy the First Minister entertained for them found practical expression in that now historical resolution, known as the National Policy. And the National Policy which he gave to the people is just as popular in Canada, just as strong in the hearts of the people to-day, as it was in 1878. It is the merest folly of hon. gentlemen opposite to compare the

position of parties to-day with the position of parties then; to pretend to compare the present state of the country with the state of the country in 1878. What we tell them is this: Before you can charge us with inconsistency, before you can say, bring prosperity to this industry or to that, you must show that the proprietors and the working classes interested in these industries, that all the mechanical, all the industrial classes of the Dominion, are crying aloud for help, as they did then; but you cannot prove that, because no such proof exists. The people of Canada to-day are enjoying a degree of prosperity which is far beyond that of almost any people in the world. If you compare the condition of our people to day with the condition of the people of the United States or England, you will find that the National Policy has proved, not only a friend to this country in her days of sunshine but also the best friend she ever had in the time when the clouds appeared upon her commercial horizon. I believe I am but expressing the opinions entertained by the majority of the people of Canada when I say that the first thing that would weaken the confidence which the people now have in the First Minister would be the first indication on his part to depart from the principle of that policy. I believe we should adhere to this policy until the industries of this country are strong and firm enough to let down a bar, when we can do so to our advantage and the advantage of our people. Reference has been made by previous speakers to the remark made by the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), and I wish to allude to that particularly, because it is in keeping with the subject upon which I am now speaking. It shows how very careless these gentlemen are in making their statements. This hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster), in the very eloquent address he delivered to this House a few days ago, referred to the prosperity of the country. He was interrupted by some hon. gentlemen opposite, who referred to the fact that some men of the Conservative party, authorised to speak for that party, had declared that under the fostering influence of the National Policy hamlets would grow into villages, villages into towns, and towns into cities. Well, as fate would have it against these hon. gentlemen, in their organ of Saturday last, the *Globe*, just as if that organ never paid any attention to these hon. gentlemen at all, there appears a leading editorial under the heading of the extension of Ontario. I will only read from this editorial a few statements, but they will be quite sufficient to show not only the falsity of everything that has been said, not only against the industries of the Province of Ontario, but also the truth of what has been advanced on this side, with reference to increase in population and prosperity. The *Globe* said:

"But let us look at the growth and expansion of Ontario in 1872—the first year of Liberal Administration—there were 406 townships and 121 village, town and city municipalities in the Province. In 1884 these numbers increased to 451 townships and 205 village, town and city municipalities. In 1872 the total population, according to the municipal census, was 1,425,000; in 1884 it was 1,752,000. In 1872 the rural population was 1,050,000, and the urban 375,000; in 1884 the rural was 1,117,000 and the urban, 635,000. With such growth, what man in the possession of the five senses, will affirm that public expenditure should have remained a fixed quantity? It is not simply that some of the older counties have been making progress—that new townships have been organised, that hamlets have grown into villages, villages into towns, and towns into cities."

The hon. gentleman for King's, N. B., has his revenge. We all remember how he was taunted by hon. gentlemen across the floor, that such a thing would never be; that it was simply absurd; that it was a prophecy that would never be fulfilled. Speaking of prophecies, I wonder if any of the prophecies hon. gentlemen opposite made, prior to and immediately after 1878, have been fulfilled. I wonder if these hon. gentlemen, travelling over the hills of their memory, ever find that their prophecies at that time have proved most miserable failures. After the adoption of this policy we all remember

we were told that the grinding monopolies which were created under this tariff would be most oppressive. Well, Sir, it is most remarkable that during the present Session of this Parliament we find hon. gentlemen assuming the role of sympathisers with these capitalists. We find there is no stronger position they have taken this year, than the charge against this Government, that they, by their introduction of this policy, have induced men to put capital into concerns that have not paid, and that these capitalists, these bloated monopolists, are now the objects of their special attention. In the one breath it is the poor man; in the other it is the bloated monopolist. Why, do not these gentlemen know that the result of all this capital being put into these industries, which if you will, in some instances has to some extent failed, is that the commodities produced by these factories have become cheaper, and that the poor man has been benefited by that. In no sense have the working classes been injured by the National Policy, viewed from any light in which you choose to view it. I wish simply to make a reference to another matter, in reference to which a good deal has been said. I have here a short table, giving a comparison of the sixteen years of our confederated life, and a corresponding period in the life of the United States:

PUBLIC DEBT—COMPARATIVE TAXATION.

Year.	CUSTOMS, STAMPS, EXCISE.	
	Canada.	United States:
1868.....	\$11,700,681	\$351,713,348
1869.....	11,125,673	336,596,828
1870.....	13,087,882	376,749,842
1871.....	16,320,368	346,457,849
1872.....	17,715,552	344,390,052
1873.....	17,616,554	299,004,479
1874.....	10,129,185	263,167,032
1875.....	20,664,878	265,100,137
1876.....	18,614,415	262,415,690
1877.....	17,697,924	247,423,527
1878.....	17,841,938	239,102,883
1879.....	18,476,613	246,313,903
1880.....	18,479,576	307,324,268
1881.....	23,942,138	329,571,245
1882.....	27,549,046	363,132,299
1883.....	29,269,698	355,796,216
Totals.....	\$300,219,021	\$4,934,259,597

Taking the population at the middle period we have for the United States a population of 45,700,000, and for Canada 3,900,000. This gives the average amount of taxation per head for the sixteen years at \$110 for the people of the United States, \$77 per head during the period of sixteen years for Canada. If we had been subjected during this period to the same taxation as the people of the United States we would have paid into the Treasury the sum of \$430,000,000 instead of \$300,000,000. I have not included the State taxation. There is one thing in the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite which must have appeared strange to those on this side of the House, that from the very commencement of their criticisms upon the statement of the Finance Minister, up to the present moment, they have not ventured to state, in any one particular, where they would alter this policy if they were so fortunate as to secure the Treasury branches. They dare not do it, because, when you go out into the constituencies and find hon. gentlemen seeking the suffrages of the people you do not find them coming out as flat-footed against the National Policy there as they do in this House. My experience in the election of 1882 was that an opponent in canvassing, the canvasser would get hold of a voter, one of their own men, and would be told by the voter: "I am in favor of this National Policy;" and then the gentleman who was canvassing would say: "Come here and let us have a talk; I am in favor of that, too; but if our friends get into power they are not going to change that." That is what I had to meet in my constituency, among other forcible arguments used to

defeat me. That is the feeling throughout the country. I say that these hon. gentlemen, in coming out so strongly against the National Policy, in declaring that it has been of such great injury to the country, that it has hung like a blight over our industries and has retarded our prosperity and the growth of our population, are not representing the men who sent them here. And, if it be a fact, as has been stated on the other side of the House, that hon. gentlemen on this side are never going to come back for some of the votes they have given, I tell them that they will never succeed in assuming the reins of power in this country if they fight out their political battles on the lines they have during this Session. I would like to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen very briefly to the condition of the agricultural classes. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who spoke yesterday and to-day, and who assumed to be the special champion of the farmers; who stated that no person could tell him anything about farming; that what he did not know about farming was not worth knowing, first built up a case against the Government and then knocked it all to pieces. He declared that there were parties coming to this Parliament and that they were determined to get a change of the tariff, so far as flour was concerned; and then he went on to show how great a grievance this would be, and he made out quite a case against the Government for what they have never done. And he made a most astounding statement, which was, that the policy of the Government during the Mackenzie régime was to tax the luxuries and lighten the taxes upon the necessaries of life to as large an extent as possible, while, under the present Government, he said the policy was to tax the necessaries at the rate of about 50 per cent. and to let the luxuries go free. I never was more surprised at anything I have heard from hon. gentlemen opposite than I was at that. Let me call attention to the kind of treatment and the sort of protection the farmers enjoyed under the Mackenzie régime:

Canadian Tariff, 1878.	American.
Wheat, free.....	20 per cent.
Rye and barley, free.....	15 cents per bushel.
Indian corn and oats, free.....	10 cents per bushel.
Wheat flour, free.....	20 per cent.
Rye flour and cornmeal, free.....	
Live animals, 10 per cent.....	20 per cent.

Then, as to the luxuries—champagne, wine, whiskey, spirits, tobacco, cigars and so on, were all spared heavy duties, high taxation for the necessaries of life being put upon tea, coffee, sugar, quinine, coal oil, books for the blind, bibles when printed seven years, scientific books, and all books printed seven years. That is the way the luxuries were taxed under hon. gentlemen opposite. The workingmen of this country, those who, as the last speaker stated, know how to appreciate a dollar when they earn it by toil, will duly appreciate the mode of taxing necessaries and luxuries respectively, by hon. gentlemen opposite, and when they pose as the special friends of the poor workingmen and the laboring classes, I can assure them that they are taking a position which is so manifestly inconsistent with their previous record, that they will make no political capital out of it, notwithstanding their loud utterances. Now, I want to give just a few more facts, if the House will bear with me, upon this question. I wish to make a comparison as to the purchasing power of money under this tariff, at the present time, and the purchasing power of money during the time those hon. gentlemen were in power; because, after all, it is only by comparisons of this nature that we can get at the correct state of the case; it is only by comparisons like those the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wigle) made last Session, in this House, that the people understand the practical working of the National Policy. It is exactly like the coal argument. When a man knows what he pays and what he used to pay, and knows what they pay

Mr. Wood. (Brockville).

on the other side of the line; he cannot see where he pays the duty. And it is just so here. Now, Sir, as to the purchasing power of farming products in 1885, as compared with 1878. In the latter part of 1878 the average price of wheat in Ontario was 84½ cents. Wheat is now quoted at say, 78 cents. The farmer in 1878, sold 60 bushels of wheat at 84½ cents—receiving therefore \$50.70, and he then proceeded to make an outlay of home necessaries, with the following result:—

5 lbs. of tea at 75cts.....	\$ 3 75
25 lbs. of sugar at 9 cts.....	2 25
3 galls. syrup at \$1.00.....	3 00
3 cwt. flour at \$3.00.....	9 00
5 lbs. starch at 13 cts.....	0 65
1 doz. canned goods at 25 cts.....	3 00
20 yds. of factory cotton at 9 cts.....	1 80
20 yds. grey flannel at 45 cts.....	9 00
2 six-pound blankets at 60 cts. per pound.....	7 80
10 yds. shirting at 15 cts.....	1 50
Total.....	\$41 75

After paying his bill he had \$8.95 remaining. In 1885 the farmer requires a similar bill of goods, and what is the result? He derives from his 60 bushels of wheat, at 78 cents per bushel, \$46.78, and proceeds to invest it as follows:—

5 lbs. tea at 50c.....	\$2 50
25 lbs. sugar at 5c.....	1 25
3 galls. syrup at 60c.....	1 80
3 cwt. flour at \$2.....	6 00
5 lbs. starch at 10c.....	0 50
1 doz. canned goods at 12½c.....	1 50
20 yds. factory cotton at 7c.....	1 40
20 yds. grey flannel at 35c.....	7 00
2 six lb. blankets at 45c.....	5 40
10 yds. shirting at 12½c.....	1 25
Total.....	\$28 60

Leaving a remainder to the good of \$18.20, or \$9.25 more than during the partial free trade era of Sir Richard Cartwright's administration of financial affairs. Mr. Speaker, I imagine that when these hon. gentlemen attempt, to talk to the people of the country about what they will do for them—for they have never done anything for them yet—when they can come to the people and attempt, by specious promises to the workingmen, to enlist their sympathies with the party they represent, they will find that the workingmen will not be deluded; they will find that the Government which has done so much for the working classes in the past, which is doing so much for them to-day, not only by protecting our industries, so that they can get the same labor in the country they did before, but also by cheapening some of the commodities, which is the practical result of competition among our industries, and of the permanence of our manufacturing institutions—I say, Sir, that the workingmen will be able to appreciate their arguments at their true value. The cheapening of the commodities is the natural result of this National Policy, if it is tried long enough, because naturally in the first years of a protective tariff, when our industries are struggling for an existence, it is possible the purchaser may pay a little more than he will afterwards, but the benefit accruing to the people after a few years will be manifest. In this country, as in all countries, combinations and monopolies will cure themselves. Since the beginning of the world there have been very few monopolies that have not cured themselves; and no monopolies can live where the conditions are favorable to competition, such as they are in this country. Now I notice, also, that our Opposition friends are endeavoring to make a good deal of capital out of the subject of assisted immigration. That is something which was taken up by the *Globe* some time ago, and it has been alluded to by the ex-Minister of Finance, and by all the lights of the party opposite. It is here that their inconsistency comes in again, and it is just as manifest as in all the other arguments they have used against this policy. You would

hardly believe that in the depression between 1873 and 1878, when our workmen found it almost impossible to live; that during all that time they brought thousands of mechanics into the country; that during all that time it never occurred to them that it was a shame to bring immigrants into a country, the labor market of which was already overcrowded. Yet they stand up to-day and tell this Government that they have been doing wrong. Sir, I believe that the policy announced by the Minister of Agriculture here, a few days ago, in reply to the hon. member for Ottawa, was strictly correct. I believe it is time that certain organisations in the old country, and certain charitable institutions, were given to understand, in some way, that Canada is now large enough to have a pauper population of its own. I believe it would be better if we were to discriminate, even more than we have done, against that class of immigrants coming to this country. The Government have shown every desire to do in this matter all that any Government can do. We have the assurance of the Minister of Agriculture that discrimination will be made against that class of immigrants coming to this country, and that the attention of the Government will be devoted to the introduction of agricultural and farm laborers. But we have something more substantial than that; we have the announcement of the Minister of Finance, in the interests of the mechanical classes, that prison labor will be prohibited altogether. I say, Sir, in concluding these few remarks, that in every respect the Government has done everything that it could do for the working classes, for all the industrial classes, in fact, for all the producing classes of this country. I say that no Government could have done more than it has done, and as all Governments are liable to err, possibly our own Government, in some respects, is not infallible. The First Minister always declared that public men were liable to make mistakes, and Governments were liable to make mistakes. But upon this question of the National Policy it will be to the everlasting credit of the First Minister, that from the day he announced that policy to the people of Canada he has remained faithful to the doctrine; and up to this moment he has shown no sign of departing from it; but, as he stated at the magnificent gathering in Toronto, a gathering of the young men, the old men, and the middle-aged men, who assembled to do him honor, he has nailed that principle to the mast-head of his party, and is willing to stand or fall by it, and in that statement he voiced the sentiments not only of his followers in this country, but, in my opinion, of the large majority of the people of Canada.

Mr. JACKSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:15 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, 20th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LEVIS ELECTION.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to say that I have made enquiry with respect to the issuing of a new writ in the case of Lévis, and I find that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, has not yet received

the necessary instructions to enable him to issue a new writ in that case. When is it proposed to give those instructions?

Mr. CHAPLEAU. No notice had been given by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to the Department of the Secretary of State, but to-day the Government have given orders to have the writ issued without delay, at once.

Mr. BLAKE. I find it exceedingly difficult to understand the course of procedure in these cases. From the statement made by the Secretary of State to this House, it appears to be his duty to give notice to have the writ issued.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I said I had not received it.

Mr. BLAKE. Either there has or has not been delay. The Clerk of the Crown in Chancery was furnished with the necessary information by the Government as to what was to be done with respect to one of those two notices, that for the West Riding of Northumberland, in time to enable the writ to be issued yesterday. With respect to the case of Lévis, the hon. gentleman says the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery did not give him notice, and that is the reason, and the only reason, the hon. gentleman has given for not having acted in that case. My belief, however, is that there is another reason, because I cannot see that the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery would have omitted to give notice as to Lévis and given notice as to West Northumberland. If he conceived it to be his duty to give notice at once in the one case, why should he have delayed with respect to the other? We all were informed of the fact that the warrant had been issued in that case, and the Government upon receiving that notice proceeded without delay to execute their part of the law and to give the necessary instructions. They pick and choose. In the one case, they give instructions; in the other case they delay. That is making a convenience for their own purposes of the law, which was not to be so used. The law is to be used in the general interest, and equal justice is to be meted out to all the constituencies; and, therefore, I conceive that the privileges of this House have been violated and the Government have neglected a duty imposed upon them.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not believe the Government have been in any sense guilty of a breach of the privileges of Parliament. Notwithstanding the forcible language which has been addressed by the hon. gentleman opposite, the clerk says the uniform practice is for the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to wait for instructions after you, Mr. Speaker, have informed the House that your warrant has been issued. With respect to the writ for West Northumberland I can speak myself. The fact is simply this: Going out of the Chamber I saw the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and, as he knew that I came from Ontario, he said he had received a warrant for West Northumberland. I said, "Very well; you had better have the writ out. Who is the returning officer?" He told me. I said, "Appoint the same returning officer."

Mr. CHAPLEAU. I did not think blame should be attached to anyone in this matter. I received to-day information from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, and we ordered that a new writ be issued in the case of Lévis. There has been no reason, although the hon. gentleman opposite insinuates there has, why I should have delayed the issue of the writ, if it had been within my power to do so.

Mr. BLAKE. I have a return here, showing that in the vast majority of cases writs were issued the day following; and in many cases on the same day, as that on which the warrants reached the clerk's hands. Here we have three days' delay in one case, and I say the spirit of the election

law, has been violated as well as the privileges of this House.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY—RETURNS.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should like to ask the hon. First Minister if he has that little document at hand with respect to the Grand Trunk Railway, I think he has got it in his desk, and he might as well place it on the Table.

Sir JOHN MACDONALD. Yes, I have had it in my desk, I got it yesterday, as I told the hon. gentleman, that is a letter from Mr. Hickson to me, and a resolution of the board in England confirming his letter. They were sent with a large envelope covering certain information concerning other motions of the hon. gentleman which did not in any way concern these two letters. So I sent it back to get a correct envelope.

Mr. MITCHELL. I am anxious to get it soon, because the Grand Trunk stock is dropping so fast, I am afraid it will disappear altogether before I get the return in.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. McCALLUM. I hold in my hand the *Globe* of the 19th of March, in which the following language is used:—

"Following the lead of Mr. White of Hastings, Mr. McCallum to-night declared himself in favor of a legislative union and the abolition of the Provincial Legislatures. The Conservative members are becoming candid. Possibly they will throw off the mask altogether before next election and appeal to the country as legislative unionists."

There is not a man within hearing of my voice to-day who heard me make use of that language. In plain Saxon, I say the man who wrote that paragraph must have written it wilfully, knowing it to be false, and I brand him a liar, a moral coward, and one not fit to associate with gentlemen.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

On order to resume adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With respect to this motion I should like to know if we can, in any way, come to a conclusion as to when the debate may be expected to close. Perhaps we might come to a vote as the discussion has lasted for a good many days.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Does the hon. gentleman know how many on his own side wish to speak?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I think we are all desirous of coming to a conclusion at a reasonable time, though of course one cannot answer altogether for gentlemen behind. I do not think, however, that there will be any unnecessary delay on this side, for I believe hon. gentlemen behind me are anxious to close too.

Mr. BLAKE. I have one practical suggestion to offer. If the debate closes to-night I presume it is not the intention of the hon. gentleman to take the resolution through the committee, because there will be a good deal of discussion on the details of the resolutions, and it would not do to take them very late at night. If we come to an understanding that the debate shall close, and if the hon. gentleman should go into committee and come out again, it would be a breach of the understanding to interpose at that time with any observations. I think it would be unfortunate, as the hon. gentleman furnishes us with a good deal of practical discussion in the committee, that it should be taken at an untimely hour.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. We propose only to go through with one resolution—the one with reference to prison labor. We would like to take a vote on that.

Mr. BLAKE.

Mr. BLAKE. In saying that, the hon. gentleman does not mean that he intends to abandon the others?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh no; we will certainly not abandon them. We simply want to take a vote on that particular one to-night.

Mr. JACKSON. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), as you are aware, Mr. Speaker, favored the House last night with a very able speech, and I am sure every one who listened to it must have been charmed with its eloquence. For my own part I may say that I was pleased to listen to him, but I must acknowledge, at the same time, that I was a little astonished at some remarks the hon. gentleman made. He spoke with regard to the exodus of Canadians to the United States. He referred to some remarks made by my colleague the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) when that gentleman spoke about his own county. He referred to the duty on coal, to the immigration policy of the Government, to the increased population of the Province of Ontario—all of which I shall give some attention to in the course of my remarks. I am very much disinclined to refer to what has been said on this subject by previous speakers; and were it not that any remarks I may make, may be read by people outside of this House who have not had the privilege of listening to this debate I should have refrained from making charges which have been made and so ably proven by other speakers, but as what those hon. gentlemen have said cannot appear in my remarks I shall take occasion to allude to them myself. During the year 1877-78 the leaders of the Conservative party charged the Mackenzie Administration with being responsible for the depression which then existed throughout this country. They saw that, according to the natural results of trade throughout the world, prosperity would return again within the immediate future, they believed if they could persuade the people that the Government was responsible for the existing depression, that at the next election they would be returned to power, and when once in power, and by the return of prosperity to this country which would be sure to come, they could and would maintain themselves in power. Therefore, it was said from one end of the Dominion to the other that the previous Government were incompetent to run the affairs of the nation; they were charged with being flies on the wheel; they were charged with retarding the progress of the country. The people were told during the election campaign of 1878 that if they wanted high prices for their wheat, high prices for their labor, if they wanted general prosperity, they should support the National Policy and Sir John Macdonald. The hon. First Minister himself stated that a readjustment of the tariff would stimulate and build up the manufacturing industries of the country, that it would create a home market for the produce of the farmer, that it would build up a labor market with high prices, that it would bring back the young men who were emigrating to the United States by the thousands and build up and keep Canada for the Canadians. These and similar statements were sounded from one end of the Dominion to the other; the elections were brought on, the Conservative party were successful. They were elected to power and we have now had six years of the hon. gentleman's Administration. Well, Sir, have these promises to the people been fulfilled? The First Minister says they have. I have here a statement made by the right hon. gentleman to a reporter of the *New York Herald*, when the First Minister was departing for Europe in November last. The reporter asked him:

"Are you still satisfied with protection in Canada, Sir John?"

"Yes; it has worked well for us. We have had five years of it, and we are satisfied it has greatly promoted our prosperity. Our young men before we adopted a protective policy were leaving us to come to the United States. We had nothing to offer them but agriculture and the village blacksmith and kindred trades. If the young men had any enterprise, any mechanical talent, any disposition for manufactures, they went to the United States with those faculties and generally pro-

pered. Now our infant industries have been fostered and have grown to be an important factor in our national life. The manufacture of cotton goods has been a little overdone, but that is the only exception. England does not like it; they tell us there that we are very poor political economists. We admit it, but we say in answer that it suits us. We are only four and a half millions of people, but we are prosperous."

Well, Sir, the hon. Postmaster General also made some remarks. I read from the *London Advertiser* of 13th December, 1881. It says:

"Mr. Carling informed his audience at the city hall, on Tuesday night, that he knew no period in the history of this country when it was more prosperous than at the present moment. Many of his Tory listeners were astonished. This declaration from the Postmaster-General fairly took their breath. One man informed us that he had had two days' work in seven weeks. Several of Mr. Carling's listeners have been for days looking for employment, but without success."

The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) also says this country is prosperous, and to prove that statement he tells us there are 60,000 families in London, England, who live in one room each; that there are 40 per cent. of the children in certain school districts in London that go to school in the forenoon without their breakfast; that there are 28 per cent. of the children in certain districts that go to school in the afternoon without their dinners, and that there are 10 per cent. of the children in certain school districts that have no fathers at all. Now, Sir, I do not see what this has to do with the prosperity of this country, and I think if the hon. gentleman cannot make better comparisons than that to prove that the country is prosperous, he had better keep his seat in future, and allow others to discuss the question. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) says there is a temporary depression, but he takes comfort. He says there are symptoms of improvement and prosperity, and he quotes as authority King and Ward lumberman of Montreal to prove that prosperity. I can tell the hon. gentleman that I am a lumberman; I have been in that business since 1861; and at no time, during the last twelve years at least, the lumbermen have not paid as low wages to the workmen as they have during the last fall and winter. I do not think we need go outside of the city of Ottawa to prove that fact. I noticed in the papers last fall that the lumbermen of Ottawa were hiring their men at from \$10 to \$12 a month, and there were hundreds of applicants even at those figures who could get no employment. That shows, I think, that the statements made by Mr. Ward, of Montreal, will not apply to this part of the country. Now, Sir, let us see what is the case in other parts of the country; let us see what is the condition of affairs down by the sea. We have heard from a number of gentlemen on both sides of the House, some telling us that there is prosperity in the Maritime Provinces, and some telling us that there is not. I have here a paper, said to have been written by a Liberal Conservative to the Moncton, N.B., *Transcript*, in September last, in which he says:

"We admit our taxes are doubled, acknowledge some public works, such as the portions of the Intercolonial Railway to connect the line we had before with Quebec and Canada, a grain elevator at Halifax that has nothing to do, some branch lines of railway which reflect but little credit on the promoters, and of questionable value at the best, our trade gone, inundated with goods from Canada sent to us at a slaughter market, mercantile depression at Halifax and St. John existing, which it may almost be said has existed for many years, going from bad to worse, no immigration coming in, no sensible increase in the population, our young men of all classes leaving the country, not from choice but necessity; no markets for our farmers, and to sum up, the Maritime Provinces paralysed for want of a fostering care which should be directed to build up our trade and commerce, and place the country in a sound financial position. It has become a one man power—a Tupper for Nova Scotia resident at Ottawa or London; a Tilley for New Brunswick."

Now, Sir, this comes from the Maritime Provinces; this comes from down by the sea.

Mr. IVES. It smells salt.

Mr. JACKSON. Now, I have another statement which should be authoritative on the subject. His Excellency

the Governor General is reported to have said in reply to an address presented to him in St. John, N.B.:

"I wish it had been my good fortune to have come here at a moment when, standing in the midst of a commercial community, I might have offered you my congratulations upon the state of trade in the Province of New Brunswick. It is, however, useless to conceal from ourselves the fact that business has lately been in a far from satisfactory state, and that notably in the case of the timber trade, which occupies so important a place in your commercial system, there has been a very serious contraction of business. These are facts which we have to look in the face, and no optimism is more senseless than that which shuts its eyes to them."

Now, here we have a plain contradiction between the First Minister and His Excellency the Governor General. One states in New York that the country is prosperous; the other states in St. John, New Brunswick, that there is a great depression. This is certainly a curious coincidence. There must be something wrong; as the proverb says, a kingdom fighting against itself cannot stand; therefore, according to that proverb, there must be a downfall pretty soon. Now, Sir, I claim that no man ever took charge of the affairs of any nation under such favorable circumstances as did the Conservative party in 1878. The star of prosperity was then to be seen in the horizon. A change for the better had already taken place in the United States. Factories which had been lying idle since 1873, were re-opened; iron factories which had been lying idle for three years at least, were beginning to open up again; furnaces were being relighted; the lumber trade which had been comparatively dead since 1873, felt the stimulus; prices were advancing; and the country in general was becoming prosperous. The years 1879, 1880, 1881 and 1882, were four of the most prosperous years that the United States ever experienced. These are facts which I know myself, for I was doing business in that country during that whole term of years. Well, Sir, Canada lying contiguous to the United States, and depending on the United States markets for the disposal of a large amount of its exports, necessarily felt the benefit of that revival in the United States; and that circumstance, together with the good crops and high prices that prevailed in this country—not brought about by the National Policy, but the result of bad harvests in Europe, England being the place where the market for wheat was established—produced in Canada during three or four years, from 1879 to 1882, a greater prosperity than almost the most sanguine could have expected. Now, I claim that this Government had it in their power to build up the industries of this country as no other Government ever had. Had they, when giving the contract to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, inserted a clause in that contract, compelling the company to purchase in this country their entire rolling stock, and a portion of their steel rails, which might have been manufactured here had the duty been taken off coal, instead of the country suffering depression as it is to-day, it would have been one of the most prosperous countries in the world. But what are the facts? Nearly the whole of the rolling stock for the Canadian Pacific Railway has been bought in the United States, and the steel rails have been bought in England or the United States; and I have been told, although I am not positive, that a portion of that material has been brought in free of duty. I intend to ask the question whether that is true or not.

Mr. BOWELL. What articles?

Mr. JACKSON. Rolling stock.

Mr. BOWELL. It is not correct.

Mr. JACKSON. Thank you. Well, Sir, what effect has the purchasing of that material in the United States had on this country. The industries of this country might have been built up enormously by its manufacture here.

Look at the city of Kingston, where the locomotive works, with a capital of \$300,000 and employing 400 or 500 men, are lying idle for want of something to do, and where the car works, employing 300 or 400 men, are also lying idle with nothing to do. Look at London, where the Ontario Car Works are bankrupt with nothing to do. We also had a car works factory established in the county of Norfolk from which I come. In 1881 the proprietor told me that although he had not direct information that he would be supplied with the Government contract, still he had encouragement to that effect and he put almost his last dollar into building a factory in Port Dover which only ran a short time when it had to close up. This is the way the manufacturing industries have been built up in this country; instead of the money being spent here, it is spent in the United States. Is this building up Canada for the Canadians? I hold that it is taking the money of Canadians to build up American industries. At this point I will refer to some statements made by the commissioner, Mr. Blackeby, in which he refers to the manufacturing industries of Ontario. Referring to Kingston, he says: The manager of those works was, unfortunately, away from home during the time the Kingston works were being visited, and for that reason no reliable data was obtained with reference to the work. Subject to correction, however, it may be stated that even during the present dull year as much wages would be paid out and as much value produced as in 1878, because up till the end of March 400 hands were engaged in this establishment. The car works here were also closed down, but as this industry was not in existence in 1878, it makes no difference in the report. He refers also to Simcoe and to other points. He says the Simcoe Woollen Company was started in 1883 and that the Joseph Brook woollen goods manufactory was established in 1867. Well, I have looked over this report and cannot find any statements in which he refers to the Brook establishment any further than to say that it was erected in 1867. Let me state in regard to this factory, that Mr. Brooks, who erected this woollen factory in 1867, continued to do business up to 1881, and was doing a remunerative business; he was prospering so much that in 1882 he became infatuated with the National Policy. Formerly he was a Reformer, but in 1882 he voted with the Conservative party and opposed me in my election. He took up the National Policy so earnestly that he advocated the building of another factory in the town of Simcoe, and through his influence another factory was erected with a capital of \$30,000, and a loan from the town of \$20,000, making \$50,000. The factory has been running now nearly two years but has not yet paid any dividend. It was intended at first to manufacture fine yarn, and the most improved machinery was got from England for that purpose, but they had to discontinue to manufacture fine yarn and have gone into the grosser qualities, shoddy work, for the fine yarn market was overstocked. I have some stock in that company myself which I offered for sale last year, but was only offered 75 per cent. which I would not accept. I find no statement in this report in regard to the canning factories in Norfolk. Norfolk had five canning factories, three of which are still in existence, two having closed their doors. The other three are still running moderately; canned goods are so reduced in price, being 30 to 60 per cent. less to-day than they were a year ago, that although the three factories are still running in Norfolk they are not making any money. The hon. member for Brookville (Mr. Wood) referred to the county of Norfolk last night. I was born in the county, I have always lived there, and have made my home there, and I have the honor to-day of representing a portion of that county in this House, an honor of which I feel very proud. The county of Norfolk, as a whole, is, I consider, as good a county as can be found. We have some

Mr. JACKSON.

poor lands there, and we have some very excellent land there, but, taking it as a whole, I think it would compare very favorably with any county in western Ontario. Now, Sir, as I represent a rural district, a farming community, I want to see how the farmers are affected by the National Policy. I find that the total exports from this country during the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1884, amounted to \$91,406,496; I find that our exports of animals and their products amounted to \$24,152,184, and of agricultural products \$18,156,060, a total of \$42,308,284. Thus, 46 per cent. of the entire exports of this country are produced by the farmers. The products of the forest amounted to \$27,203,083, or 29 per cent.; fisheries, \$8,609,314, or 9½ per cent.; and manufactured articles, \$4,177,146, or 4½ per cent. Now, here is the point. The manufactured articles is the industry which this National Policy was intended to build up. As hon. gentlemen opposite have drawn comparisons between 1878 and 1884, they will allow me the same privilege. I find that the manufactured articles exported from this country in 1878 amounted to \$1,681,756, and in 1882, \$4,264,454, or a reduction in three years during which the National Policy was in force of \$417,302; and I find in 1884, after 5 years' experience of the National Policy, that there was \$504,610 worth of manufactured articles less exported than there was in 1878. Now, here is a business that the National Policy was intended to foster and build up, and we find from this report that more than half a million dollars less was exported of these articles in 1884 than in 1878, which shows conclusively to my mind that the National Policy was a fraud and has proved a failure. The other exports of this country were: Products of the mine, \$3,442,492; miscellaneous, \$687,880; coin and bullion, \$281,292. The exports in 1881-82 were \$102,137,203; in 1882-83, \$98,085,804; and in 1883-84, \$91,406,496, or \$10,730,707 less than in 1881-82, or nearly 10 per cent. less exports from 1882 to 1884. The only way that you can figure the prosperity or depression of a country is by the exports and imports, and the exports give the wealth of the country in my opinion. Individuals may become rich by trading with each other, but a nation's prosperity depends upon the development of its resources whereby it exports to foreign countries and sells in foreign markets, thereby getting their wealth and returning it to the country. The figures I have given show conclusively, I claim, that this country is in a depressed state. In 1883-84 we had imports \$24,980,517 in excess, and, unless the Government can show where this discrepancy of nearly \$25,000,000 is to be made up, I claim they are going behind. I want to show how protection affects the farmer. During the last fiscal year, the farmers of this country exported to the United States \$6,367,702 of animals and their products, and of agricultural products, \$7,508,111, making a total of \$13,875,813. The American tariff of 20 per cent., which is a loss to the farmers of this country, because they sell in the American market, deducts from the farmers' pockets \$3,775,162. They buy within 10 per cent. as much as they sell, as a rule, and 80 per cent. of what they purchase is foreign, which would be about \$10,000,000 worth of foreign goods which they buy. On that \$10,000,000, the duty amounts, on an average, to 35 per cent., which would be \$3,500,000, which makes a total of \$6,275,162 taken out of the pockets of the farmers during the last fiscal year on account of protection, of which \$2,775,162 was paid into the American treasury, and \$3,500,000 into the Dominion treasury. You may say that what they pay into the American treasury does not affect the farmers of this country. I have been doing business between the United States and Canada for the last twenty-five years, and I know that, on every animal that is taken from Canada and sold in the American market, the producer loses 20 per cent. on the cost. If a horse is valued at \$100, the farmer loses \$20 on it, because the duty had to be paid before he sold in the other market,

and the same with cattle and sheep and anything that is produced by the farmer and exported to the United States. Here is an item which to some will seem of very little importance, the item of eggs. That has grown to be an enormous trade in this country. In 1882-83 there were \$2,256,856 worth of eggs exported from this country. This last fiscal year the amount was only \$1,960,197, or a falling off of about 2,000,000 dozen of eggs during the last fiscal year. The farmers on that article alone lost during the last year about \$344,000 on duty. The hon. member for King's, Nova Scotia (Mr. Woodworth) stated the other night that the producer paid the duties on potatoes going into the Boston market. I quite agree with him that the producer pays the duty on potatoes and on everything sold in the American market. Where the market is established, when there is a duty between where it is produced and that market, he pays the duty on it. At the same moment he turned round and said that the producer paid the duty on coal in the same way. The hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood) last night made nearly the same statement. The market for coal is established in the United States, and all expenses attached to that, after the market is established, are paid by the consumers in regard to coal. The Government received this last year \$1,316,381.90 in duty on coal. Who paid that to the Government? Was it the producer or the consumer? I claim it is plain enough to be seen that it is the consumer who pays that duty on coal—there is no question about it. This is what the farmers have got to suffer. They have lost during the last year over \$6,250,000 by protection. It is time they began to get their eyes open in this matter. I have an article here taken from the Jackson, Michigan, *Patriot*, which describes the views of the people in this country better than I can myself.

"Looking at the facts, setting all theories aside, we cannot discover wherein our farmers are benefited an iota in the price of their exportable commodities by protective taxation. The tariff has nothing whatever to do in fixing the price of articles of export. And of our total exports from 80 to 90 per cent. are the non-protected products of the soil.

"But, on the other hand, it is apparent that the net earnings of our farmers are very much reduced by the protective taxes they are compelled to pay on nearly everything they purchase for use and consumption.

"They sell their surplus in foreign markets where our tariff laws are inoperative in the matter of prices, and they buy what they require in the way of farm implements and household articles in the home market where the tariff is operative and is intended to keep prices far higher than they would be if there was no tariff.

"The price of their surplus wheat, provisions and cotton is determined every hour in Liverpool in competition with the producers of the world, while the price of much that they buy is determined by the cost in foreign markets, plus the percentage of protected taxation levied by our tariff laws.

"The claim that our farmers are enriched by protective taxation is the shammiest fraud in the whole category of frauds used to bolster up the fallacies and sophisms of protection.

"But, say the protectionists, build up home manufactures by the help of tariff taxes so as to have a home market for all the products of the soil. That is impossible. The farmers are producing 600 millions a year more products than the home market, after a hundred years of protection, can furnish a market for.

"In all leading industries our present capacity for producing manufactured goods exceeds our capacity for consumption. There is but one cry in all protected industries at present, and that is 'over-production.' The iron furnaces and mills, and woollen mills, the cotton mills, and the boot and shoe factories, the agricultural implement factories, the furniture factories, and other great industries are suffering for the lack of a market for their products.

"The trouble is not because we have too little, but because we have too much, and under the trade-restricting tariff system cannot sell to people of other countries, because we will not buy of them on equal terms such things as they have to dispose of.

"Trade is reciprocal, and protectionism is the enemy of reciprocal trade. People who desire to sell must be willing to buy, or else trade is impossible.

"Then, under our tariff system of placing taxes upon raw materials needed by our manufacturers, the cost of manufacturing is so increased that they cannot sell their products in competition with manufacturers who are not thus handicapped. The manufacturers of England, France and Germany are not burdened with tariff taxes levied by their respective Governments upon the raw materials they use.

"Placed at this great disadvantage our manufacturers cannot compete with them in the markets of the world. For this reason our leading

industries cannot increase much beyond merely supplying the demands of the home market.

"The only way to increase the home market for farm products is to strike down the tariff restrictions, which are an embargo upon trade, remove the burdensome tariff taxes from all raw materials, permit fair and free competition, and let the best men and nations win.

"Our unprotected farmers successfully compete with the cheapest labor in the markets of the world; and our manufacturers, we firmly believe, could do with equal success if the burdens of tariff taxation were removed and the restrictions imposed upon trade by our tariff laws were abolished."

Now, Sir, that is from a farmer's standpoint in the State of Michigan, and it touches our case in this country precisely. But, at the same time, the farmers in this country must understand that it will be impossible to reduce the taxes raised from duties down to what they were before, because the expenses of the Government are so great that the taxes will have to remain high for a long period of years. Although the effects are pointed out here, they are hard to be remedied; no matter what Government may be in power they cannot be remedied for a long time to come. Now, I want to say a word in regard to the bounties on pig iron. I claim that the Government have no right to take the people's money to bolster up any individual industry at the expense of the masses of the people. Any municipality, any corporation, has a perfect right to grant bonuses where they expect to receive some return in the way of advanced value to property, as in the case of a railway, or anything of that kind, where they expect to receive either direct or indirect advantage from it. But, when the Government takes money from the pockets of the people to bolster up any manufacturing industry, and which money has to be paid by the mass of people, I say it is decidedly wrong. Now, what are the facts? After all the assistance given by the Government the product of the pig iron industry has only amounted to 28,000 tons last year. A bounty of \$42,000 was given to the pig iron industry, and I claim it is a robbery of the people. Farmers, as a rule, have to pay for these things, and I claim it is entirely wrong. Now, Sir, I want to pay attention to the immigration policy. I find from the Auditor General's report for the year ended 30th June, 1884, that the total expenses for immigration purposes were \$511,208.83, and for quarantine \$64,117.89, making a total of \$575,326.72 paid for immigration and quarantine. I also find that \$142,138.82 were paid out for printing, advertising, &c. The first on the list in this line comes the Burland Lithographic Company, \$25,917.30; the next comes the Montreal *Gazette*, \$9,211.15; the London *Free Press*, \$6,075.60; the Toronto *Mail*, \$9,803.92. Now I might here mention that the Toronto *Mail* have denied that this amount of money was received by them for printing or publishing in any way; they claim that it was the *Mail* Printing Company that received the money. Well, this printing company and jobbing company, I understand, belongs to the Hamilton *Spectator*, and if it is taken from the Toronto *Mail* it must be given to the Hamilton *Spectator*. We find also the Hamilton *Spectator* credited for \$6,593.26; the Montreal *Minerve*, \$213; the Montreal *Herald*, \$2,767.20; the Montreal *Industrial World*, \$2,500; L. J. Demers et freres, \$2,322.42; J. J. Foote, Quebec, \$3,780.46; H. W. Bennett, Prescott, \$6,141.95; G. H. Taylor, Ottawa, \$1,600. I find MacLean, Roger & Co., of the city of Ottawa, Government Printers, received the enormous sum of \$34. There are numerous other smaller items that I will not mention, varying from \$3 to \$1,000. Now I find there is a charge for photographs. I am sorry the hon. First Minister is not in his seat, because I wanted to ask whether this was a photograph taken of himself and his colleagues in the Cabinet to be sent into foreign countries as an advertisement to induce immigrants to come to this country by their good looks, or whether it was a photograph of himself taken in his new G. C. B. costume given by the Queen, to be sent into foreign countries for the same purpose. We find there were expended for paper for pamphlets, \$27,660.79. I will

not go into all the details of that list, but I find the sum for printing, advertisements, &c., and paper for pamphlets amounts to \$109,327.85. Next we find that \$34,697 was paid for travelling expenses, incidental expenses, and so forth. Heading the list is John Dyke, agent at Liverpool, who received 13 months' salary, \$2,150.18; travelling expenses, \$9,331.94; or \$27.52 per day for the whole period of 13 months, excluding Sundays. Next comes Thomas Grahame, agent at Glasgow, 13 months' salary, \$1,299.87; travelling expenses, \$3,334.27; or \$10 per day, excluding Sundays. Chas. Foy, Belfast, 13 months salary, \$1,083.44, travelling expenses, \$2,861.20; or \$8.44 per day. Thomas Connolly, Dublin, 13 months' salary, \$1,083.44; travelling expenses, \$2,291.19 or \$6.75 per day. J. W. Down, Bristol, 15 months' salary \$608.33; travelling expenses, \$2,048.74, or \$6.04 per day. We find a number of lesser lights receiving smaller amounts, which I will not mention. I make these statements merely to show the people of the country how the public money is being squandered, and in order to give them some little insight into these matters. I find also in this connection that Sir Charles Tupper is credited with receiving \$791 for travelling expenses in connection with the immigration policy. I also find a further sum of \$718.40 was received by Mr. John Dyke for expenses at exhibitions, which makes a total of \$12,242 paid to this one man. The sum of \$101,178.14 was paid to the steamship companies for assisted passages. All the rest of this vast sum of money has been squandered and given to agents and others to assist in this great work. I claim that this is a gigantic swindle from beginning to end. Only \$100,000, in round figures, out of the enormous sum voted was paid for assisting emigrants to this country, the rest being swallowed up by hungry wolves knocking at the door of the Government. This is an outrage on the people of this country; this is something which should not be tolerated and which will not be tolerated by the people, in my opinion. I want to show how the people are talking and acting with respect to it. The hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) claimed credit to the Government for having changed their policy on this point. It is true they have made some changes in their policy in regard to restricting certain classes coming to this country; but they deserve no credit for that change of policy because the trade and labor councils throughout the country compelled them to do so. The bold stand they took compelled the Government to yield, and therefore the Government deserve no credit. I desire to read an extract in answer to the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Wood), who stated that laboring men had no grievances. I want to show that hon. gentleman what the grievances of workmen are. Here are resolutions passed by the wage workers of the City of Hamilton, wherein they state:

"Whereas, the system of importing pauper and Chinese labor to this country by the Government of the Dominion of Canada does not in any way protect the industries of our country or increase the wealth of the producers, but the importation of pauper and coolie labor in an already glutted labor market brings and increases poverty and its attending evils. The enforcement of labor contracts made in foreign countries detrimental to the interests of wage-earners of Canada will result in a degrading competition that will break the noble spirit of labor and render our slavery unbearable. We denounce the actions of the Government as criminal in protecting the manufacturers and strangling competition by the many unfair advantages derived from such protection, while the producers are taxed in order to increase their number and cheapen the cost of production.

"Therefore, be it resolved, That the workmen of Hamilton condemn the policy of the Government in allowing the importation to our shores of pauper immigrants, and call upon them to take measures to return such foreign paupers as are now in our land and to legislate against the arrival of others.

"That we demand the recall of the emigrant agents and lecturers employed by the Government and the application of the money appropriated for their remuneration to some public work upon which some unemployed Canadians can earn their bread. That we especially protest against the introduction of Chinese labor in any part of the Dominion, and call upon the Government to send back all Chinese now in Canada, or enforce such a poll tax as will drive them hence.

Mr. JACKSON.

"That we demand the repeal of all laws that do not bear equally upon capital and labor, and the substitution thereof of such laws that will protect the laborer's rights from the encroachments of selfish capitalists.

"That the workmen of Hamilton refrain from giving support to either of the political parties in the future, until such time as they secure by legislation, not promises, their rights."

The hon. member for Brockville said that wage-workers had no grievances. I think that document destroys his theory entirely. Let us see what other action has been taken. The City Council of Toronto on the 16th instant passed a resolution to petition the Governor General in Council, the House of Commons and Local Legislature, praying that pauper immigration to Canada may cease, and that both Governments abandon the paying of immigrants' railroad fares from any of the ports of entry to the Province of Ontario. Such has been the course taken by Ontario, and it shows plainly that the people of Ontario, and those of the cities especially, are determined not to be overrun in future by pauper immigrants if they can possibly prevent it. I claim that the exodus is brought about almost entirely by this immigration question. I claim that the young men of our country are being crowded out by foreigners who are brought in and take the places which should be filled by our native young men, and as they cannot obtain remunerative wages for their services they are compelled to go to the United States. And this immigration difficulty is the very reason, to a great extent, that forces them out of this country. Hon. gentlemen say that there were more of our countrymen leaving in former years than there have been of late, but statistics prove the contrary. They prove that there have been almost three times as many who have left during the last four years as there were in the four previous years. This shows conclusively, to my mind, that this immigration policy is the real reason for forcing these young men out of the country. I can say, of my own knowledge, that five of my own relatives left my neighborhood within a few years, four of them for Dakota and one for Michigan—all of them able young men. Now, this is very serious, and, unless these immigrants are stopped from coming into the country, it is going to have a ruinous effect. We have the climate, the soil, the territory, to build up a great nation. What we want now is a Government policy which will induce foreigners to come to this country with their families and locate on those vast territories which we have in the west, and make homes for themselves, and we want a policy which will keep them here when they come. We do not want a policy which will drive them out; but, with a good policy and good laws, all the immigration expenses necessary is to devise means to advertise in the newspapers of foreign countries, showing that we have a country here fit for people to come to and make homes for themselves, and that being done, I claim that this country will be prosperous.

Mr. VAIL. Mr. Speaker, I can hardly hope, after so many able speeches have been made on the motion of the Finance Minister, to say much that will be interesting to the House, but as the debate is drawing to a close I feel it incumbent on me before the vote is taken to refer briefly to a few statements which have been made by some of the gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) said that the speech of the Finance Minister was a remarkable speech. I agree with him; and I venture to say that considering the depressed state of almost every industry in the Dominion of Canada at the present time it would be difficult to find another man in this House who could have made such a speech. For my part I only know one at the present time, and he is not now in Parliament. When that gentleman was obliged to draw on his imagination for his facts, he was always very demonstrative in manner, and very emphatic in his statements, and I am inclined to think that the Finance Minister has

taken a leaf out of his book in the present instance, and has copied from his *role*. For my own part I was somewhat dissatisfied in the speech of the Finance Minister. I did hope, Sir, that with the evidence of the depression on the right hand and on the left, with the fact staring us in the face that the manufacturing industries of the country were in a depressed condition, and the further fact that almost every branch of business in the Dominion of Canada was in the same state—I did hope that the hon. the Finance Minister would have made a clean breast of it, and would have come to this House the present Session and stated boldly and squarely that the National Policy was a failure, acknowledge that he was incapable of lifting the country out of the confusion and depression which his unwise policy had brought it to, state frankly that he was convinced it was impossible to make the country prosperous and the people rich by Act of Parliament, and that, therefore, he had determined to retrace his steps. Had he done so, Mr. Speaker—I speak for myself, and I think I can speak for a good many on this side of the House—we would have had some sympathy for him; we would have said, As you have acknowledged you were wrong, as you have made up your mind in future to pursue the course we have been advocating for the last five years, we will assist you to the fullest extent and help you out of your difficulties. The Finance Minister, I am sorry to say, did not think proper to take that course. He has rather chosen to say to the people of this country, I know the business of the country is in a depressed state; I know I have taxed you beyond what you can well bear; I know I have taken \$20,000,000 more out of your pockets than I required for the necessary expenditure of the country; I know all this and I know there is only one way out of this difficulty at the present time, and that is to make a change in the trade policy of the country, and go back as near as possible to a revenue tariff. Well, Sir, the Finance Minister after having in effect told the people that notwithstanding they have these hardships to bear; notwithstanding he had taken this \$20,000,000 from the pockets of the people—he says to them in effect: Well, you ought not to complain, because you are not so badly off as the people of some other countries. And then my hon. friend starts on a false basis to show that the taxation of the Dominion is not quite equal to the taxation *per capita* of the United States and of the Australian colonies. Well, Sir, if that were true, is it any great consolation to the people down by the sea, who have paid their proportion of this \$20,000,000, which has been expended in bridging canyons and tunnelling mountains on the Pacific slope—is it any satisfaction for them to know that they are no worse off than the people of some other countries. I say it is not; and I say the Finance Minister will not get any credit from the poorer classes, whose bread and fuel are taxed to find money to build a railway thousands of miles away from them, and from which they can never get a return of one dollar. Now, Mr. Speaker, what the country complains of at the present time, is the fact that the Government have been false to their pledges, that they have not carried out their promises. They promised, if they succeeded to power, in 1878, to make times good by Act of Parliament; they promised that there should be no depression; they promised that the people would soon be made rich if they would only put on all sail. Well, I ask where are those people now who took the advice of the Finance Minister and put on all sail in order that they might become rich in a short time? Hundreds of them have gone into bankruptcy in the last year, and I am afraid that hundreds more will follow in the next year. But, as I before said, what the country has to complain of at present is that the Government have not fulfilled their pledges. Now, I must, at the risk of repeating what has been said before, briefly refer to the means used in 1878 to defeat the Mackenzie Government, and I think I

am privileged to do so in consequence of the statement made on the other side of the House that the answer to all that has been said by us was the fact that the country in 1878 had pronounced in favor of the National Policy, and had duplicated that verdict again in 1882. Now, Sir, when the elections were about to be held in 1878, we stated that if the party led by Sir John Macdonald came into power the country would have to submit to a protective policy and, consequently, increased taxation. That statement was denied most positively. But it was thought necessary by the friends of the Conservative party to telegraph to Sir John A. Macdonald, in order to ascertain whether he had made such a promise, and, if so, whether he intended to carry it out. I will read his message in reply, as it was printed in the *Morning Herald* of Halifax, in capital letters at the head of the editorial column, and transmitted through the country in every direction. It was as follows:

“What Sir John says: Neither at London nor elsewhere have I gone beyond my motion in Parliament—

Well, very few of the people knew what that motion was—

“and I have never proposed an increase, only a readjustment of the tariff.”

Well, that is very positive.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I suppose it is true.

Mr. VAIL. I say that telegram, coming from Sir John Macdonald, who was the leader of the Conservative party in this country, had a wonderful effect upon the people, because many of them believed it. No answer could have been sent at that time which would have had such an effect upon the elections as that telegram.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. VAIL. The hon. gentleman says “hear, hear.” It may have been something to be proud of to deceive the people, but it was nevertheless a piece of deception of the very worst kind.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hear, hear.

Mr. VAIL. No doubt it was a good political move; at the same time, I think if the hon. gentlemen had to do it over again, he would not send exactly such a reply.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes, I would.

Mr. VAIL. Well, it had its effect on the elections of 1878, and therefore those elections were carried by deceiving the people. Now, another little piece of deception was practised in St. John, New Brunswick, by the Finance Minister. That hon. gentleman told the people of St. John that the Mackenzie Government had been spending too much money, that they were an extravagant Government, that this country could not afford to spend more than \$22,000,000 a year, that had he been Finance Minister during the five years previous, he would not have spent more than \$22,000,000 per annum, that that was all the country required, and any man who would spend more than that, sum was not fit for the office of Finance Minister. Now, let us see what this economical Finance Minister has expended since he came into power. In the very first year after he came in, in 1879, the expenditure was, in round numbers, \$24,650,000; in 1881, it was \$25,000,000; in 1882, \$27,000,000; in 1883, \$28,730,000; in 1884, \$31,107,000; and the expenditure for the present year will be still more. What will the country think of this, after the assurances given the St. John people. Now, there is a certain expenditure which is under the control of the Government themselves, and which they can make large or small, just as they choose, that is the expenditure for the civil service of the country. This expenditure requires to be looked after more closely than perhaps any other. Now, I have a statement of the expenditure on this service from

1874 to 1885, but as I do not wish to weary the House, I will only give the amounts for the last years of each Government as a comparison. In the last year that my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was in power, our expenditure for civil service was \$861,000, whereas the expenditure for 1885-86, according to the estimates of the present year, will be \$1,200,000, an increase of no less than \$339,000 per annum. Now, you would suppose, if there was an expenditure that the Government would feel a disposition to curtail as far as possible, it would be the expenditure on the civil service of the Dominion. I, however, find the number of persons employed in the civil service under the Mackenzie Government, 390, whereas, according to the estimates of 1885-86, the number has now reached the large figure of 679, an addition of over 70 per cent., or 289, since 1878. Now, that is a very large addition, and when the people see these figures, I think they will make up their minds that the Government of the present day is an extravagant Government. Now, to go back to the election of 1882, it will be remembered that the House was dissolved a year before the expiration of the term. The business of the country had been prosperous; a good many people had made money; the policy of the present Government had enabled a great many people who were interested in manufactures previous to 1879 to get a boom, and to unload their stocks upon other people at a large advance in price; and business generally speaking, was good. The Government, I suppose, took for granted that that was the time to go to the country, for they saw the little cloud in the distance that might overspread the whole canopy by-and-by, and they did not know in what condition they might find themselves at the expiration of the Parliamentary term. Well, what did they say to the people at that time? They told the people that in consequence of capitalists being anxious to invest large sums of money in the manufacturing industries of the country, and the fact that they declined to invest till they could be assured that the National Policy for at least another five years would be continued, the Government determined to dissolve the House and go to the people, in order to get an answer to this question so that the country might have the benefit of this promised capital. Well, the times then were good, and this statement coming from such a source and having been referred to in the Governor General's speech, led the people to suppose there would be large investments in manufactures. The people were busy, the elections were suddenly sprung upon them, very few took any interest in the contest, and the consequence was the Government came back with about the same majority they had before. I know that we have had several bye-elections since. I know what influences the Government have brought to bear in some cases upon constituencies in order to have their friends returned; I know they are all-powerful; I know what is said to the people when the bye elections are held. The people are told: The Government is strong, they are backed by a large majority, what is the use of your returning an opponent at the present time? And I suppose this sentiment prevails except in very intelligent constituencies where the people are guided by principle and are not looking for favors from the Government, and act independently. The Government have been fortunate in carrying these bye-elections, and I do not know that that is any very great disadvantage to the Opposition. I think that, as the matter stands at present, the Government had better have control of affairs a little while longer. A large majority in this House seem willing they should have it, and I do not think it would be very desirable for the Opposition to cross the floor at present, and shoulder the difficulties under which the Government are laboring. There is not a day that we do not see marked, in their countenances, the fact that they have almost insurmountable difficulties to overcome. We know they are

Mr. VAIL.

interviewed by gentlemen from Ontario in the liquor interest, they have to meet gentlemen in the milling interest from Ontario and other parts of the Dominion, they have to confront deputations in the temperance interest from different places, they have to meet gentlemen in the corn interest from the Maritime Provinces; they are confronted by gentlemen in the Canadian Pacific Railway interest from Montreal. All these interests have to be faced, day after day, and where the money is to come from, when the Government grant all the requests that these people make, is what they do not know. They have just now more than their hands full, and, as far as I am concerned, I am willing that they shall carry on the business of the Government a little while longer, but it will not be very long. If the members of the Government had always been of the opinion that the protective policy was the right policy for a country like this, I would not feel they were so culpable, but the majority of them have changed their minds on this subject. There was a time when they were very much opposed to a protective policy, and stated plainly that such a policy would be detrimental to the best interests of the country. And I believe they think so to-day, but having put their hand to the plough they dare not look back. Now, I propose for a short time to turn my attention to my hon. friend, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. McLelan). That gentleman, when addressing the House the other night, I thought, might have spared us his reference to speeches previously made, because his statement was contrary to the facts. Gentlemen on this side look cheery and pleasant, and when they make speeches make them in a pleasant manner. I do not think, under the circumstances, that the Minister should have referred to them in the way he did. He said:

"They have assumed a tone of sadness and depression; the hon. gentlemen who sit opposite seem to be acting in a spirit of rivalry as to who shall present the condition of the country in the most sad and doleful colors possible. There seems to be a rivalry among them in the spirit of that which may be supposed to exist amongst undertakers."

And so he goes on. Well, I have heard a great many speeches delivered in this House, and I have heard a great many delivered elsewhere, and I must say, that a more doleful speech, a speech uttered in more dolorous tones, I never heard either in this House or out of it, than that which came from the mouth of the Minister for Marine and Fisheries that day. He looked at the Finance Minister as if he would like to bury him, because the latter had got him into the uncomfortable position of being obliged to make a speech and go back on the views he had so often and so strongly expressed in days gone by. When my mind carries me back to the old anti-confederate debates, I remember that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—well I do not know whether it was he, but there was a Mr. McLelan in the Local House of Nova Scotia, and that Mr. McLelan took a leading part in opposition to Confederation. He made a great many strong statements then, as he always does, when he warms up to his subject. He generally prepares his speeches in such a way that his views are strongly expressed, and his language is very emphatic; but on all those occasions he almost excelled himself. I will read a few extracts from that hon. gentleman's speech, which, I think, will show that he has changed his mind somewhat in regard to what should be the proper trade policy for the Province of Nova Scotia at least. Mr. McLelan at that time objected to Confederation, because, in the first place, the Provinces were so disunited and their interests so different, that it would be impossible to form a Confederation in which the Maritime Provinces would be sufficiently protected; in the next place he objected to Confederation because Ontario being a very weak country and not able to defend itself, the militia of Nova Scotia would be brought up here to defend the people of Canada; he objected again to Confederation because the people of Canada were a very extravagant

people, while the people of the Maritime Provinces were an economical people, and that, therefore, the latter would be placed in a very awkward position, and become corrupt when brought into contact with the extravagant people of the upper Province; further, he objected to Confederation, because Nova Scotia's interests would be sacrificed and her position in this House would be that of begging for what was her just due without being able to demand it. This Mr. McLelan—of course I will not say, for the moment, that it was my hon. friend opposite—said:

"The fact that the interests of the Provinces are so diversified that each has its own interests; and its centre of interests within itself precludes the possibility of a federal union being formed to work harmoniously."

If I understood the Minister of Marine and Fisheries the other night, he said, I think, that everything now was working harmoniously; Then he says again:

"Under Confederation we shall be placed under the same tariff, and the delegates had not looked to the effect of this increase of tariff. It must be evident to all that whilst we import \$16.26"—

I want the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Customs to take a note of this—

"per head of dutiable goods, while Canada only imports \$9.33 per head, we shall pay into the general revenue nearly double the amount paid by the population of Canada. We are larger importers, not only because of our pursuits, but because we have the means of paying for more goods."

You see he thought Nova Scotia was a very rich Province, while Canada was a very poor one. Then again—he grows a little more eloquent here—he says:

"I cannot conceive a more degraded or humiliating position than the representatives of a spirited people compelled to forego their political opinions—their conscientious convictions on all public questions—in order to obtain for their people a consideration in the distribution of the funds. But even supposing our nineteen representatives could so far forget themselves as to turn political hucksters and offer to sell themselves, body and soul, they will never obtain more than a few pickings from the public chest, which we shall do more than our share in filling. Under any circumstances, however humiliating, we shall be powerless to enforce a just consideration of our interests."

Has Mr. McLelan changed his mind, I wonder, before this? I am not, of course, alluding to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Then, again, he goes on very pointedly, and puts down 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and so on:

"1st. We surrender the entire control of the constitution of this country.

"2nd. We endanger the harmony existing among us as fellow colonists by bringing our diverse interests into conflict.

"3rd. We reduce our local expenditure for roads and bridges to a large amount, or supply that deficiency by direct taxation.

"4th. We subject ourselves to the annoyance and tax of the Stamp Act.

"5th. We surrender to Canada the power to tax us to any extent their extravagance may render necessary, and which I have shown you in the outset, \$782,560 (per annum, I suppose)."

A little further on he says:

"Confederation instead of extending the commerce of the country will rather cripple trade. I have already shown that Confederation must necessarily impose on us a very heavy tariff and exceedingly large burthens. The consequence of this will be to increase the cost of living and producing the articles of export. And when you increase the cost of living"—

Listen to this. This is very important just now—

"and of wages, you are unable to compete with other countries in the sale of your coal and fish and other articles of which Nova Scotia is especially calculated to produce."

Well, that is pretty strong language, and it was very pointed at that time. I shall only refer to one other paragraph, because it is not worth while to take up the time, though I have the volume here and might read on for half an hour. He says:

"The House has now before it its death warrant, and while we may not hope to see it die like a Christian, it should at least imitate the Indian savage who sings his death song with calmness and dignity, in the belief that he is about to enter the happy hunting grounds, and in like manner did I expect to see the advocates of this proposition sing the death song, inasmuch as it will give them the entrance to Canada, the 'happy hunting ground,' for office-seekers."

Does my hon. friend recognise this Mr. McLelan of 1865? in the person of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Well, that Mr. McLelan did find the happy hunting ground of office. No sooner was Confederation carried than he joined Mr. Howe in a delegation to Ottawa for better terms. That resulted in getting an advance annually for the Province of Nova Scotia, and gave my hon. friend the Minister of Marine a seat in the Senate and a commissionership on the Intercolonial Railway board. My hon. friend filled the position until after my friend the member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) came in, when the Board of Commissioners was done away with. My friend remained out of office for a certain time, but he was uneasy, and the time very soon came, in 1878, when he was enabled to do his part in inducing the people of Nova Scotia to accept a policy which he had told them, in the strongest language, and over and over again, would be ruinous to the best interests of the Province he is the sole representative of in the Cabinet. He has been in the Cabinet some time, and I have never heard him venture to make a speech touching upon this question until his speech the other day. I am sorry he has had to go back upon his former record. I am sorry he was not in a position at all events, if he had gone back on his record, to tell the House that he was mistaken in his views, that he was the representative of a Province which, although he had said it would be under great disadvantages in the Confederation, was now in a good position, that he had been mistaken in regard to the trade policy which was required for that Province, but had changed his mind, and now had good reasons to believe that the protective policy was an advantageous policy for the Province he represents. I hoped he would be in a position to go from one end of that Province to the other, and point out where this National Policy has been of advantage to the country. But he did not do it. He scarcely referred to Nova Scotia. You would hardly have supposed he ever saw Nova Scotia, that he had any interest in Nova Scotia, much less that he was the sole representative in the Cabinet of the Province of Nova Scotia. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries—I am sure he will allow me to call him that, may retort on me to some extent and say: You were an anti-confederate too. Well, there is some truth in that, but my position in regard to Confederation was exactly this—I am not ashamed that all the world should know it. When Confederation was first spoken of, and the delegates met to arrange it, I said that, I could not see any advantage in it from a Provincial standpoint, but if it was the wish of the British Government and would strengthen the British Empire, and if I could be shown a scheme under which all the Provinces could be protected, I thought we were in duty bound to accept it, but I must first know whether the smaller Provinces would be properly protected in the Confederation and would have sufficient funds to carry out their local expenditures. When the Quebec scheme was framed, as every man knows in this House, who studied the subject at all, the smaller Provinces were entirely sacrificed, they were placed entirely at the mercy of the Upper Provinces, and while their taxation would be largely increased they would not have more than half enough money to carry on their local works. When I saw that, I objected to Confederation, and I continued my objection until we got the better terms after we were confederated; and then I said, in my place in the House of Assembly: We have got better terms, we have got all we can for the present though we may get more by-and-bye, and I think we are bound to accept the better terms as an instalment and give Confederation a trial. Would anyone say that I took an improper course? Have not subsequent events shown that I was right in the course I took? I am glad to say that the Provinces were getting along very well up to 1879. There was no real cause of complaint. The tariff

we then had was a pretty fair tariff, though it was very easy at that time to show that the people of Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces, were all paying more *per capita* than the people of the other Provinces. At the same time, we had no great reason to complain. There was a desire on the part of the people of Nova Scotia to make the best of Confederation; there was a desire on the part of the people of New Brunswick to make the best of it; and I believe Prince Edward Island intended to make the best of it when she came in; but, Mr Speaker, the National Policy made a very great change in the feeling of the people towards Confederation, and I am sorry for it. I am as much interested in the Dominion and desire its prosperity as strongly as any hon. gentleman in this House, or any man in this country, and my wish is to see this country prosper from one end to the other. I desire to see all the Provinces in a prosperous condition, consequently I feel in duty bound to tell the Government that their present trade policy is day by day drawing the very life blood from the Maritime Provinces. I do not want to array one Province against another, but I do not want the people of Nova Scotia to suppose that they are being ruined by Confederation; but I do want them to understand that the cause of their unsatisfactory condition at the present time is bad Government and the National Policy; it is because of a protective policy which is not suited to our Province, and which the Minister of Marine educated the people of Nova Scotia up to believe would be ruinous to us.

Mr. McLELAN. Not a protective policy, but a National Policy.

Mr. VAIL. Well, is not this National Policy a protective policy? That is just where the trouble is. If it was a proper National Policy instead of a protective policy the people would not be so opposed to it, but the trouble is, it is a highly protective policy; and the people have never been accustomed to such excessive taxation. The trade returns show that this policy takes more money out of the people of the lower Provinces, according to their population, than it does out of the people of the other Provinces, and thus it works unfairly and unjustly to them. Mr. Speaker, I have extracted from the trade returns some figures showing the amount of duty that we have paid in Nova Scotia since the National Policy came into full operation. We paid in 1880, \$1,298,573, which was about the amount that we paid previous to that time. Now in the first year after that the difference between what was collected in 1880 and in 1881 was \$200,658; in 1882 it was \$459,000; in 1883, \$535,000; in 1884, \$608,600, making in the four years an increase under the National Policy of \$1,803,570. Now, Mr. Speaker, had we imported a larger amount of goods we would have no reason to complain, because we must, as a matter of course, pay a larger amount upon a larger importation. But that is not the case. The value of the dutiable goods we imported in 1884 was only \$6,468,000, and on that sum we paid over \$1,900,000 whereas, in 1879, we only paid \$1,183,000 on \$6,829,000 of dutiable goods imported. I may now, perhaps, refer to the bread tax. This is a heavy tax on the Maritime Provinces, and bears very hardly upon the poorer classes of the people, who pay the largest portion of this tax. The amount collected on corn meal is very large, and we know that that is consumed mostly by the poorer classes, and by the lumbermen and fishermen. Now, the Finance Minister has collected from the poorer classes of the people in Nova Scotia, since the National Policy was introduced, up to the 1st of December, 1884, \$232,000 on breadstuffs alone. That is a very heavy tax, and I did hope, Mr. Speaker, that after the Finance Minister acknowledged that he has taken \$20,000,000 more out of the pockets of the people in the last four or five years than he

Mr. VAIL.

required for the ordinary expenses of the country, that he would to have taken this duty off flour and meal—I may say, off the staff of life—which is such a heavy burthen on the people in the Maritime Provinces. I hope the hon. gentleman will yet see his way clear to do so. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have referred to the protective policy, and I have shown pretty clearly, I think, that it bears hardly upon the Maritime Provinces. I have looked at this report of the commissioner sent down to examine into the industries of Nova Scotia, but I have not been able to extract much information from it. It appears that the commissioner went to Halifax and after that visited only two or three of the central counties, so of course he could not make a very extensive or reliable report. But taking it on the whole, it is not, I suppose, as far as it goes, what I may call a very unfair report. The greatest unfairness about it, I think, is the rather important omission, that he has entirely neglected to tell us how many industries have been closed up since the National Policy was introduced. Now, Mr. Speaker, I pretend to know something about the Province of Nova Scotia, and I have taken some little pains to get information in regard to the position of that Province from one end to the other. I think I know more about it than the commissioner that was sent there, and I can tell the House pretty clearly what changes have been made, how many manufactories have been established and how many have been closed. In Yarmouth, since the protective policy was introduced, they have established a woollen mill, a duck factory, and a knitting factory. I do not know that there has been any industry closed up. In Digby County there has been nothing established since 1878. We had at that time three large tanneries, two within a stone's throw of each other, and a third not more than two miles away. They were all doing a fairly prosperous business up to the introduction of the Protective Policy; they are all closed up now, and there is not a man to be seen about them. In Annapolis County there has been nothing established, and two foundries and one organ factory have been closed. I am not sure, but I think the organ factory was removed to Truro, in the county represented by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. As regards King's County, I have not been able to get much information, but if there have been any changes made for the better, which I doubt, they have been very slight indeed, and are in no manner due to the Protective Policy. In Hants there was a cotton mill established, which is now running at the expense of the owners of the stock. They have not paid any dividend, I think—so far at all events. Whether they have or not, I am quite sure they have not made a dollar. This last year the factory was closed for some time. I do not know whether it is running now or not.

Mr. ALLISON. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to read from the *Windsor Courier* a statement regarding that factory?

Mr. VAIL. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman interrupting me if I make a misstatement, but unless he can correct me, I think he asks too much, when he asks me to allow him to read the paper now.

Mr. ALLISON. I think that is the best refutation of the statement made by the hon. member.

Mr. VAIL. No doubt what the hon. gentleman says is correct in regard to the newspaper article, but we can't always rely on what appears in the newspapers. I acknowledge that a statement made of the gentleman's own knowledge would be entitled to some weight, and I shall be very glad to receive any explanations he has to make, he may know something in regard to the cotton factory that I do not know; but I know that it has not made any money, and that it was closed for a certain time this autumn, whether

it is closed now or not, I am not prepared to say. The company, I was told, opened negotiations with the Upper Province manufacturers for the purpose of establishing fixed prices at which the product should be sold, and it was said that unless they were able to make this arrangement they would not be able to run the mill. That I know. In Halifax there have been three sugar refineries and one cotton mill established. The stock of the old sugar refinery is about \$350,000 or \$360,000. At the annual meeting held during this year, since Parliament opened, the annual statement was presented, and it showed as the result of the year's operations that the concern had lost \$208,000. I think that is a pretty big loss considering that the capital is only about \$360,000. The refinery in my opinion, has not been of much advantage to the stockholders, as it has only paid one small dividend since it commenced operations. The cotton mill has been running, but I do not think it has made any money or declared a dividend. One foundry has been closed. I am not quite sure whether it was closed after 1878 or about that time; but at all events it is closed now. A second one, which was a very important industry in the town of Dartmouth, where the junior member for Halifax resides, went into bankruptcy last fall. That is about all the National Policy has done for Halifax. In Shelburne, I understand, a small wollen mill has been established, which employs about half a dozen hands. There is also a trunk factory which employs four or five hands. In Queen's nothing whatever has been established; and one foundry, which was doing considerable business before the Protective Policy was introduced, has failed, and is now closed. In Lunenburg, a small woollen mill, which employs about half a dozen hands, has been established. I think that is all that the National Policy has done for that county. In Colchester, the county represented by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a hat and cap factory, a knitting factory, and a canned milk industry, have been established. I do not think the protective policy has done very much for the last named, for I am not aware that any change was made in the duties which would help that industry very much. On the other hand, the large steel works, which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us the other day was one of the industries the National Policy was especially designed to build up and foster, failed last year, and the concern is in liquidation now, as my hon. friend near me says; it is in the hands of assignees. So, notwithstanding the fact that the country was called upon to pay a tax of \$1.50 a ton on iron as a bounty to that company to keep it alive, it is dead now, although it was able to run before 1878, and had been running many years before that time. Besides, the Union woollen mills near Truro have failed. One would hardly suppose that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, being a member of the Government, would allow any industry in his county to fail under what he calls a National Policy. The Archibald tannery, also near Truro, which was a large concern, is now closed. There was a shoe factory which did a pretty large business there, and it is also closed. Now, after this exhibit, I should like hon. gentlemen, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries included, to tell me what the National Policy has done for the county he represents. There are more industries closed, and the most important industries in that county have been closed up since 1878. All the most important industries that were established prior to 1878 are closed. Yet I am told that the National Policy is the policy that should be carried out in the interests of the Maritime Provinces. I have inquired respecting Cumberland, and I cannot find that any new industries have been established in that county. We had woollen mills established there before the National Policy, and I recollect seeing the proprietor of one of them at the exhibition in Halifax, when he was exhibiting his cloths there after the National Policy was introduced. He told me, at that time, showing me his

cloth, that he could manufacture at a profit previous to the introduction of the protective policy; that he wanted no National Policy. He said he was satisfied the inducements held out by the Government under the protective policy to invest money in different industries would result, before many years had passed, in such competition as would prove the ruin of those industries, and his words have often occurred to me in the last year or two. He was a prophet, and he exactly predicted what has taken place, for that is the injury which the National Policy has done to the industries of this country, and it is from the effects of over-competition that they are suffering at the present time. I go on to the county of Pictou. A glass factory and steel works have been established there. I believe they are doing a very fair business at the present time; at all events they are working. During the last year two of the largest tanneries in that county, which were the largest in Nova Scotia and as large as any in the Dominion, were closed; and either one of those tanneries, if I am correctly informed, employed more men than the two new industries, the glass factory and steel works put together. I ask, therefore, what has the National Policy done for Pictou county? I proceed to Antigonish, nothing established there; Guysboro, nothing there; Richmond, nothing there; Inverness, I am not quite sure about that county; but if any new industry has been established it is on a very, very small scale indeed. There has been nothing in Victoria; and I believe nothing of any consequence in Cape Breton. I ask this House why it is that hon. gentlemen, who ought to know better and who, I believe, do know better, will stand up and speak in favor of the National Policy when the result of it has been as I have stated. I will turn for one moment to the report of the commissioner who was sent out to investigate the industries of the Maritime Provinces, and read a few extracts from that report. It seems that in the county of Halifax he visited about 45 manufactories, large and small. Of this number, although his business was doubtless to get an expression of opinion in favor of the protective policy, 27 of them said nothing, 9 of them have spoken out against the National Policy, and 9 have spoken in favor of it. He says:

"The Acadia steam biscuit factory and confectionery proprietor says:— 'In 1878 this establishment only manufactured confectionery; in 1882 the biscuit business was added. We find openings for business in New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia. The Upper Canadians are our most troublesome competitors. They 'slaughter' their goods in our territory, supplying customers at figures below their own prices, and selling also to retail dealers in a way that interferes with the wholesale dealer. We would have no difficulty in successfully competing, if the Western Provinces' men would only sell at western home prices. Time will, in all probability, cure this evil.'"

Here is another extensive concern of which he says:

"Macdonald & Co., extensive brass founders, steam and hot water engineers, plumbers, coppersmiths, gas fitters and hoopers, were indisposed to furnish information of any kind. This concern was started in 1865."

Now that does not look as if they were favorable to the National Policy, or that it was necessary to their existence because they had been running since 1865. Here is another person who speaks of the National Policy:

"The National Policy affects us beneficially in the candy line, but otherwise, in some respects at least, in other lines. For instance, the duty on coal is against us; only a day or two ago we paid \$100 on a cargo of hard coal, of which, by the way, we use a considerable quantity. There are other articles also which occupy a place objectionable to us on the dutiable tariff list. But one can't expect everything in his own favor. Other industries than ours must share in the benefit derivable from the protective system which the National Policy supplies."

Longard Bros., steam and hot water heaters, machinists and stove fitters, remark:

"That they have plenty of work, and could do more if their facilities were extended. They make this reference to the tariff:—'The duties on articles used in our business, which we obtain from the United States, are too high. So far, we have not been able to obtain in the Dominion satisfactory articles for fittings, either in copper, brass or iron.'"

Here is another:

"R. Taylor, of the Halifax boot and shoe factory, carries on extensive works and manages with skill and prudence a very large business. His works are located on the continuation of Brunswick Street (formerly Barrack Street), and his warerooms, etc., are on Hollis Street. He has been in business fourteen years and has made considerable progress during that period, adding from time to time to his outfit machines of the latest and most improved designs. The proprietor, judging from the tenor of his remarks, is not an ardent Unionist nor yet an admirer of the National Policy. He says:—"Business is dull. Confederation is one cause of this dullness, and the National Policy is another. The duties on certain articles used in manufacturing boots and shoes, such as serge, elastic, and findings in general, is objectionable. These articles are not made in the Dominion, nor even in the United States, except, perhaps, in the case of a few articles. There is not sufficient encouragement to warrant any one engaging in their manufacture. We get our supplies from England. Serge was duty free before the National Policy came into force."

That does not say much in favor of the National Policy for that industry.

Mr. BOWELL. It shows the impartiality of the report.

Mr. VAIL. I am glad that it is impartial in one respect. He has made a pretty fair report, but he has left out, as I before said, what is a very important thing, and that is a statement of the number of factories closed in the Province of Nova Scotia since the National Policy was introduced.

"J. P. Mott & Co. carry on a large spice factory and lime and soap works in Dartmouth, but the leading proprietor was decidedly reticent, considering that neither the country nor any one or more individuals in it had any right to a knowledge of his business. That the works were started some 37 years ago is all the knowledge that could be gathered from a direct interview with Mr. Mott."

I may say knowing that gentleman I am pretty sure that is just about what he would say. Here is a statement from a firm who have always been Unionists, and who have, I believe, been friends of the present Government, and would like to be yet if they had not seen that the present policy was injuring many of the industries in the Province of Nova Scotia instead of benefiting them:—

"Gordon & Keith's furniture factory is the successor of a cabinet making business conducted prior to 1860, by Thompson & Esson, in the old-fashioned style. The new proprietors, in a little while, revolutionized the business. They secured spacious warerooms and established a factory, into which they introduced the latest machinery. Their enterprise and pluck received fitting reward in an enlarged and lucrative business, the principal market being Nova Scotia. Mr. Keith, of this firm, was pleased to remark as follows:—

I see the senior member for Halifax is present, and I am sure he will at least take what Mr. Keith says as very near the truth.—

"The National Policy operates badly in our business. It imposes duties on many things used in the manufacture of our goods, such as upholstery goods, hair-cloth, curled hair, covering materials of all kinds, British mirror plates, castors and furniture hardware generally. With respect to hair-cloth and curled hair, it is a well known fact that they are not, and as respects the latter, cannot be supplied in the Dominion. The same may be said of the mirror plates. Then, as to the castors, it is a fact that they can be purchased in the United States and laid down in Halifax, duty paid, at a lower figure than that at which Smart, of Brockville, who has undertaken their manufacture, can supply them. Then, as to the other articles of furniture hardware, so long as they are not made in the Dominion, they should at least come in free, or under a modified rate. In fact, if our tariff rates on the articles named were reduced, we could secure an entrance into the Newfoundland market. The Americans can now undersell us in our own market in the matter of hair mattresses."

Here is another:

"F. Mumford & Son, Dartmouth, engaged in the manufacture of ships' knees and in general forging. They complain that ships' knees are allowed to come into the Dominion duty free, and that the duty on coal has increased the cost of that article from \$1.85 to \$2.25 at the mines, and, per consequence, advanced the cost of knee manufacturing. Messrs. Mumford & Son have a commodious establishment, the heavy hammers and other appliances in which are driven by steam."

That is the only reference I shall make to these reports.

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

Mr. VAIL.

After Recess.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 106) for the relief of Alice Elvira Evans (*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Edgar.) On a division.

Bill (No. 107) for the relief of George Louis Emil Hatzfeld (*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Kilvert.) On a division.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I would wish to divide the House on these Bills, but the House is so thin this evening that I do not think it would be fair to do so. Therefore, I make this statement with reference to these and any other Bills of the same character which may come up this evening.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 37) further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Robertson, Hamilton.)

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 97) for the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry (*from the Senate*).—(Mr. Taylor.) On a division.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

Mr. VAIL. When you left the Chair, Sir, I was referring to the different industries that had been reported upon by the commissioner appointed to make enquiry into their working in the Province of Nova Scotia. I stated that, so far as the Province was concerned, the National Policy had been of no advantage whatever, and that no industries of any consequence had been established in addition to what existed under the former policy. I did not refer to New Brunswick, because I know very little about the condition of the industries there, and because the hon. members for Queen's and Charlotte, N.B., went very fully into that subject a few days ago, and I hope their speeches will be read by every person in that Province. But I may state that the cotton manufactory in St. John, N.B., has, I understand, gone into liquidation; so that old concern, which was in active operation for several years prior to the introduction of the protective policy, and was doing a prosperous business, has had to go down under this policy, which was especially designed, the Government said, to build up and foster. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are very fond of asserting that this discussion is confined to the question of protection *versus* free trade. Their idea evidently is to lead the country to suppose that the policy of the Opposition is a free trade policy. Why, Mr. Speaker, to talk now about a free trade policy, when we are only about 4,500,000 people, with a debt of \$250,000,000, on which we are obliged to pay interest besides raising a sufficient amount to cover our annual expenditure on public works and for carrying on the Government, would be simply nonsense. We must raise a considerable amount in this country, I am sorry so say, for a good many years to come, and a revenue tariff must necessarily, in the present state of things, be a protective tariff. Therefore I hope that hon. gentlemen who talk about protection *versus* free trade will in future discuss the question of protection *versus* a revenue tariff. Some hon. gentlemen opposite would lead the House to suppose that there was no discord at present among the different Provinces, that everything was working harmoniously, and that the people were contented, prosperous and happy. But one of the hon. gentlemen, the member for Queen's, P.E.I., who preceded me on this side, pointed out that in the city of St. John, N.B., at a meeting of the Board of Trade, very strong resolutions were passed in favor of joining the United States. In

Halifax I know there is a great deal of dissatisfaction with the protective policy, and a great many people there, and I may say all over Nova Scotia, are beginning to lose hope in the future of that Province. In Prince Edward Island I find that discontent exists there also. I notice in a newspaper that the Premier of Prince Edward Island, Mr. Sullivan, announced to-day he would move an address to Queen Victoria "representing the failure of the Canadian Government to carry out that part of the terms of Confederation which requires maintenance of the steam service for mails and passengers between Prince Edward Island and the main land, and praying the Queen to compel Canada to fulfil the terms of the union and compensate Prince Edward Island for non-fulfilment in the past." That takes in the whole three Maritime Provinces, in which it is evident there is a great deal of discontent. If there is discontent in those Provinces, the present Government is to blame for it. There was no discontent of any consequence prior to the introduction of this protective policy in 1879. The people, generally speaking, were contented, they had made up their minds to make the best of Confederation, and it is lamentable that to-day these Provinces should be clamoring for some change which none of us would desire to see brought about. I intend to refer shortly to the charges made against us by hon. gentlemen opposite, of attempting to make it appear that the country is not in a prosperous state. The hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) stated emphatically the other day that he defied any gentleman on this side to point out any statement coming from any responsible source, made by any responsible person, that the present Government had ever declared that they could make times good by Acts of Parliament. Well the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) read a portion of a speech made by Sir Charles Tupper in 1878, and the quotation is so apt, besides being short, that I think it will bear repetition. Sir Charles Tupper said:

"The hon. gentleman ought to know that if governments are good for anything they are good to increase the prosperity of the country by Acts of Parliament."

That is very positive and emphatic, and there can be no question as to its meaning, and ought to satisfy the member for King's, N.B., that he was not well informed on the subject. Gentlemen on the other side complain of us for saying that the people are leaving the country and that times are hard."

Well, I notice that in the debate on the Budget in 1878 the right hon. gentleman, now leader of the Government, used this language:

"It is not the tariff but the debt that makes the taxation."

Well, I think we have a debt now, and we must necessarily have taxation.

"If we incur a debt, the moment we incur it our obligations have to be carried out; and it matters not how this is done, we increase the debt *pro tanto*. It is the debt that makes the taxation, and the tariff only regulates the mode by which that debt can be defrayed. Hon. gentlemen opposite sneer at the statement that thousands of our people had left the country to seek employment in the United States."

Then again, in reply to Mr. Ross, who was then representing Middlesex, the right hon. gentleman said:

"He spoke also as if the depression could be denied. Who denies it? Is it denied in Ottawa; would any man who walks the streets in Ottawa deny the depression?"

Well, that is pretty strong. No doubt a good many men were at that time out of employ, but where are the men now who were engaged in the workshops then?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. At work.

Mr. VAIL. If they are, it is in the United States, or somewhere else out of this country. They have all left since 1878. Hon. gentlemen opposite ought at least to hesitate before charging us with making use of language calculated to injure the country when we say there is great

depression in the country. They should have known that their high tariff could only benefit a few while the masses would be injured by it. I am now going to refer to a statement made by Sir A. T. Galt in 1876, in regard to the effect of protection upon a country, and as he is a well known authority, his remarks will, no doubt, receive attention:

"But if we are to succeed in getting immigrants to Canada we must not lose sight of the fact that it must be made attractive to them. It must be a cheap country. Immigrants must not find that it was dear as other countries which perhaps offer more advantages. That led to a consideration of the question of the high duties on imports. High rates had unquestionably made the United States a dear country, and Canada comparatively cheap, because of its moderate duties, which afford perhaps the most direct compensation for the natural advantages which the adjoining Republic possess over the Dominion. (Hear). He did not believe there was any advantage whatever in the doctrine of extreme protection. (Renewed applause). He did not believe it was possible to develop manufactures on any large scale by high duties. Our market is too limited, we have only four millions of people to supply, and it must be clear that the result of high duties would be to create an artificial industry which did not rest on its own intrinsic strength and merit. It was to be observed that protection (high duties) enhanced the cost of every other article as well as that in which a particular manufacturer might be interested. It rendered it more expensive for every manufacturer to manufacture his goods. If every thing the boot and shoe maker was protected by high duties, it was evident that his goods must be dearer. The result would be that exportation of our surplus goods to foreign countries would be impossible.

"We cannot have an export trade if the goods are artificially made dear in this country. We have in the United States a most complete example of that. There is a country which ought to be the cheapest country in the world, which has the largest amount of available land and every natural advantage, and yet by a wrong system of legislation and economic policy the people have succeeded for many years past in making it one of the dearest countries in the world instead of the cheapest."

That is the language of Sir Alexander Galt in 1876. I shall not refer to that matter further. I am now about to pass to some observations made by the junior member for Halifax, who, I am sorry to see, is not in his place. However, it is not my fault, as I gave him notice before you, Sir, left the chair at 6 o'clock, that I intended to refer to his statements. Before doing so I would just refer to one remark made by the member for Gloucester (Mr. Burns). He said:

"Gentlemen opposite did not object to the bounty for fishermen. The only thing they found fault with was that the grant was only for one year, and they insisted that the grant should be perpetual."

I am very glad that acknowledgment came from the member from Gloucester. It was doubtless the intention of the Government to give the fishermen a bounty for one year only, and that happened to be the year before, or about the time the elections were to come off. They intended to confine it to that year, but, to the credit of the Opposition, they suggested that it should be made perpetual and passed into an Act. The Government accepted the suggestion, and therefore the fishermen have the Opposition to thank for the bounty being made perpetual. I may state here that the bounty is smaller than it ought to be. The least the Government could have given the fishermen was the interest on the money received from the American Government. They have not given them that, and the fishermen have a right to complain that, up to the present time, they have not received the full sum that they were fairly entitled to. The member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) in referring to what my hon. friend from Queen's Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies), said in regard to the shipping interest, stated that when comparing the shipping of Great Britain with the shipping of the Maritime Provinces, he had, in the case of Great Britain, added the steamers to the sailing ships, and in the case of the Maritime Provinces, had left the steamers out and only counted the sailing ships. My hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I., states that that is not correct. The statement made and the calculation made by the hon. member for Queen's included both sailing ships and steamers in Great Britain, and the sailing ships and steamers in the Dominion.

Then the hon. gentleman referred to a statement made by my hon. friend from South Brant (Mr. Paterson) in regard to sugar, and he undertook to make the House believe—I do not think they did believe it—that sugar was cheaper now in Canada than it could be purchased in the United States and laid down here under the Cartwright tariff. It does not require many figures to show exactly what the cost of sugar would be from the United States. In the one case, the cost of the sugar being \$6.13, to deduct the drawback of \$2.79 would leave \$3.34, the duty on which would be \$1.83½ under the Cartwright tariff. Under the present National Policy, the duty would be \$3.14 consequently the difference between the price at which sugar could be purchased now and its price under the Mackenzie tariff would be just \$1.30, which the consumer would get the benefit of. My hon. friend from Brant was quite right when he made the statement, and I am sure my hon. friend from Halifax did not understand the question when he undertook to show that his statement was not correct. Then, again, he referred to the banks in Nova Scotia, and he made a greater mistake there, I think. He said the increase in the capital paid up from 1869 to 1884 was 154 per cent. That may be right. I have not taken the trouble to go over that from 1869 to 1879, because I did not think it was necessary. What he desired to show was that the Maritime Provinces, or that Nova Scotia at all events, was prospering under this protective policy because the amount of paid up capital in the banks had largely increased since 1878, and because the bank deposits had increased. I have examined the paid up capital of the banks of Nova Scotia since that time, and I find by the bank statement that, in 1879, it was \$4,295,872, and the amount of paid up capital at the present time is \$4,098,207, which makes a difference of \$197,665 less than it was in 1879. Now, that would show, according to the hon. gentleman's own argument, that the Province of Nova Scotia cannot be prospering very much if he takes this as indicating that the people have really more money now than they had at that time. But I do not think that shows it at all. I think it is the very reverse of that. Money, I think, is just like any other commodity; it is regulated by the supply and demand; and, when business is good and money is in demand, as everybody knows, money is dear, and it finds ready use in business transactions; but, when business is dull and there is nothing doing, of course people want to do the best they can with their money, and so they put it in the banks at 3½ or 4 per cent., preferring to keep it there while business is considered unsound. I think it is the best evidence we can have that business is dull and in a depressed state, and that there is no demand for money by business men, when capitalists put it in the banks. That is one reason why the amount in the Savings Bank has been increased. A great deal has been said about that, and I have said before in this House that the amount of money in the Savings Banks in Nova Scotia in no manner shows that the poorer classes of people are prospering. The bulk of the money in those banks in Nova Scotia is deposited by men of means, in order to get 4 per cent., and I know of many cases where two and three names of a family have been used in order that they might get \$9,000 or \$10,000 or even \$12,000 into the Savings Bank and get 4 per cent., though the law prevents them from depositing more than \$3,000 in their own name. That is the reason why the amount in the Savings Banks in Nova Scotia has increased so much of late years.

Mr. HESSON. They are not all poor down there then?

Mr. VAIL. I think that Nova Scotia has, perhaps, according to her population, as many wealthy men as any other Province of the Dominion; I have not the slightest doubt about that. But the wealthy men are the men who made their money before the protective policy was con-

Mr. VAIL.

ceived, and these are the men who have been taking their capital out of business and depositing it in the banks, and are satisfied to get 3 and 4 per cent. rather than to run the risk of losing it in business. Why in the city of Halifax to-day, in the sugar and cotton industries, the stockholders are losing \$40,000 annually for interest on their capital invested in the sugar and cotton industries. And that is the way the people of Halifax are benefitted by putting their money into industries that have been encouraged and fostered by the present Government. Then, again, the member for Halifax (Mr. Stairs) said the present Government had done all they could to get reciprocity. Well, if all the Government could do was to pass an Order in Council, they were not able to do much. Now it seems to me that it is childish, it is ridiculous, for the Government to say that they have done all they could do in order to get reciprocity; they have passed an Order in Council informing the United States that when they are ready to allow certain Canadian products to go free into that country, we shall be ready to do the same thing in regard to certain of their products, but we don't as yet know whether they have transmitted this to the United States Government. Well, Sir, how long is this to last? Is it to be hands off on both sides, and that neither party will make the first move? Would it be derogatory to the character of this Government to inform the Government of the United States that we are willing to consider this question on its merits, that reciprocity would in the opinion of the Government be an advantage to both countries, and in that way show our willingness to enter upon negotiations. Do hon. gentlemen suppose that the Government of a country of 50,000,000 people are coming here to beg the Government of the Dominion to give them reciprocity? I do not want the Government of the Dominion to go down on their knees to the Government of the United States; all I want them to do is to notify the Government of the United States that they are ready to consider this question. It is an important question, and our Government should inform the Government of the United States, with as little delay as possible, that they are ready to consider it. That is the least they could do; they have not done that, and the country will hold them responsible until they go that far, or until they get an answer from the United States that they are opposed to reciprocity. The people of the Maritime Provinces are very much interested in this question. Every hon. member in this House from Nova Scotia knows that the United States is the natural market for the products of the Maritime Provinces, and if we are shut out from that market it will certainly be detrimental to the interests of the business community of Nova Scotia. In the history of that Province there never was a period of ten years when it enjoyed more prosperity than it did under the reciprocity treaty with the United States, and I believe it was equally advantageous to the people of that country. It had the effect of giving free interchange of commodities and the effect was good in many ways. When the people traded with each other a good feeling prevailed which was an advantage to both countries. In referring to banks the other night, the hon. member for Halifax neglected to state two or three things in connection with the banks which, I think, would go further to show that business is not in such a prosperous state in the city of Halifax as he would have us believe. For the first time in a good many years the principal bank in Halifax has had to take \$130,000 from their reserve fund in order to pay their dividends and losses. Another bank has been obliged to reduce its dividend, during the last six months, from 3 to 2 per cent., paying 5 per cent. for the year instead of 6 or 7 per cent. it has formerly paid. Does that look as if business was in a very prosperous state? I noticed the other day in one of the Montreal papers that the Union Bank, which had a subscribed capital of \$1,000,000 and only \$500,000 paid up,

at their general meeting last month decided that they would ask for an alteration in their Act to enable them to reduce their capital from \$1,000,000 to \$500,000. Does that look as if business was in a very prosperous state, and money in great demand? I think not, Sir. Then he stated that the merchants of Halifax were doing a much larger business than formerly. Well now I do not believe that the senior member for Halifax would make that statement. I know something about Halifax, I know something about Nova Scotia, and I do not hesitate to say from the best information I can obtain that business of all kinds has not been so depressed as it is at present for many years, many old business men say 40 years. I have known when times were considered hard, when business in some particular branches of industry was in a depressed condition. It has often happened that when the ship-building business was dull the fishing business was good; when the fishing business was bad the lumber business was good; and when the lumber business was bad the mining business was good, and so on. But I have never seen the time when the depression was so general as it is at the present time. I speak thus confidently because I know what I am speaking about. I have always had a very great objection to leading the House to suppose that we are very much worse off in Nova Scotia than other portions of the Dominion; but when hon. gentlemen state publicly in this House that business is in a flourishing state, that men are doing a larger business than they have been heretofore, I feel bound to state that that is not the case. The best evidence we have that business is not in a thriving state in Halifax is the fact that real estate of all kinds is not worth, upon an average, more than 60 per cent. of what it was fifteen years ago. Wharf property, which is the best index of the state of trade, is not worth more than half as much as formerly. I know that within the last two or three years wharf properties, that sold seven or eight years ago for from \$30,000 to \$40,000—\$20,000 paid down, leaving a balance of about \$15,000 on the property—have within the last two or three years been taken back by the mortgagee for the face of the mortgage, say \$14,000 or \$15,000. I know that in several other instances wharf property has depreciated to the same extent. I do not believe any business man in Halifax will say that business is in a satisfactory condition if I except the junior member for Halifax. Then the business men of Halifax depend largely upon the West India trade; but the policy of the Government with reference to sugar has, I may say, almost ruined the West India trade, on which Halifax so largely depends. The duty on sugar is so arranged that it is an advantage to import it from Germany, from China, and from Brazil, and this beet root sugar is used now by the manufacturers, instead of the lighter grades of sugar that have less saccharine matter than the lower grades, and the consequence has been that sugars from the West Indies have not been used for refining purposes, and manufacturers have imported nearly all the sugar they have used during the last few years from the ports I have named.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not on account of its strength.

Mr. VAIL. It is because the Government have so regulated the duty that a large proportion of the duty is paid on the *ad valorem* cost. The consequence is that manufacturers buy low grade sugar, and they can import such sugar at a much lower rate and manufacture it to more advantage than they can the higher grade sugars I have mentioned, or rather the brighter sugars, which were formerly imported from the West Indies. The Government have not only done this; they have done something worse. They granted last year \$50,000 as a subsidy for a steamship line to run between Germany and Halifax to bring this very sugar, at 14 shillings a ton freight to Halifax, which sugar is killing out the West India trade, and they thus

added to the trouble caused by their outrageous policy in regard to the sugar duties. If there is anything for which the Government is responsible it is for the prostration and almost complete ruin of the West India trade.

Mr. BOWELL. Does the hon. gentleman not know that the *ad valorem* duty on sugar is higher now than when he was in office.

Mr. VAIL. On certain grades it is.

Mr. BOWELL. On all grades.

Mr. VAIL. I do not think so. If the change was not in the interest of refiners, I should like to know how the refiners at Montreal are able to manufacture now, when they said they could not manufacture—I believed they could—under the old tariff.

Mr. BOWELL. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows that the duty is now higher on refined sugar?

Mr. VAIL. We can discuss that matter at some other time, when I shall be able to point out a further dereliction of duty on the part of the Government in regard to the sugar duties. Before closing my remarks I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he thinks the National Policy, or the protective policy, has assisted the ship-building interests in Nova Scotia.

Mr. McLELAN. Yes.

Mr. VAIL. How then does it happen that the ship building business has fallen off this last year. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the National Policy has helped the carrying trade.

Mr. McLELAN. The carrying trade has increased in the Dominion.

Mr. VAIL. It has been very dull this last year; very little money has been made out of it for several years, and the feeling of ship owners is that the time is not far distant when there will be not so much in the carrying trade by sailing ships as heretofore. I hope it may be otherwise. Does the hon. gentleman suppose for a moment that the National Policy has helped the fishermen. It has helped them in this way: It has taxed their food and the canvas for the sails of their vessels, and their cordage. It has injuriously affected their business, and that business in the Province of Nova Scotia has been not so good as in former years. There has been a fair catch, but the prices are much lower than formerly. Then I should like to know if the National Policy has helped the lumberman. There is nothing the lumberman uses that has not been increased in price by that policy. That industry was in a state of depression last year, as every lumberman knows, and is still. Another business of considerable importance is that connected with gypsum. I am quite sure the hon. Minister will not say that the National Policy has helped that business. I know it is said that it helps the coal miners to some extent. If it does, it is to a very limited extent, for everything they use has been made more expensive by the protective policy. I should like to know from the Government, which professes to be very sincere in regard to the coal policy, how much Nova Scotia coal they have purchased, or the Minister of Public Works has purchased, for the purpose of heating the public buildings at Ottawa during the last three or four years. If I am correctly informed, every ton of coal used is American coal. It appears to me, if those hon. gentlemen were sincere and desirous of fostering and protecting our coal trade, they would naturally obtain Nova Scotia coal and set the consumers of Ontario a good example. They have not done so, and I think they are not entitled to credit for encouraging that industry. Another important industry is the exportation of wood, an industry which cannot have been assisted in any way by the National Policy. Of course, in the western

portion of Nova Scotia, as I have said, our natural market is the United States, for the reason that the Upper Provinces do not want, and cannot take, what we have to export. Our vessels running across to the United States with lumber and cordwood naturally want to bring back wheat, flour and breadstuffs of different kinds as cargo. The duty on breadstuffs is a very great tax upon them, and they are obliged to pay it or purchase flour that comes down by rail from the Upper Provinces at a great disadvantage. These are all disadvantages under which our people labor, and it is not to be wondered at that they should prefer a different policy to that which is carried out at the present time by the Government. I do not pretend to say it would be possible for this Government or any other Government to arrange a tariff that would bear evenly upon all the Provinces of the Dominion. I acknowledge it would be very difficult and almost impossible to do so; but I do not hesitate to say that if the Government had made up their mind to so readjust the tariff as to make it bear as heavily as possible on the Maritime Provinces, they could not have done it more effectually, or framed a tariff which would be more injurious to our people than the present protective, or what is called National Policy. It is, I am sorry to say, a policy which will, to a certain extent, have to be carried out in the future, in consequence of the heavy liabilities imposed on the Dominion, and the large amount of revenue which will have to be raised. We all know that, and I hope the time is not far distant when, if there is not a change of Government, this Government will, at all events, get the scales removed from their eyes, and see as we see on this side; when they will so arrange or adjust their tariff policy that in the future the people of the Maritime Provinces will only be taxed what is fair and reasonable. Mr. Speaker, I desire to thank the House for the patient hearing they have given me. I have spoken under great difficulties, for I am physically weak to-day, and I thank the House for the consideration they have shown me.

Mr. ALLISON. It was not my intention to make any remarks on the question before the House, but as the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), in speaking this afternoon, referred to some industries in the county from which I come, I asked the privilege of reading from a newspaper which is published in that county by a gentleman belonging to the Reform party, who was a representative of that county in the last Parliament of the Local Legislature, but who has for the present retired from politics and entered the field of journalism. The hon. member very properly declined to allow himself to be interrupted when he was speaking, and I now wish to read a short extract from that paper, referring to the industries in the town of Windsor. I may say that the hon. member for Digby confined his remarks principally to the cotton factory established in that town, and if I am not mistaken, was incorrect in his statement that that factory was closed, even for any length of time. If it was closed at all, I am confident it was but for a few days, for the purpose of stock-taking, or repairs, or something of that kind. He has spoken of the distressed condition of that institution. I express my opinion that his leader, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), had as much to do with the erection of that factory as any person in the county I represent. He spoke in the constituency in 1881, when the matter was under consideration, and succeeded in convincing the people that so much money was to be made by the manufacture of cotton that a good many of his own friends, with their usual keen eye to business and their enterprise in such matters, put their money in with others, and the factory was established. The predictions of the hon. leader of the Opposition have been as usual, unfulfilled; as the shareholders who were to be "bloated monopolists" have not yet received large divi-

Mr. VAIL.

dends; and cotton has been unusually low in price to the consumer, who was the object of his sympathy. The president was my opponent at the election, and his platform, as laid down on nomination day, was that he "was a follower of Edward Blake." With regard to the other industries, I should like to read this article. It is headed "False Statements," and appears in the Windsor *Courier* of 3rd February, 1885:

"The *Free Press*, published at Ottawa, under date of January 20, contains the following:—

"Closed factories: Having met with heavy losses during the past two years, the large furniture factory at Windsor, N. S., has been closed. For the same reason the Windsor iron foundry has shut down, and hundreds of unemployed mechanics are now crying for bread. Oh, Sir Leonard, thou false prophet, why did we allow ourselves to be deceived by the predictions from thy oily tongue in 1882?"

That is from the *Free Press*, Ottawa, to which the *Courier*, published by a Reformer, replies:

"We are in a position to give the above a flat denial."

Then, after the next sentence or two, referring to the fact that both the furniture factory and the iron foundry had closed for a brief period, as is their custom, for the purpose of taking stock and making repairs, the *Courier* continues:

"It is a libel on Windsor to say that hundreds of unemployed mechanics are now crying for bread. If there is a town in Nova Scotia, in Canada—yes, in all America—where less poverty exists than in Windsor, we should like to know where it is situated. Beggars are never seen on our streets, and we doubt if there is a family in our town which is not making a comfortable living. If there is such a family it is on account of sickness or from some other reason than want of employment."

The article, after a reference to the mechanics of Windsor, proceeds:

"We know many of them who have quite large sums to their credit in the savings and other banks. Such untruth and trash may go quietly broadcast over Canada in the columns of what is called a respectable journal, and receive no contradiction. But in the interests of our town, and in the interests of truth, we will nail it as a falsehood when it comes to our knowledge. We wish every community in Canada was as comfortable as that of Windsor is at the present time."

The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) this afternoon did me the kindness to say that he would pay some heed to any remarks or explanations I would make, and for that remark I sincerely thank him. I think he will not pay less heed to Mr. T. B. Smith, with whom he is well acquainted, a member of his own party, who voted against me at the last election, and who is the editor and proprietor of this paper. The hon. gentleman refers to the fact that three tanneries in the county of Digby have been closed since the National Policy came into operation. I may say that the only steam tannery we have ever had in our county has been established under the National Policy, and is in a prosperous condition. The hon. gentleman, speaking from a sectional point of view—as I am always sorry to hear any one speak in this House—continually referred to the depression which existed in Nova Scotia, and to the unfair treatment which that Province has received at the hands of this Dominion. I merely wish to reply to this remark by reminding him of the fact that his leader, who I am sorry is not in his place, invariably makes the statement, when he refers to this subject, and considers himself prepared to prove it, that Nova Scotia has received too much from the Dominion, and that it is Ontario, his native Province, that has to pay the piper. I would also remind him that his memory is slightly at fault with regard to the number of manufacturing industries in the Province of Nova Scotia. He made the statement that there were only two sugar refineries in Nova Scotia. He must have forgotten that the molasses refinery of his intimate friend, Mr. Jones, has been enlarged and increased into a sugar refinery.

Mr. VAIL. I said there were three sugar refineries.

Mr. ALLISON. He also referred to the fact that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in conjunction with Mr. Howe, acting as the confidential friend and financial adviser

of that lamented gentleman, secured better terms for Nova Scotia. I would like to refer him to another fact in connection with that point. Mr. Power, for some years after the era of Confederation the Liberal member for Halifax, speaking at a public meeting in Nova Scotia, from experience with, and observation of, both parties—while I admit he still adhered to the Liberal party and deprecated the idea that Confederation had been brought about—made this statement: "Nor have I any hope from a change of Government at Ottawa"—this was when the Government of the right hon. leader of the present Government was in power before—"nor have I any hope, he said, from a change of Government at Ottawa," as the leaders of the Opposition—referring to the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake), the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie), and other leading men of the party—"have opposed, step by step, and inch by inch every concession made to Nova Scotia." I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House, for having allowed me this brief period of explanation, and I thank the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), who I believe has the floor, for giving way to me for this short time.

Mr. TASSÉ. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, when I heard the hon. members opposite bewailing, one after the other, in tones which were steadily becoming more and more doleful, on the woes of the country, indulging in the most gloomy predictions as to the future which lies in store for us, I have asked myself if we were not attending a celebrated meeting of the Constituent Assembly. On that occasion a great tribune was trying to impose on France a most excessively onerous tax, a tax which was to take from each individual one-fourth part of his income, and which, for that reason, has been called the "contribution of the fourth." And the great speaker beseeching France to meet the engagements which were then bearing down heavily on the country, concluded by these words: "Bankruptcy, hideous bankruptcy is at our door; it threatens to consume you, yourselves, your property and your honor, and during that time you are deliberating." Indeed, Mr. Speaker, my intention is not to compare the hon. members opposite to Mirabeau haranguing the Constituent Assembly on that occasion, but when I heard them bemoaning the country on its woes, I have asked myself if we were not really attending that celebrated meeting. Indeed, for the last few days, and even until a very late hour of the night, we hear of nothing but bankruptcy, we hear of nothing but misery, we hear of nothing but distress, laborers without work, wholesale expatriation and onerous burdens. Until now the hon. members who spoke had only evoked that spectre in the language of Shakespeare. It was to be the lot of the member for Lotbinière (Mr. Rinfret)—and I regret that circumstances have precluded my answering him at once—to lament in our own beautiful French language. His speech deserves more than ordinary attention, for it appears to me to be the true expression of the sentiments of the small *Pléade Rouge* which, on this same question, has reflected all the colors of the rainbow. The speech of the hon. member may be reduced to three main propositions, although these are somewhat swamped by numerous incidental remarks. In the first place, according to him and according to every Liberal who has addressed this House, even according to the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), who has just spoken, protection has been injurious to the country, and has been a cause of ruin to Canada, and a cause of industrial and agricultural distress. Secondly, he has stated that our expenditure and our debt are increasing at an alarming rate; and thirdly, the construction of the Pacific Railway is being pushed too rapidly, in his opinion. But, up to this time, such statements have been contradicted in a manner so clear, so conclusive, that it may seem useless, at this advanced stage of the discussion, to undertake a refutation.

Nevertheless, as this speech is the only one which has been pronounced in French on the great question which is now occupying the attention of the House, I believe it is our duty to prove to our friends opposite that whenever they feel inclined to fire on the Government troops, there will always be some one ready to fire back, and sometimes with very good effect. Mr. Speaker, I have asked myself the following questions: Is it very true, from actual results, from the experience of the last few years, is it very true that protection has been a cause of ruin to Canada, a source of misery and source of financial embarrassments of all kinds? Yes, answer the members opposite; yes, answer the opponents of the Government; yes, answer all those who have become blind through party spirit, or who prefer abstract theories to the teachings of history. But against that opinion, which is that of a small minority, we have the opinion of the great mass of the electors, not only of a Province in particular, but of all the Provinces in the Confederation. We have, I say, the opinion of the manufacturers, of the capitalists, of the workmen, of the agriculturists, who, on two different occasions, in 1878 and in 1882, have upheld, by a very large majority, the principle of agricultural and industrial protection. Hon. members opposite say that we are in the midst of a crisis. Well, let us compare for a moment the situation of Canada in 1877-78 with the situation which the establishment of the protective system has given to this country. In 1878—nobody has yet forgotten that dismal date, that fatal date—our manufactures were closing one after the other; in all parts of the country there was nothing to be seen except laborers without work, clamoring, not as the Romans of old, for *panem et circenses*, bread and shows, but for bread and work, what is wanted by the workmen of Canada. A mournful pall shrouded the country; discouragement had taken hold of the stoutest hearts; and I, for one, will never forget the desolation which overwhelmed the city of Ottawa—a very melancholy picture, if compared to that which is to be seen to-day. What was the main cause of such an economical disaster? It can be easily explained. At that time we had no protection, our markets were almost wholly in the hands of our mighty neighbors, into the hands of the United States. The late hon. Minister of Finance himself had to admit that our Canadian market had become a slaughter market for American produce, and the only proof I want of that fact is the speech which he delivered as a Finance Minister, in 1876:

"We know, Sir, that when the price of American staples are high ours will be high also. When labor is dear in the United States it will be dear in Canada; when cheap, it will tend powerfully to make it cheap in Canada also. And it is no source of wonder that when the cost of production becomes small in the United States, it should react more or less unfavorably on persons engaged in similar manufactures on this side. I do not purpose at this present moment to enter fully into the discussion raised as to Canada being a sacrifice or slaughter market. But I must admit candidly that I have no doubt that the distress of our manufacturers has been aggravated, though I will not say to what extent, by this cause."

So that we have, from the hon. member himself, who was then Minister of Finance, the admission that one of the causes of the industrial crisis was due to the fact that the Canadian market was almost wholly under the control of our mighty neighbors, the people of the United States. I know very well that the hon. member for East York, not later than two years ago, during his visit to Scotland, at Greenock, told the inhabitants of that place that his defeat at the elections of 1878 was due to the fact that there had been in the country a succession of bad crops from the day on which he had taken the reins of the Administration. He said:

"Referring to politics, he said he assumed office in 1873. For five years following they had very bad crops, and the lumber trade was very low, the trade being altogether in a wretched condition. This naturally led people to propose new theories for the formation of happiness and the bettering of trade."

I am very sorry for the hon. member for East York, but he has been trying to explain his downfall by a thoroughly imaginary cause. It is not true that there had been a series of bad crops from 1873 to 1878. And, for the moment, I want no other proof but the words which he, himself, then First Minister, was putting into the mouth of His Excellency at the opening of the Sessions of 1874, 1876 and 1878. In 1874, the Speech from the Throne contained the following:—

“Notwithstanding the commercial depression which, owing to exceptional causes, has prevailed to a certain extent during the year, we are glad to know that the general prosperity of the country has not been seriously affected thereby.”

In 1876 similar language was used:

“We have reason to congratulate ourselves on an abundant crop.”

And in 1878:

“I am happy to congratulate you on the abundant crop which has been gathered in all parts of Canada.”

Is not that sufficiently conclusive? So much for speeches from the Throne. In 1875 there was nothing said about crops in the speech from His Excellency, but the Minister of Finance (Sir Richard Cartwright), stated, in his Budget Speech, that the crops had been abundant. Let me quote the following:—

“The excellent crop with which we have been favored last year will have a very favorable effect on the population, both commercial and agricultural.”

In 1877 the then Minister of Finance (Sir Richard Cartwright) held opinions which were quite the reverse of what was said by his late chief, the hon. member for East York. He said:

“The five or six years which have elapsed since we last took the census, with the great exception of the last, were years of prosperity.”

In 1883, however, the hon. member for South Huron was very far from singing to the same tune. Really, such frequent contradictions can neither be explained or excused. What did he say?

“The Mackenzie Government were condemned because the country was not so prosperous as they would have desired it to be during the last years of their administration. That was the common fate of all politicians.”

On the one hand, we find the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) saying, in Scotland, that if he had lost power at the general elections of 1878 it was due to the bad crops which we had during the three or four years which immediately followed his Administration. And on the other hand, we see his Minister of Finance stating exactly the reverse. We find the speeches from the Throne in 1874, 1875, 1876 and 1878 stating quite the contrary. Therefore, when it is stated that, if the Mackenzie Administration had lost the power at the elections of 1878, it was because there has been in the country a succession of bad crops, we may say that such a statement is false, for these bad crops have never existed. Why seek difficulties where there are none? Mr. Mackenzie has lost power: First, because he has badly administered the country, and secondly, because he refused to establish protection, for which the electors were clamoring. If I remember well, it is a fact that at that time the industry of the country was in such distressful straits, that only two industries—if it is possible to give them such a name—were in a thriving condition. They were the soup-kitchen industry and the official assignees' industry. These two are about the only industries which have thrived under the Liberal Administration. Well, Mr. Speaker, what has happened since? The Conservative party, so ably presided over by the right hon. leader of the Government, made a promise to the country while they were occupying the Opposition benches, and they formulated a complete political programme. They promised if they came to power to adopt a policy of protection to the agricultural, manu-

Mr. TASSÉ.

facturing, mining and other interests. That is just what has been done. We went before the people in 1878 with that policy, and the people were so fully satisfied, so fully convinced that a radical change in the economical condition of the country was needed, that they elected the Conservative members by an immense majority; not only in one Province, not only in one particular section of the country, but in all the Provinces from east to west, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. In 1879 the protective tariff was established in its broadest form, and since then we have been ratifying it from Session to Session. A few changes have been effected, but every one of them was inspired by the protective idea. If it is important to give to our system all the stability and the permanency which is consistent with our fiscal system, on the other hand, we must know how to adapt it to new wants, to new circumstances, which may arise. In such a matter as this, expediency may, with advantage, play a great part. For the second time, in 1883, we have consulted the electorate. Have the electors told us that that policy did not suit them; that it was such as to cause prejudice to the country? Not at all. The electors have come to the same conclusion, and that was, that the protective policy was just what was wanted by Canada. Most of the old Conservative members who had occupied seats in this House from 1878 to 1882 were re-elected by large majorities. And since that time I am not aware that our opponents, the members opposite, have made much headway. To-morrow even, if a plebiscit was to be submitted to the people on that one question of the tariff, eight-tenths of the population would pronounce in favor of the maintenance of the protective system. What the Conservative party then proposed, that is to say, to throw off the yoke of the foreigner, of our American neighbors, that result has been obtained, and the statistics laid before the House point out that there has been a great revival in the industry of the country. Indeed, if we examine a few figures, and these statistics are far below the exact truth, we find that the number of manufactures during the first five years which have lapsed between 1878 and 1884 has been increased by 595; that the number of operatives which have been employed has increased by over 34,000; that the aggregate of wages paid yearly has increased by over \$10,000,000; that the industrial production has increased by over \$52,000,000; that the amount of capital invested in the various industries of the country has increased by over \$29,000,000. And these statements, which have been prepared by commissioners duly authorised by the Government, let it be understood, only apply to about two-thirds of the manufactures in Canada. The hon. member for Lotbinière has mentioned a few cities, in order to prove that he is right in stating that the country is suffering from an industrial crisis, and he said to us: Why, look at Montreal, look at Hamilton, look at St. John, look at Halifax: you will find there traces of a great crisis, of a great depression. In the first place, neither Halifax nor St. John are industrial cities, properly speaking; they are rather maritime cities. However, Halifax has a good number of thriving industries, and the city of St. John is recovering as rapidly as could be expected from the terrific conflagration which came very near destroying it in 1877. Let my hon. friend consult the report which I have just mentioned, and he will find it to contain very reassuring statistics on that point. Carried away, as he was by party spirit, I am surprised, however, to see that my hon. friend has not included Toronto in that list, and I am convinced that our friends from Toronto will feel greatly slighted when they hear that they have not been put on an equal footing with the city of Montreal, for we all know that the capital of the Province of Ontario has the ambition to follow in the footsteps of the great city of Montreal, and strives to become its equal, if not its superior. But I understand why Toronto has not been mentioned; it is because not very long ago the hon. leader of the Opposition

was making a speech in the capital of Ontario on the economic situation of the country, and he said to the electors: It is true there is depression in other parts of the country, but I am happy to make an exception as regards Toronto. Moreover, the *Globe*, which is the principal organ of the Reform party in that country, not later than the 28th of December, 1884, published the following:—

"The progress of this city must be a cause of deep gratification to all Torontonians. The assessment, which is the most trustworthy index of the value of property, has gone up by leaps and bounds. In 1873 the assessment was \$44,764,882, and in the year just closing it is \$85,212,318. What makes this progress satisfactory is that it is all substantial. There is not to be discerned one sign that the assessment is anywhere above the selling value or that values are inflated. Toronto's population has increased so rapidly that suburb after suburb has been built up to and absorbed. Places which a few years ago were 'commons' or large vacant lots are now covered with handsome houses, facing block-paved and well-lighted streets. One who knows the city well, returning after a few months' absence, finds important changes on every hand. The progress made is not the result of a temporary boom, but is caused by the steadily-growing importance of Toronto as an industrial and educational centre."

But if the hon. member has not spoken of Toronto, he has spoken of Montreal. My hon. friend is generally better informed on what takes place in the country, and more especially in the Province of Quebec, to which he belongs; for if it is true that the trade of the city of Montreal has not been so extensive in 1884 as in former years, it is no less true that progress, and considerable progress, has been achieved in that city. Indeed, if the giant who moves about at the foot of Mount Royal does not extend his arms as rapidly as he did in the past, he is far from feeling drowsy. I might quote the figures of the commission. It may be said that these figures have been cooked for official purposes; but I have others, which will prove that the progress, in the city of Montreal last year, has been rapid. And as a proof I shall quote the report of the building inspector. It states that during last year 318 new houses have been built, representing a capital of over \$1,000,000, and among these 318 new buildings we find, 5 warehouses, 4 manufactures and 24 stores. In 1883, the preceeding year, only 260 buildings had been erected, of which there were 4 schools and churches, 7 warehouses, 9 manufactures, 2 shops and 23 stores; the rest were tenements and other lodgings, which makes a difference of 58 buildings in favor of the year 1884 as compared to 1883. The Montreal Board of Trade is far from viewing the situation from as gloomy a standpoint as my hon. friend. On the contrary, it does not hesitate to announce a revival in all branches of trade. Here is what is said in the last report of that institution:

"Over-production in some classes of manufactures, and a general fall in values, have produced their inevitable results. But your council are confident that Canada has not experienced the wave of depression in any great degree as the merchants and manufacturers of Great Britain and the United States. A policy of caution in imports has characterized the business of the year, and should, in the opinion of your council, be continued for some time longer. The prospects for the future are by no means discouraging. The over-production of cottons and woollens especially is almost exhausted, and mills are resuming work, while the fact that the grain crop of last year remains to an unusual extent unsold, justifies the hope that the coming season will witness a revival of trade in all departments."

Besides that, my hon. friend has evidently forgotten, or has never known, that last year the hon. member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) was making a speech before the Young Men's Reform Club of the city of Montreal, and he used the following words, which are far from justifying the statement that the city of Montreal is on the verge of ruin and bankruptcy:

"So, it would be unworthy of any statesman; it would be unworthy of any public man not to admit, as I admit most fully and thankfully, that within the last seventeen years there has been on the whole, in many respects, very considerable progress. In that time Canada has developed a magnificent system of internal communication. Very great improvements have been made in many parts of the country in our whole system of agriculture. There is no doubt whatever in my mind, and I am glad to believe it, that a very large class of our fellow countrymen are living in much greater wealth and comfort than they were a few

years ago. More than that, I know that there are certain specially favored localities in which very great absolute progress has been made. Looking at the city of Montreal, for instance; remembering what Montreal was twenty-five years ago, and comparing it with what your city is to-day, I cannot help paying a tribute of unfeigned respect to the energy."

I regret that I have lost the rest of that speech, but I know that it is in keeping with the above. Now, we all know that while the grain trade—which enters so largely in the transactions of Montreal—has diminished last year, there is only a temporary depression. We all know that at the present time great elevators are being built in the eastern part of Montreal, that enormous quantities of grain, which is destined for them, have been stored at Port Arthur. We know that millions of bushels of grain are to be sent from Manitoba and the North-West to Montreal, and I am convinced that, with the Ottawa route, which must eventually be built, and which will be the route of the future, and with the route of the St. Lawrence, the city of Montreal will be enabled to pursue its destiny, which is to become the rival of New York, as far as the grain trade is concerned. Now, Hamilton has been spoken of. I know very well that there has been a certain depression in the cotton industry during last year. We all know, however, that this depression, which is due to the overstocking of the market, is drawing to an end. We all know that most of the mills, which had either been totally closed or were only working on half time, are about to resume or are now resuming operations. There was too much cotton goods of a certain class produced; the production is to be diversified hereafter. But while there has been a local depression in the cotton industry at Hamilton, on the other hand we find a considerable increase in the other industries of that city: the stove factories, iron bridge factories, manufactures of agricultural implements, and many others. That city, I am glad to state, has always been one of the most important of the manufacturing centres in this country. I think that city was the first in the country to hoist the flag of protection. That city was the birth place of the late lamented Mr. Buchanan, who was the first apostle of protection in Canada. And under the Mackenzie regime, when the Liberal party commanded a large majority in the country, such was the force of the protectionist sentiment in Hamilton, that both the reformist members of that city were the first to ask for a protection tariff; and even the *Hamilton Times*, which, up to this day, is one of the principal organs of the Liberal party, was also one of the first to hoist the flag of protection. But the Liberals having betrayed that patriotic cause, having burned what they had worshipped, the city of Hamilton has since considered that its best interests would be better promoted if they were defended by Conservative members. Besides, this is the opinion of all cities having a certain importance, if we except Kingston. The hon. member for Digby, if I understand him rightly, has told us that the city of Ottawa, which I have the honor to represent here, was also undergoing a period of depression. This is not the first time that I have heard slanders against this city. On many occasions, since the adoption of the protective tariff, I have heard hon. members opposite making the most gloomy pictures of the city of Ottawa. The truth is, that in 1878, when the Liberal party was in power, there was universal misery, distress and desolation here. The truth is, that at that time, there were hundreds, thousands of laborers without work. But, thanks to the change which has been wrought, the city of Ottawa, since that dismal date, has resumed its onward march towards progress. In 1882 we were only 26,228 inhabitants, but in 1883 we were 27,645; in 1884 we were 30,079, that is to say, only during last year we have added 3,146 to our population. The assessment which, in 1883, only reached \$11,105,002 amounted last year to over \$11,500,000, or an increase within one year of nearly one half million of dollars. The other day the hon. member for South Huron

(Sir Richard Cartwright) laid great stress particularly on the statements prepared by the school inspectors, in order to show that the population of Ontario had decreased. These incomplete and inaccurate statistics give a false idea of the situation. I want no other proof of that fact than the article published by the *Globe* on the development of the population in Ontario, which article was quoted the other night by the member for Brockville (Mr. Wood). Well, according to these same figures, the city of Ottawa had last year several hundred children attending school more than it had the preceding year. Another good way of finding out the situation of the city and the misery which may prevail within its limits. Each year, in our city—and I suppose the same thing is done elsewhere—a certain amount of taxes is remitted to the rate-payers, who are too poor to pay them. Last year the amount of taxes which were remitted to the poor rate-payers was \$2,000 less than in previous years. And if another proof was wanted, I might appeal to—I will not say an authority, for I do not accept that newspaper as an authority—but I might appeal to the statement of a newspaper which is not disposed to show in bright colors whatever it can show in dark colors; I refer to the *Free Press*, the organ of the Liberal party in this city. Here is what it said on the 25th of December, 1884, with regard to the city of Ottawa:

“Ottawa is to-day the fastest growing city populously in the whole Dominion—it is growing twice as fast proportionately as is Toronto. That growth appears to have increased since the municipal census was taken a few months ago. Strangers who recall Ottawa as she was four or five years ago, and contrast the rush and bustle on our streets to-day are agreeably surprised. All her vacant houses are now filled up and new ones are being erected on every hand—the coming summer promises in house building to be the busiest the city ever witnessed.

The detractors of Ottawa had better hurry up, for their day will soon be gone. Ottawa's advantages are now no longer hidden. Ottawa is the best distributing point for manufacturers in the whole Dominion and offers most abundant and cheapest motive power. Ottawa is nearer by a hundred miles the whole Canadian sea board, Maritime Provinces and Quebec, than is Toronto; she communicates directly with the Inter-colonial and Grand Trunk systems to the New England States and the Canadian Maritime Provinces. The Canada Atlantic gives her a short road to Boston, the most important market for Eastern Canada; the St. Lawrence and Ottawa gives a short road to New York, and the projected Ottawa and Waddington Railway a shorter road still. The Ontario and Quebec and the Grand Trunk connect Ottawa with the Western States and Western Ontario, the former direct, the latter by a short line. The Canadian Pacific main line places Ottawa as near Winnipeg by rail as Toronto is, and much nearer that the whole peninsula of Western Ontario; besides, Ottawa is on the main line, whereas Toronto is on a siding. Under these circumstances, in a few years' time, Ottawa naturally expects emigration of the Western Ontario manufacturers to this city.”

There is what the opponents of the protective tariff are forced to admit; here is what is said by these newspapers which are systematically and almost daily underrating the great benefits which have been the result of the great fiscal revolution, of the great economical revolution, which has been created under the auspices of the Conservative party. Up to this moment I have only spoken about cities; let us now speak about the country places. The other day the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), in the speech which he delivered in this House, has told us that the condition of the agricultural class was all that could be desired, except that the prices had fallen—that the farmers were in a thriving condition. I believe that by making that admission the hon. member gave up the whole case of the Opposition, and that by so doing he has unwillingly paid a solemn homage to the policy of the Conservative party. However, this admission should not surprise us. I do not think that the economical situation of the Province of Quebec has ever been any better than what it has been for the last few years. All that we can complain of is that our granaries are crammed with grain that has not been sold. One would think that we were living at the time of King Pharaoh, when Joseph was filling up the granaries of Egypt. The situation leaves so little to be desired that it seems people have solved the

Mr. TASSÉ.

problem of making agriculture a paying business, of having it recognised as the most free, the most lasting, and the most independent of callings. The Canadian farmer begins to understand the importance, or rather the necessity, of giving up the old hackneyed practices, diversifying his culture and of undertaking cattle raising on a larger scale. As a consequence, the exportation of cattle, as well as the exportation of butter and cheese, has increased of late years. Notwithstanding what was said by the member for West Elgin, it was the Conservative party which was the first to protect cheese, by putting a duty of 3 cents on it. Hardly five years ago usury was one of the great plagues in our country places. Well, since the last few years, that canker has almost completely disappeared. To-day the farmer who can offer fair security can obtain money at a comparatively low rate of interest—5, 6 or 7 per cent.—whereas formerly they were paying 8, 10 and 12 per cent. I have taken the trouble to examine the reports published by loan societies and building societies in the Province of Ontario, for the year which has just ended. And what do we find in these returns? Several of these societies have each loaned, on real estate in the Province of Ontario, amounts as high as two or three millions; the value of the soil is increasing; they have lost but very little on their investments; they have paid large dividends to their shareholders; there was but very little arrears in the reimbursements of the loans they have made. I may say as much about the Credit Foncier, which has already lent a million dollars and has only suffered a few insignificant losses. This is certainly the best criterion of the agricultural prosperity which exists in the country. Now, Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said about bankruptcy; a great deal has been said about failures which have taken place in the country. No doubt there has been a great number, and I am sorry the number is so large; but we must not forget that the number of failures in the country is a great deal smaller than it was during any one year under the Mackenzie Administration. In 1884 failures in Canada only reached the amount of \$18,000,000, while in 1875, under the Mackenzie Administration, it was as high as \$28,843,000. Between 1875 and 1879, 9,000 persons have stopped payment, and their liabilities amounted to \$13,500,000; while, from 1879 to 1884, 5,000 persons stopped payment and their liabilities amounted to \$57,000,000, which makes, in favor of the present Administration, a difference of \$76,000,000. I know very well that the hon. member for South Huron, in a speech which he delivered at Napanee, in December, 1883, has stated that that year was the year in which there was the greatest number of failures. Here are his own words:

“The list of bankruptcies began to swell to such proportions that the list for 1883 would prove greater than that of the worst year of the depression, when Mr. Mackenzie was in power.”

It is very evident that the hon. members opposite forgot to speak to us about a certain industry. I said a while ago that there were only two thriving industries under the Mackenzie Administration, and that these were the soup-kitchens and official assignees. I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, but there was a third one: it was the coal oil industry. I do not know for what reason, but the Liberals have a great love for petroleum. I would not wish to insinuate that they are in alliance with those who were called *pétroleux* in Europe; I only notice that they have a particular affection for this inflammable matter. Was it because the oil wells were situated in the county of Lambton, which was represented by the then First Minister, who is still one of the leading members of the Liberal party?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. TASSÉ. My hon. friend says, yes. I am glad to hear that expression, because, while the Liberal party refused protection to other industries they extended it to coal oil.

As a matter of fact, only for the circumstances which I have just mentioned, this exceptional protection would seem rather strange. At the same time, I am glad to state that that industry which was fostered in such a special manner is even now more flourishing than it was then.

Mr. DE ST. GEORGES. That is the reason why the Conservative party imposes a tax on barrels which are used for coal oil.

Mr. TASSE. In spite of that tax, my hon. friend will be happy to learn that last year's exportation of petroleum, in which, like all Liberals, he takes such a tender interest, has been 594,268 barrels, while, in 1883 it amounted to 534,330, and in 1882 to 492,583. That is to say, the coal oil industry, like all other industries, has undergone, since the adoption of the protective tariff, a very great progressive movement. I know that our friends opposite are in favor of a cheap country to live in. They are in favor of cheap living. These gentlemen ought to be happy, ought not they? In fact, living has never been any cheaper than what it is at the present time. Never have the necessaries of life been as cheap. These gentlemen who have been repeating to us that the protective tariff would necessarily raise the price of all the necessaries of life should feel contented instead of lamenting the way they do. I am bound to state, however, that cheapness of living is not sufficient to ensure the happiness of a people. I am still of the opinion, which I have professed in the past, that cheap living does not always give the true measure of the prosperity of a country. In France, for a long time, those who were called the candidates of high bread were denounced; and yet what do we find to-day in that country which is governed by Mr. Jules Ferry, a free trader? We find a considerable increase of the duties on wheat, flour, oats and barley. In that country, which is governed by Ministers who are freetraders, the Customs Commission of the Chamber of Deputies has decided to propose the imposition of a duty of 2 francs 40 centimes on wheat, and it was adopted; a duty of 4 francs 80 centimes on flour; a duty of 1 franc 50 centimes on oats, and a duty of 2 francs on barley. And in Germany, Mr. Speaker, the same thing is done; duties have also been increased there on the articles which I have just mentioned. Therefore, the people of France, as the people of Germany and the people of the United States, have understood that the protective system only can do a great deal towards promoting the prosperity of a country. Our hon. friends opposite have said to us: Why, your system has been unable to put an end to the excess of the importations over the exportations of the country. That is true; we can only point out to the year 1880, in which the exportations have exceeded the importations by a million; but there is another fact which is just as true, and that is, the excess of importations over exportations during the five last years has been a great deal less than what it was under the Mackenzie Administration. From 1875 to 1879 the exportations have amounted to \$82,059,000. From 1880 to 1884 they have exceeded \$105,000,000, making a difference of \$23,061,708 in favor of the last five years. And this excess of importations may be readily explained by the enormous quantities of raw material which we were obliged to import for our industries, and of articles which were entered for the construction of the Pacific Railway. Last year there has been a large discrepancy between the importations and the exportations, but it is explained by the fact that there has been a deficiency of nearly \$20,000,000 in the production of wheat. It may be said that this is an enormous figure, but it is nevertheless an accurate figure. It is based on statements which have been published. The fall wheat, in 1882, has produced over \$31,000,000, while in 1883 it has only produced \$11,597,839. However that may be, the Opposition should be the last to

upbraid us on account of the excess of our importations over our exportations. Do we not know that according to the English school, the Cobden school, the volume of imports is a very good sign of prosperity and of active trade. "Take care of the imports," they say, "and the exports shall take care of themselves." According to that, England must have made brilliant operations last year, for the surplus of her imports has exceeded £110,000,000 sterling. Unfortunately for the Cobden doctrine this same year has seen one of the most terrific crises in the history of Great Britain. The other day the hon. Minister of Finance was remarking that stocks had gone up considerably from 1879 to 1885. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) has asked the hon. Minister to give the quotations for 1878, as compared to 1885. The hon. Minister of Finance had not these quotations with him at the time, but I have taken the trouble to consult them, and they show a large increase as will be seen by the following figures: In 1878, Montreal Bank was quoted at 161, and in 1885 it was quoted at 193. Molson's Bank was 92 in 1878 and 114 in 1885. The Bank of Toronto was 136 in 1878 and 182 in 1885. The Merchants Bank, which was 63, in 1878, is to-day quoted at 111.

Mr. CATUDAL. Does the hon. member take into account the fact that the Merchants Bank has reduced its capital by one-third? You say that in 1878 the Merchants Bank was quoted at such a price, and that in 1885 it was quoted at such another price; do you keep account of the difference arising from the fact that since 1878 the Merchants Bank has reduced its capital by one-third?

Mr. TASSÉ. I do not know whether the quotations which I am now giving were made with reference to that reduction, but there would still be a rise, even with that reduction. The Merchants Bank, which was quoted at 116 in 1878, is now quoted at 121. Other securities, which I might mention, also show a decided rise. When I see the hon. members of the Opposition attacking, as they do, the fiscal policy of the Government, I ask myself if these gentlemen are not as many Saturns devouring their own children; for we have not forgotten, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal party of Lower Canada was one of the first to demand that the agricultural and manufacturing interests should be protected. The member for Lotbinière was, the other day, denouncing agricultural protection. Well, I think that if his natural leader, Mr. Joly, could have heard him, he would, perhaps, have disowned him as one of his followers. Because, those who have read the *Debates* of this House know that in 1872 Mr. Joly was asking for protection on sugar and exemption from Excise duties on beet root sugar during ten years. It will also be remembered that in 1872 the Liberals wanted to bury their past in oblivion. They were ashamed of it, and they had a thousand reasons to be ashamed of it. Therefore, they wanted to reorganise it, by leaving aside such men as Messrs. Doure and Lafamme, for instance. These men have since been seen coming back to the surface—and by borrowing from both parties the best planks of their platforms, in the hope of producing an *ensemble* of principle which might unite all men of good will, irrespective of parties. An important meeting was held in Quebec, and it was presided over by the predecessor of the hon. member for Lotbinière, the hon. Mr. Joly. Well, on that occasion, there were loud demands for protection in favor of the agriculturer and trader, for protection in favor of the industries of the country. So much so, that in 1876 a committee was appointed to investigate the agricultural condition of the country, and, that in answer to certain questions put to hon. Mr. Joly, that gentlemen stated that if his friends had abandoned the cause of protection, as most of those who are now occupying the other side of the House have done, he, at least, had not given it up. And the following is the

answer he addressed to the president of that committee, on the 24th of March, 1876 :

"I have only received to-day a series of printed questions from your commission, in whose work I take a very deep interest, and I hasten to send you my answers. I am afraid they will be found somewhat lengthy, but I must say that I feel a certain amount of satisfaction in being able to formulate my views on this subject, whatever may be the worth of such views. In fact, it is a kind of protest against charges brought against me during this Session, in the House of Commons and in the public press—that I have abandoned the principal article of the programme of our national party. What we claim above all is a national trade policy. My friends have been charged with having abandoned it, and as leader of the national party, my name has been mixed up with those reproaches; but I have not abandoned that policy."

Now, in answer to the following question which was put to him by the committee :

"Is it in the interest of Canada to continue to admit American products free from duty, while the products exported on the other side of the frontier are liable to a high duty?"

He said :

"No; it is against the interests of Canada. I humbly believe that only raw material used for manufactures should be admitted free from duty.

"It is not by lowering the price of everything that we will ever attain national wealth. The dearer we pay the better it is for us, provided our means of paying are at par with the increase of prices. Ask the laborer which he prefers—flour at \$4.50 per barrel and no work, or flour at \$6 and plenty of work. Agriculture and manufacturing may together insure great results; but let these two industries isolate their interests, and their divided forces will be far from accomplishing as much."

It may be said that the hon. Mr. Joly is no longer the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. I know that; in fact, he has had the same fate in the Provincial House which was met by another leader of the Liberal party in this House. Perhaps the mode of procedure was less violent but that was all the difference. It is traditional in that party to behead the chiefs when they do not lead to victory. If I am told that Mr. Joly is no longer the leader of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, one thing will be admitted, and it is that the hon. member for East Quebec—who, I regret to say, is not in his seat—is at the present moment the leader in the Dominion Parliament of the Liberal party of the Province of Quebec. Well, that hon. member, and not very long ago at that, held the same opinions, the same sentiments, on protection. In 1871, when he held a seat in the Quebec House, he said :

"Quite a number of years ago the great patriot we have just lost, the Hon. L. J. Papineau, seeking a remedy to the evils from which we were suffering, summarised his policy on the subject by this simple precept; 'We must buy nothing from the metropolis.' I am of opinion that that policy is to-day forcing itself upon us with as much weight as it did even at the time when it was formulated. It is a duty for us, and especially for us Canadians of French origin, to create national industry."

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, our hon. friends will say: Why, this was a long time ago—it is many years since our leader expounded on the question of protection, those ideas which are those professed to-day by the Conservative party. I will quote, Mr. Speaker, utterances which are a little more fresh. They were uttered as far back as the 22nd of March, 1877. Mr. Laurier was not then, it is true, as strong a protectionist as he had been in 1871; but he was still fairly so, as may be judged by the following short extract from one of his speeches:—

"I am of opinion, however, that certain industries cannot be established without the aid of the Legislature; and I say it openly, in the presence of my political friends."

As will be seen, these words from Mr. Laurier have been uttered not many years ago, and they prove one thing: It is, that our friends opposite have completely given up the economical ideas which they formerly held. They have sacrificed everything to the domination of their allies, the Grits. At this same meeting of 1872 another leader of the Liberal party, who is not sitting in this House, it is true, but who has a seat in the highest House in the country, the hon. Mr. Pelletier, said:

Mr. Tassé.

"The manufactures in the different branches of industry which we might develop with such beneficial results, do not receive the necessary protection. You will probably tell me that, nevertheless, a strong impulse was given towards progress; that the spirit of enterprise seems to spring up. Yes, gentlemen, hunger and misery have often led to superhuman efforts. The terrible commercial crisis which prevails to-day, while alarming those who were most confident in a brighter future, induces them to make supreme efforts in order to avoid complete ruin. It is true that generous efforts have been made for some time back; a few enterprising capitalists are trying, it is true, to establish manufactures, but have they been able to inspire confidence in their success? Have they been able to do away with this great objection of the tariff, which makes it impossible to export our produce? What guarantee have they when they risk their capital in manufactures which are constantly exposed to a change in the tariff, which might paralyse everything? There is alongside of us a population of forty millions, with whom we are unable to trade. Our country offers immense advantages, and in spite of that it is still the most backward country in America, owing to the want of encouragement to manufactures."

If I wanted to make a review of most of the prominent members of the Opposition, I might do, what has already been done besides, I might show that these gentlemen have all, one after another, been in favor of a protective tariff. I heard the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) telling us a while ago that the Government had done nothing to encourage sugar industries in this country. That gentleman has forgotten the very important fact that under the Mackenzie Administration the sugar refineries closed their doors, which they have re-opened since the establishment of the protective tariff. He has forgotten that, in 1876, his colleague, the hon. Mr. Jones, who was then sitting on this side of the House, on the Ministerial benches—but that did not last very long, I am not sorry to say—was clamoring in vain for protection on sugar. I shall quote his own words, pronounced in this House on the 3rd of April, 1876 :

"He might be laboring under a misapprehension, but he understood the hon. member for South Waterloo, on a former occasion, when he introduced his motion relating to the West India trade, to allude to the sugar refining interests as likely to be greatly benefited thereby. If the hon. member was in earnest in his proposition to subsidise a line of steamers then, he could not understand his position now. The hon. gentleman had said that but 300 persons were interested in the sugar trade, but if the number of vessels engaged in this large commerce with the West Indies and the men indirectly connected with the business were taken into account, we would find that number swell into thousands. He thanked the hon. Postmaster General, for the stand he had taken on this question. If the refinery in Montreal could have worked under the present system no application would have been made, but it had been sufficiently demonstrated that it was impossible to keep open refineries in the face of the bounty allowed by the United States. It was no use tinkering with the tariff, but the Government should be prepared to deal with the American system, which was annihilating our trade. When \$2.50 duty per 100 pounds was paid, and a drawback of \$3.00 was allowed, which was equal to ½ a cent per pound, it was plain to be seen that no tariff would enable a refinery to exist in Canada. Unless a duty was imposed equal to the bounty, it would be no use trying to do anything."

In 1877, the hon. Mr. Jones returned to the charge and again reproved the Government. Here is what he said on the 9th of March :

"The sugar interest demanded some consideration, because, if some legislation did not speedily take place, he was afraid we were going to lose a large trade with the West Indies. That trade, in the Maritime Provinces, at the present moment, involved from three to four million dollars a year, but the inevitable result of the present policy would be to drive the whole trade to the United States. We sent our vessels with outward cargoes, which were sold in the West Indies, and they were obliged to take the sugar to the United States to have it refined. Cargoes of sugar passed through the Boston refineries, and in 24 or 36 hours were exported into Canada again under a bounty of 50 per cent. Such a system could not continue very long. In a short time, when the Americans found out that they had destroyed our trade, they would dictate their own terms, and then it would be seen how disastrous the present policy was."

We did precisely what was asked by the hon. Mr. Jones, when he had his seat among the Ministerial benches. He wanted to protect that industry, and since that time we have seen not only the great Redpath refinery opening its doors at Montreal, but we have seen others cropping up or taking large proportions. I was speaking a while ago of the Liberal leaders in this House and at Quebec. In 1881—it is not a very long time since—the hon. leader of the Opposition was visiting Montreal. We were on the eve of general elections. The hon. gentleman was visiting

his faithful in Montreal, seeing, no doubt, with regret, that instead of increasing, their number was diminishing at every election. On that occasion the hon. leader of the Opposition expounded views which resembled a great deal those of the most extreme free traders; besides, it was not the first time in his life; but Mr. Mercier, who had a better knowledge of the popular sentiment in the Province, who knew that the views advocated by the hon. leader of the Opposition were quite unpopular; that they were repudiated not only by the Conservatives, but even by almost every Liberal, Mr. Mercier felt alarmed at the opinions expressed by the hon. leader of the Opposition, and he endeavored to limit their bearing to a certain extent. Here are the words which he used under those circumstances:

"When we left power the receipts of the country were not as high as they are to-day; but the Conservatives failed to keep themselves within reasonable limits and they have raised the tariff in an exaggerated manner. But we must be impartial; this increase, large as it was at the outset, did not produce a bad result; it has put an end to deficits, if we are to believe Sir Leonard Tilley, and it has induced capitalists to invest large sums in the manufactures."

Mr. BLAKE. Of cotton.

M. TASSÉ. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that large sums have been invested in the manufacture of cotton. He is perfectly right. But it is equally true that millions have been invested in other industries. Under the Liberal régime there was no large amounts invested in cotton, and although people were then in favor of a cheap country to live in, cotton goods were not sold as cheap as they are to-day, neither were they manufactured in such large quantities as they are to-day. When the hon. leader of the Opposition was denouncing the policy of the Government with respect to duties imposed on cotton, he said: If you put a duty on cotton, cotton goods will be sold at an extravagant price; you will make the fortune of a few speculators, of a certain number of capitalists, to the detriment of consumers. He cannot deny that. To this pretension we have answered that we were not afraid of the profits which might be realised by the manufacturers; that it was not to be expected that they would invest their capital with the sole view of pleasing the public, and that even if the prices of their manufactured goods were to be higher for a certain time, domestic competition would not be long in bringing them down to a normal rate. Well, what are the facts to-day? Facts have so well given the lie to the predictions of our friends opposite that they are now reduced to deplore the losses which the cotton manufacturers have suffered of late years. Facts have so well belied the predictions of the hon. leader of the Opposition on this important question of cotton manufacturing, which has inspired him many an eloquent speech, that instead of blaming the Government to-day he should be one of the first to commend their conduct. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who did me the honor of interrupting me, will admit that there is at Montreal a newspaper, which is supposed to be the organ of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec, and which is called *La Patrie*. That journal is to-day edited by Mr. Louis Honoré Fréchette, who for several years held a seat in this House as the representative of the beautiful county of Levis. At the last elections Mr. Fréchette was a candidate in the county of Levis; I think it was for the fourth or fifth time. His opponents, it seems, had circulated the rumor that if he was elected, he, Mr. Fréchette, one of the supporters of Mr. Blake, would make it his duty to wage war in this House against the National Policy, which was very natural, I admit, for the National Policy is the great line of demarcation between the Liberal and Conservative parties. Well, Mr. Fréchette, knowing that he could not be elected in the county of Levis if he hoisted the flag of free trade, declared, in a letter, that if he was elected, neither he nor his chief, the hon. Mr. Blake, would work against the National Policy. Perhaps the hon. leader of the Opposition

has read that letter, which was published in the *Chronicle* of the 10th of June, 1882, for the purpose of removing the fears of the electors. The letter said:

"I hear that there is some uncertainty prevailing somewhere regarding my views, as a candidate for the county of Levis, regarding what is generally termed the National Policy.

"I wish to state here what I stated yesterday before the public of Levis, St. Joseph and St. Romuald, that my platform is exactly that of my leader, Mr. Blake, on that question as well as on the others.

"I never believed in the so-called National Policy; I think it has done more harm than good to the country; but I most positively declare that my intention, if elected, as well as the intention of the Liberal party, is not to interfere with that policy, which has been established by the popular will, as a change in the system would probably create a disturbance in our industries and trade, which must be avoided at all hazards. I consider the National Policy as necessary, now that it is inaugurated—and for this the Conservatives alone are responsible—a necessary evil, which could be cured only by a remedy worse than the disease."

This language is far different from that of the member for South Huron, who exclaimed in this House: This tariff cannot stand. Well, I do not think that the hon. member for Durham, who must have read that letter,—

Mr. BLAKE. I have not read it.

Mr. TASSÉ. I know the hon. leader of the Opposition to be a great reader of newspapers, of everything that bears the liberal stamp; I know he takes a great interest in the French and English literature of his party. Did he ever protest?

Mr. BLAKE. I have never read it.

Mr. TASSÉ. The hon. leader of the Opposition says that he has not read it. Well, now that I have read it to him, does he, or does he not, approve it.

Mr. BLAKE. I approve it in part, and I disapprove it in part.

Mr. TASSÉ. Very flattering for Mr. Fréchette, the editor of *La Patrie*, organ of the Liberal party in the Province of Quebec. This disavowal from his chief is one of the finest compliments that was ever paid to a Liberal journalist, to my knowledge, for a long time back. Until now we have noticed what protection had done for Canada, but we have never asked ourselves what we should be without it. I venture to state that, without this tariff, the Canadian market would still continue to be, what it has been under the Mackenzie régime, a slaughter market for American over-production. Without protection we would see to-day 60,000 workmen, and more, without work, without bread, and most of them emigrating in a body, as they did under the old Administration. And the fact that since the 1st of January last only 100,000 operatives have resumed work in the American manufactures, shows what would have become of our market had we not a tariff to protect us against the production of the United States. We would be at the mercy of the American manufacturers, as we were under the Mackenzie Administration. Without protection we would still be the vassals, the tributaries, of the great American Republic. The interprovincial trade, which has made such rapid progress for the last few years, would not have taken the proportions which it has taken, which it is still taking, and which it shall continue to take as long as we are protected. Without protection British Columbia, which last year imported over \$624,000 worth of goods from the Eastern Provinces, would not certainly have imported such a large amount from its sister Provinces. Because, in 1874, when the Liberal party came into power, the total amount of the value of goods shipped from the Eastern Provinces to British Columbia was only \$66,104. Without protection, coal mining and the consumption of coal, which has nearly doubled, owing to the industrial establishments in the country, would certainly not have reached such great proportions. Without protection the Canadian workmen would certainly not have recovered the easy circumstances in

which they have lived for the last few years, and could never have succeeded in a very short time in depositing, together with the farmers, an amount of \$13,000,000 in the post office savings bank. Without protection we could never have put an end to the deficits, which amounted to over \$7,000,000 under the Mackenzie Administration, and which have been converted into a surplus of over \$18,000,000 since the adoption of the protective tariff. Well, Sir Richard Cartwright, himself, admitted, when he was Minister of Finance, that deficits, especially if they became chronic—and unfortunately they were chronic under his administration—might become a source of very grave difficulties, and that it was necessary to adopt energetic means to put an end to them. The Conservative Government have adopted those means and our hon. friends opposite, instead of blaming them for having taken these energetic means of putting an end to deficits and of protecting the credit of the country, should, on the contrary, congratulate them on the important and patriotic work which they have accomplished. I know, without protection, the immense sacrifices which we have incurred to construct the Pacific Railway would, to a great extent, be useless. Instead of finding an outlet for our industrial produce in the immense agricultural region of the North-West, the people of these Territories would continue, as in the past, to import their goods from the neighboring States. Now I come to another point. The hon. member for Lotbinière has spoken to us about the debt of Canada. Indeed every member of the Opposition has lamented on the extent of our debt. But, Mr. Speaker, none of them have told this House that every cent of that debt is represented by a productive capital. None of them have said that every cent of the public debt of Canada is represented by improvements and works, without which Canada would not be to-day the rich and prosperous country which it has become. None of them have said that that debt is not the price of blood, as are the debts of England, France, Germany and the United States. I do not hesitate to say that the debt of Canada would find favor in the eyes of the most rigid of economists. And while I see the public debt of our country represented under such false colors by those who style themselves as the free trade party of Canada, I am glad to be enabled to give them the opinion of one of the chiefs of that school, Mr. de Molinari, one of the chief editors of the *Journal des Débats*, a man whose opinion has been quoted very recently by the great newspapers of Europe on the importance of maintaining free trade in the old world. Mr. de Molinari visited Canada some years ago, and especially the Province of Quebec, where he carefully studied our economical situation. On his return to France, here is what he said about the debt of Canada:

"The Dominion and provincial debt has been contracted wholly for the construction of an improved system of communication, canals and railways, which might, with due regard to proportion, bear comparison with that of the United States. Nevertheless, for a few years back, the finances of the Dominion had felt the influence of the crisis. There had been a decrease of the receipts, arising most exclusively from Customs, from licenses for the sale of liquors and the sale of public lands; fortunately the crisis is over and the deficits have already been superseded by surpluses in the receipts. Bear in mind that Canada is one of the countries in the world where there is the least taxation, and that the contributive faculties of the people have hardly been grazed."

There is the opinion of Mr. de Molinari, and yet the hon. late Minister of Finance, and those who hold his views, are constantly proclaiming in this House that Canada is one of the most overtaxed countries in the world. Mr. de Molinari, who has not the same reasons for representing, under false colors, the financial position of the country, does not hesitate to state that Canada is one of the countries in the world where there is the least taxation, and that the contributive faculties of the people have hardly been grazed. He goes on to say:

"It would be a blessed laud for speculators conversant in the art of picking the hen without causing her to cackle; but where there are no armies to be paid, no war loans to redeem, there is no need of a heavy

Mr. TASSÉ.

budget, and there are many reasons for abstaining from picking the hen at all. The Canadian federation occupies a position similar to that of the United States before the Secession war; and, thanks to God, none of the questions which are agitated between the parties are of such a character as to provoke other contests than those of the press and the hustings."

I have said that every cent of our debt was represented by public improvements. Since 1867 it has been increased by \$100,000,000. Well, what is this increase composed of? In the first place, we have a sum of \$27,624,638 for provincial debts. So that this is not at all an increase of taxation. It is simply debts from the old Provinces which have been assumed by the Dominion Parliament. Thus we have public improvements: Pacific Railway, \$47,291,564; Intercolonial Railway, \$29,486,027; canals, \$31,404,938; making a total of \$135,807,209. To these five items I may add \$29,374,000, which have been expended, irrespective of the debt, out of the ordinary receipts of Canada. And the Liberal party has its good share of responsibility for that increase of the public debt. From 1874 to 1878 the interest on the debt has increased by \$980,882, while from 1878 to 1884 it has been increased only by \$851,672. And let us bear in mind that the rate of interest is now lower than it was then. In 1867 the average of the rate of interest on our loans was 5.21 per 100; in 1873, 4.38; in 1878, 4.05, and in 1885, 3.98. This is a proof that our credit, instead of declining, is now gaining in the London market. But our hon. friends say: Why, public expenditure is increasing in alarming proportions? Certainly it is. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. But if it does increase we must not forget that our receipts are also increasing. This is just the reverse of what happened under the Liberal Administration. We must not forget that within a few years the public revenue has been increased by several millions, and it would be absurd to pretend that an additional revenue of nine millions could be levied with the same amount of expenditure. Within a few years we have created a whole Department—the Department of Interior—which, alone, during the last four years, has brought to the Treasury not less than \$4,000,000, arising from the sale of lands in the North-West. It is also known that we have had to establish new post offices and Custom houses in a great part of the North-West, and in new places in other parts of the country. We have made a great many other expenses which represent, in a legitimate measure, the increase of the debt, as compared to what it was formerly. The other day, the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), who is an authority on such matters, compared the expenditure of 1875 and 1876 to that of 1883 and 1884, and showed that we had spent during those last years \$6,619,334 more than in 1875 and 1876. But, as he rightly remarked, this increase is easily explained. Out of that sum, \$2,079,488 were expended for the collection of revenue more than in 1875; the revenue itself has increased during that period by a sum of \$9,250,000. Out of that sum, \$1,901,045 was devoted to the sinking fund and to the cost of management of the public debt, and the balance, \$2,264,540, represents the increase of the ordinary expenditure. That balance itself contains: For public works, \$959,910; mail subsidies and grants to lines of steamers, \$204,090; grants to Indians, \$839,831; mounted police, \$116,465. Now, all these amounts show an increase, and it was the Mackenzie Government themselves who started that expenditure, particularly the extra expenses for surveys in the North-West, and to maintain a strong supervision there. After all, they are not a heavy burden on the people, for they only represent an extra tax of 12 cents per head. Now, we come to another point. The hon. member for Lotbinière has lastly spoken to us about the Pacific Railway. He has told us that the construction of that railway was pushed too rapidly. I am not of that opinion. I think that the more railways we have in the country the better it will be for us. I believe that the locomotive is the best factor, the mightiest

lever, of material progress in any country. It ought to precede and not to follow the march of colonisation. It is a great many years since the Conservative party, represented by Sir Allan McNab, said: "My policy is railways." The policy of the Conservative party is still to-day as it was then, a railway policy. We know what that policy has done to develop the resources of the country. Where should we be to-day if the 10,000 miles of railways which make up our admirable system of railways did not exist? Where should we be without the Grand Trunk, against which our friends opposite fought so violently, as they did against all great measures of public interest which were advocated by the Conservative party? Where would we be without the Intercolonial and the Pacific Railways, which will give us a through line of railway from ocean to ocean? Even in 1872 Sir George Etienne Cartier, while proposing in this House the great measure of the Canadian Pacific Railway, said: All aboard for the west! It is very well known that nobody attached more importance than he did to the construction of that great railway, for in the Bill which he succeeded in having passed in the old House, it is enacted that the construction of the Pacific Railway will be finished within ten years. I regret that the hon. member for L'Islet (Mr. Casgrain) is not in his seat, for I would take this opportunity to reproach him with having written a most unworthy page, a very regrettable page, a page which can never be forgiven. In a book which he has published lately, which was in itself a fault, for the book was written in order to justify one of the greatest outrages that was ever attempted against the responsible system in this country, to justify that which has been called the *coup d'état*, the hon. gentleman has taken occasion to throw mud at his opponents. He has chosen to enter into the private affairs of a man who is no more here to defend himself—a man whom he never would have dared to fight face to face—but who has left followers and admirers who will be equal to the task of defending him. The member for L'Islet has attacked the memory of Sir George E. Cartier; he has entered into the domain of his private life to vilify him. But I am happy to state that there are many Liberals to-day who, reviewing the political career of our late lamented chief, do not hesitate to admit that he was a great patriot and a friend to his country. And this House has echoed public gratefulness by erecting him a monument that all the scribblers in the world are unable to disfigure. The hon. member for Lotbinière complains that we are proceeding too rapidly with the construction of the Pacific Railway in British Columbia. I am sorry to find that my hon. friend has completely forgotten the history of his party; because, before he left power, Mr. Mackenzie declared, in this city of Ottawa, in a speech which he delivered against my candidature in 1878, that he had asked for tenders for the construction of the Pacific Railway in British Columbia. And yet we see the Liberal members upbraiding the present Government for pushing too rapidly the construction of that section. Not only do they blame the Government for building rapidly the British Columbia section of the Pacific Railway, but I have heard, with still greater surprise, the hon. member censuring the Government for building that section which is situated on the north shore of Lake Superior. On this point, as on the other, my hon. friend forgets the history of his own party. In 1880, his own leader, the hon. member for West Durham, said:

"I should not be surprised if some hon. member from Quebec had indicated to the Minister of Railways, in language as strong as was consistent with the politeness due to a powerful Minister, that it was essential that he should throw out, at any rate, some ray of hope, however faint, that at some early period the Quebec railway should be connected with the through line; that he should say to the members from Quebec: Gentlemen, at the present time we can only burn the candle in the middle, and at the western end, but the time will come sooner than you expect, when we will burn it in the middle and at both ends, when it will be alight in the east also. Quebec may expect the eastern end to be commenced when the western road is finished—that is, that it

will be begun in 1890, and may be finished in 1897, and I hope they will all be alive to enjoy it."

Again, the leader of the Opposition has shown himself a bad prophet. It is not in 1897 that the section on the north shore of Lake Superior will be completed, but within a few months, after wonders of activity, which ought to deserve his approbation. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but the newspaper which is the organ of the Liberal party (the *Globe*), whose authority my hon. friend will not gainsay, said, with regard to Lake Superior, in 1871:

"Our rulers will be traitors to their country and to British connection if they lose a single season in making it practicable and convenient for settlers to go to Fort Garry through their own territory, and in putting things in a fair way for the Canadian Pacific Railway. It is a question not merely of convenience but of national existence; it must be pushed through at whatever expense. We believe it can be so pushed through, not only without being a burden pecuniarily to Canada, but with an absolute profit in every point of view. Without such a line a great British North America would turn up an unsubstantial dream; with it, and with ordinary prudence and wisdom on the part of her statesmen, it will be a great, a glorious reality.

"Instead of the fact that the North Pacific is under construction being an argument for allowing the Canadian project to lay in the meantime in abeyance, it affords the strongest reason possible for its being pushed through without delay. Politically, it is a manifest and pressing necessity, while commercially it is as evidently of the highest importance for Canada. In this way alone can this country have any chance for her fair share in the lucrative trade with the North-West, which will assuredly spring up, and in the varied traffic with the Pacific world, which, to a great extent, will pass through Canada territory, if once what will be the shortest and easiest route from ocean to ocean is in working order."

It will be seen, by these few extracts, that the opinions expressed by our hon. friends opposite are exactly the reverse of the opinions expressed hardly a few years ago by their chiefs and by their principal organ in the country. We are told that the construction of the Pacific Railway is being carried on too rapidly. That is the opinion of the hon. members opposite, but that is not the opinion of the country. The settlers who are disseminated along the line of that immense route, which has 3,000 miles in length, the settlers who are lost in the immensity of the prairies and even along the shores of the Mackenzie River, who are without communication, either direct or indirect, with the civilized world, will not think that the construction of that railway is going on too rapidly. Neither will the traders of Manitoba, of the North-West, and of British Columbia, who have to import goods from the eastern Provinces, think that the construction is going on too rapidly. The manufacturers who have a surplus of production in the old eastern Provinces, and who reckon on being able to dispose of their surplus at profitable prices on the western markets, will not think that we are constructing this road too rapidly. The whole commercial world, who recognise in the Pacific Railway the most direct route between Europe and Asia, will approve of the rapid construction of that railway. No, Mr. Speaker; the construction of the Pacific Railway will not be completed a moment too soon. Thirty years ago, in the *Revue des Deux Mondes*, a prominent economist, Mr. Langel, published an essay on the proposed transcontinental lines of the American continent, and speaking of this enterprise he said: "The proposed undertaking in Canada is simply a dream, but if ever that road is constructed it will create a perturbation in the business of the world." And the London *Times* said that the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway would be one of the most brilliant achievements that any country in the world could ever boast of. The hon. member for Lotbinière concluded the other day by speaking to us about the programme of the Liberal party. I should be very happy to know exactly what that programme is. I have taken a great deal of trouble to find out what it was, but without success, up to the present time. The Opposition is against every thing which is proposed by the Government. That is about all the programme they have. It seems that the same ignorance prevails on the other side of the House among the members of that

party. In a newspaper which is edited by one of the lieutenants of the hon. leader of the Opposition—I refer to the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills)—the *London Advertiser*, the following words could be read concerning the programme of the Liberal party a few days before the opening of the Session:

“We trust that the leaders of the Reform party, in the House of Commons, will avail themselves of the present Session to enunciate their views on those public questions which are likely to present themselves for solution at the next general elections.”

But that is not all. Last year the *Montreal Witness*, which is also a Grit paper, published a correspondence from a person who occupies a prominent position in the Liberal party of Ontario. I think it was Mr. Robertson, of St. Catharines, a well known Liberal. This friend of the Liberal party complained in that correspondence that his party had no programme, and that his chiefs were deficient in energy and unanimity. Here are a few of the complaints he made:

“A general survey of the condition and prospects of the Liberal party in Canada leaves, on the observer, three distinct impressions. 1st. That the Liberal chief displays a great want of energy; 2nd. That his leading organ is conspicuous for its timidity and want of nerve; and 3rd. That unanimity is entirely wanting. Whether Mr. Blake and the *Globe* are influenced by public opinion, or public opinion is influenced by the attitude of the Liberal leader and his organ, may be open to dispute. It, however, is certain that Mr. Blake is making no serious effort to rally the forces of Liberalism, and that the *Globe*, while so bold and even dictatorial, is now a veritable slave to every class or organisation which may wield any political influence. There is scarcely any question of real interest to the people of Canada which the *Globe* has the courage to thoroughly and impartially discuss. We have *ad nauseam* editorial upon editorial, written in a strain of dull mediocrity, on the crimes, real or supposed, of the Dominion Government.

“A study of the political system gives no great encouragement to those who look for an active and aggressive Liberalism, and for any well-united and well-concerted attack on the present abuses of authority. A homogeneous Liberal party in Canada has no existence. There are Liberals in Ontario, Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, but there is no union between what should be sections of one great army. Local issues determine to a great extent the results of elections in some of the smaller Provinces, and are not without their effect on the smaller ones. No great principles, no common policy, unite the Liberals of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick with those of Quebec and Ontario. The battle of Dominion elections is fought by regiments recognising no common commander, and the result is anarchy and defeat.”

And this is not the only Liberal paper from which I might quote. Here is another extract from the *Waterford Star*, of the 26th of January, 1885. An article headed “Reform Platform” concludes as follows:—

“We repeat that what the Reform party needs at the present crisis is aggressive leaders and representatives in Parliament and fewer good-Lord good-devil men. We have endeavored to keep posted as to the politics of the day, yet if any one asked us to define the policy of our party, we would have to say, with the *Mail*, “We haven’t got any;” at least, we haven’t been able to discover it. We write the above in no captious spirit, for the mere purpose of fault-finding, but because a sense of duty compels it. We have suffered two ignominious defeats as a party at the polls, and will suffer a third unless we become more aggressive and take steps to define our policy and divide the House on it, to show the people we mean business and not mere clap-trap.”

Well, if the Liberal members, if the Liberal papers, if the Liberal electors, have that same opinion of their chiefs, and come to the conclusion that they have no programme which could be accepted even by the Liberal party, I ask them how the Conservatives who, for a thousand good reasons, have no confidence whatever in the opinions and policy of our hon. friends opposite, could be converted to their opinions. But that is not all. Some time ago the Liberal party gave a great dinner in the city of Montreal. On that occasion the member for East Quebec delivered a speech, in which he expounded certain views which will astonish those who have not yet read it:

“Gentlemen, remember one thing: if the whole population was composed of such men as the members of the *Club National* we would be independent already.”

So that the hon. member for East Quebec is in favor of immediate independence, even at the risk of throwing us into the arms of the United States.—

“But such men as you are a minority in the country.”

Mr. TASSÉ.

That has been known for a long time.

“If to-day we are not independent, if we are still a colony, the fault, if there is a fault, does not lie with the metropolis, but with the Canadian people who, let us admit the fact, do not deserve their independence.”

So that the member for East Quebec thinks that the Canadian people do not deserve their independence.—

“Gentlemen, before we get our independence, the people of our country must be taught to be patriotic, for I do not hesitate to say that they are deficient in patriotism.”

According to the leader of the French Liberals, the people of this country are deficient in patriotism. This is a high compliment, which will, no doubt, be appreciated at its full value.—

“I can say it unhesitatingly, because their answer is written in plain letters on the ballots of our representation. Look at what is taking place in Quebec. Out of sixty-five members, you will find fifteen in the ranks of the Liberal party. Am I to be told that we are a patriotic people? Am I to be told that the people who has not resented the abominations of which we have been the victims since the month of October, 1879, is a people of patriots? For my part—I regret it for the country’s sake—but I repeat it, our people are deficient in patriotism. What, gentlemen! when the party who has been guilty, on the 29th of October, of the darkest treason ever mentioned in the history of any country; when the party who has cut down the head of patriot-martyr, when that party has, under such circumstances, found grace before the people, and when the people, instead of nailing these traitors to the pillory, have absolved them, and what is more, have rewarded them, am I to be told that patriotism is to be found among such men? If we had our independence what would we do with it? I fear that we would rank with the nations where public interest is made subservient to private interest. I fear that we would come down to the rank of the people of Mexico, Guatemala, South America, and ever so many others.”

Well, I would like to know what the supporters of the hon. member for East Quebec think of such an astounding opinion. I should like to know from the hon. member who will address the House after me to-night, what he thinks of his chief, when the latter says that the people of the country are lacking in patriotism because they do not claim their independence? Not content with underrating their own country, the Liberal chiefs have become so enraged with disappointed ambition that they even insult the people. The member for East Quebec wound up his remarks by saying:

“Now you will, perhaps, ask me, before I am done, what the chances of the Liberal party are. To-day we are not very numerous”—

I believe our friends opposite hold a similar opinion on this point.—

An hon. MEMBER. We have the quality.

Mr. TASSÉ. I have no doubt that is the opinion of our hon. friends opposite. Only the people do not hold the same view. Let us hear more from the member for East Quebec:

“At Ottawa we are hardly more numerous than we are at Quebec. Here we are fifteen out of sixty-five; there we are sixty out of two hundred and ten. I have often thought that the Liberal party was like the saints, that is to say, our Kingdom is not in this world!”—

It takes a great stretch of imagination to find points of resemblance between the Liberal party and the saints, even on this point:

“But I begin to have ideas which are more bright and pleasant.”

I do not see why the French leader should begin to see things under a more pleasant aspect, for in spite of repeated contests his party has never exceeded the number of the small *Rouge Pleiade*, whose memory is far-famed. I do not think that the Province of Quebec have more confidence to-day in the policy of the Liberals than they had formerly. On the contrary, all the elections which have taken place, or nearly all, have about maintained the glorious position held by the Conservative party the day after the great contest of 1882. And while, on the one hand, Mr. Laurier complains that his country does not deserve independence, we see the hon. member for East York swearing by all that is good and great that he intends to die for the English flag.

It is true that the member for South Huron also appears to be leaning towards independence, while the leader of the Opposition has pronounced in favor of Imperial federation. This is a new proof that the Liberal party has no unanimity, has no acceptable programme. In that same speech which I have just quoted, the member for East Quebec said that since the *coup d'état* had been condemned, the Conservative party in his Province was a mere plaything in the hands of Sir John. Even yesterday I heard the hon. member for South Huron telling us that he was in favor of the maintenance of a truly national spirit. And yet this same hon. member said at Napanee, in 1883, that the people of Upper Canada ought to form a league, as they did twenty years ago, to put down what he called French domination. Thus, while we see, on the one hand, the member for East Quebec preaching that the Lower Canada Conservatives were only puppets in the hands of the First Minister, on the other hand we see the leader of the Opposition complaining that the Province of Quebec rules with absolute power over the whole country. Mr. Speaker, the people seeing that, on the one hand, the Liberal party has no well-defined programme, and that what programme they do have is unacceptable in many respects; seeing that, on the other hand, the Conservative party has a policy which is based on the protection of our great agricultural and industrial interests, a policy based on the development and construction of the great works which are indispensable to the prosperity of the country, the people of Canada, I do not hesitate to say, will continue their confidence in the Conservative party, who have done so much to deserve it.

Mr. HACKETT. I think the House and the country are to be congratulated on the very able and satisfactory statement made by the Finance Minister. It must be gratifying to the people of Canada to know that the financial affairs of the country are in a very satisfactory condition. For the last year or so hon. gentlemen opposite have been going about endeavoring by every means in their power to decry the credit of Canada. They have stated on almost every platform, and their press has repeated the statement, that the people were leaving the country in large numbers, that taxation was rolling up at a fearful rate, and that the debt of the country was something enormous. Now, we are glad to know from the statement of the hon. Minister of Finance that these assertions are quite unwarranted, but that the credit of Canada as a borrowing country stands high in the money market of the world—that in fact our securities occupy a front rank. We are also glad to know that notwithstanding that large amounts of money have been appropriated for public improvements, the debt per head of the population is less than that of a great many other countries, and not so great as that of other countries on this continent. What is the reason, Sir, that things are in so satisfactory a condition? In my opinion, we must attribute it to the beneficial working of the National Policy. Those of us who were in this House in 1879, when the policy was inaugurated, will remember the vicious opposition that that policy met with from hon. gentlemen opposite. We then saw these hon. gentlemen rise, one after another, and assert, in the most confident language, that this policy was going to ruin the country, that it would be the means of creating vast monopolies, and that the consumers of the country would be ground down under the iron heel of those monopolies. Again, in 1882, when the Government appealed to the people for a confirmation of this policy, we had to meet the same arguments. We were told that great cotton lords and great sugar lords existed in the country, and that these men, after making fortunes out of the poor people of the country, in a few years, were in London, Paris, Rome and other cities of the old world, spending their money lavishly. But two or three years later we have

a different story told on the floor of this House. We are now told that these men are all ruined, and that the capital they have invested has all been lost. We know that depression does exist; but this fact we have to comfort us: that the consumers of the country are buying the articles required by them for the support of themselves and their families at a cheaper rate than has ever before been known in this country. This is the result of the National Policy, and this I consider is very satisfactory to the people. Now, Sir, without entering into the abstract question of the National Policy, I may say that my object in rising on this occasion is to correct some errors that the hon. member for Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) made on the occasion he addressed the House a few evenings ago. That hon. gentleman on that occasion made a very remarkable speech—remarkable for its inaccuracies, remarkable for the way in which he compared our country with the countries of the world, by distorting facts and figures to show that Canada occupied a very poor position as compared with other countries. I am glad to say, however, that the hon. gentleman directed his remarks principally to the Dominion of Canada as a whole. Some two or three years ago, when the hon. gentleman took his seat in this House for the first time, speaking of the financial condition of the country, he singled out Prince Edward Island as being especially ground down by the National Policy. He told us on that occasion how the people were being driven out of Prince Edward Island, how whole rows of houses were to let, how the wharves were deserted, how no business was doing, how everything was so depressed and demoralised that men having money were afraid to invest it, and how the greatest ruin prevailed in that Province. I admonished the hon. gentleman on that occasion that he was doing a great wrong in decrying his Province, and that his remarks would have a bad effect upon its credit. I am glad that since then he has learned wisdom, and that my admonition has had a good effect; because in addressing the House now he does not confine himself to Prince Edward Island, but speaks of the whole Dominion. The hon. gentleman, at the commencement of his remarks, treated us to a little dissertation on loyalty. It was called out by some remarks made by the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster), to the effect that there was no respectable gentleman at present in the Liberal-Conservative party, or no respectable newspaper in the country, advocating annexation to the United States. The hon. member for King's made that statement, and I believe it to be correct. He stated, further, that there was a paper, he believed the only one in the Maritime Provinces, advocating annexation, published in the city of St. John, and edited by a supporter of hon. gentlemen opposite. The hon. member for Queen's, in reply to that statement, singled out something that had been said long years ago, long before the Provinces were united in a Confederation. He singled out some remarks made by the hon. Minister of the Interior, I believe, and other gentlemen occupying high positions in the country; he also referred to some remarks made by Mr. Beaudry, of Montreal. With all this, I do not see what we in Canada, at the present time, have to do. We know that before Confederation the North American Provinces had separate tariffs and separate forms of Government, one not amenable in any way to another. We know the struggles that men had to undergo in those times to gain the privileges we now enjoy. We know that it was only after fearful struggles that responsible Government was obtained in this country. And it is an honor to the men who were then ruling this country that they stood up and declared: We will have our rights, or go for separation from Great Britain, and for the independence of the North American colonies. Amongst other gentlemen, he singled out the Minister of Finance. He wanted to prove that the Minister of Finance was an annexationist. He said he was the treasurer and secretary of an annexationist society;

and, to prove his statement, read an extract from a proclamation issued by that society. I will read that extract from the proclamation, to show to what lengths the hon. gentleman would go to sustain an assertion :

"The time has come for this Province to address the Sovereign, with the explicit declaration that unless relief be obtained separation from the Empire and the independence of the North American colonies will be desirable."

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Not a word about annexation.

Mr. HACKETT. Yet the hon. gentleman said the Finance Minister was treasurer of an annexationist society. I consider it unworthy the hon. gentleman, holding a front position, as he does, in the ranks of his party, to so distort facts as to make black appear white and white black. As the hon. gentleman has entered into the question of loyalty, I hope he will pardon me if I read a portion of a remarkable speech which he delivered in 1880, not prior to but since Confederation. At that time the question of the ratification of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company was before this House. The hon. gentleman called a meeting of the electors of Queen's county, P. E. I.; the meeting was held in the market hall at Charlottetown; and in the course of a very long and able speech he uttered the following sentiments:—

"We are now asked to consent to a contract which will seal up that great country and hand it over to a monopoly, a contract which will be an iron hand upon the neck of every young man who goes there as a tiller of the soil, a contract from which there is no escape, politically or commercially, excepting one, and that is annexation to the United States. It is an escape which no politician likes to talk about, but it will come one day, and when it comes we must take our chance and make the best bargain we can."

The hon. gentleman, as an American statesman would say, considered annexation to be the manifest destiny of Canada. He would make it appear that, rightly or wrongly, we should be annexed to the United States. The hon. gentleman, before he charges others with disloyalty, should consider his own utterances. I see behind him the descendants of some of the loyalists who left the United States after the close of the revolutionary war, leaving all their property behind them, going to the then sterile and inhospitable shores of Canada to gain a livelihood for themselves and their families. I would commend the hon. gentleman to their care; and if they do not prosecute him for his seditious language, I hope, at any rate, they will not associate with him. The hon. gentleman went on to take up the question of the exodus, which appears to be a live question at the present time. Referring to the remark of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster) that he did not believe that there was any such exodus from the country as was pictured by the hon. gentlemen opposite, the hon. gentleman said :

"He says that proclaiming that there is such a thing as an exodus to the United States is calculated to injure the country, and that it should not be stated, though it is the truth. A truce to sentiment, let us have facts. What are the facts? It is a fact contained in the census report, a fact well known to the hon. gentleman, a fact which he could not shut his eyes to, a fact which he has heard repeated and has never heard challenged in this House, that in the United States there are 712,000 Canadians to-day, and yet he says there is no exodus."

That may be very correct, but I want to show you, Sir, why an exodus has taken place from this country. One of the chief causes is the utterances of hon. gentlemen opposite, the mournful wail they raise on all questions connected with Canada, the terrible pictures they draw of the dire distress of our people—all which have had the effect of driving out of the country very many people. They became discontented. They said: It is surely a good country to emigrate from; it would be dangerous to remain in it much longer, and those who had means to go were induced to go, by the terrible pictures of distress drawn by hon. gentlemen opposite. Amongst those who encouraged this exodus, to a large extent, figure the hon. member for Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies)

Mr. HACKETT.

In that remarkable speech which he delivered at Charlottetown, he had also something to say with regard to the exodus, and the bad effects the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company would have on emigration to Canada. In very emphatic language he depicted the miseries of the people of Ireland, who, he said, were suffering under the iron hand of the landlord, and who were compelled to seek refuge in America. And he said :

"If they come here and the contract becomes law, they will simply jump from the frying pan into the fire"—

Is not that a noble sentiment? Is not that calculated to encourage immigration?

"As the great North-West will be entirely into the hands of the most powerful of landlords, are emigrants fools enough to go there? No, they will go to the American Republic, where they will have freedom."

These were the utterances of the hon. gentleman on that occasion, and I quite believe they are calculated to have a very great effect in dissuading immigrants from coming to the shores of Canada. Although we know hon. gentlemen opposite are very much in the habit of going on in this style, we sometimes find in their ranks people who will rise above party considerations and give utterance to patriotic sentiments. In Summerside, the shire town of the country I have the honor to represent, the *Summerside Pioneer*, a newspaper edited by a gentleman who supports the Opposition and who is a very respectable man, whom I am glad to know, rises on occasion above party feeling and gives utterance to live sentiments. In November, 1883, the *Summerside Pioneer* stated as follows, with regard to the exodus:—

"It may be well enough for young persons who have no means of making a living to try their fortune elsewhere; but we consider it a mistake for those who are moderately well off to rush after imaginary wealth."

He goes on to say—I would ask my hon. friend to give particular attention to what he says :

"There are always croakers in every community, who make a business of crying down the place in which they live, and this Province has its full share of such people. Persons of that stamp would turn the Garden of Eden into a frog pond, with a green scum on its surface. It is no wonder that our young people, growing up with the steady wail of discontent in their ears, should seek other fields on being able to leave the parental nest."

I think the editor of the *Summerside Pioneer*, supporter, as he is, of the hon. gentlemen opposite, very aptly described the effect of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, not only in this House but in the country. It would appear that when the hon. gentleman referred to the 712,000 Canadians at present in the United States, he would make out that they all went there since the inauguration of the National Policy; that all these people were driven out of Canada through the effects of that policy, and were obliged to seek a home in the United States. Let us look into that statement. In 1870, according to the United States census, 490,000 people, natives of Canada, were in the United States. That was before the introduction of the National Policy. In 1880, only one year after the National Policy became the law of the country, we find 712,000 native Canadians in the United States, the exact number cited by the hon. gentleman, so that if you take the decade from 1870 to 1880 and add the death rate, which, according to a very elaborate calculation of the leader of the Opposition, made last year, would amount to 21 per cent., we find that the total number of Canadians who went into the United States during that decade would be 345,000, or about 34,000 a year. Thus only 34,500 of the 712,000 left the country under the National Policy. Still the hon. gentleman would make it appear, and he sends his speeches broadcast through the country, that 712,000 people were driven out of Canada through the effects of the National Policy. The hon. gentleman went on to refer to the great progress

that was made in the United States. He stated that at the close of the civil war the United States had a debt of \$2,500,000,000, or \$69 per head of population while now it was only \$25.39 per head, and he said that the people of that country had made all this great progress since the close of the war. But, when the hon. gentleman from King's, to whom he was referring, stated that they had nothing to show for the debt at the close of the war, he said they had four or five millions of negroes to show. Everyone knew that. Everyone knew that the great struggle between the north and south was over the question of the negro slaves, and every humane and benevolent man in every civilised country in the world was glad to find that the result of the war was the freedom of those people, and that men should cease, in North America at least, to trade in the blood and flesh of each other. But that was a war of destruction. The hon. member for King's was perfectly correct. It was a war of destruction, and they had nothing to show but the negroes, and what to do with them was absorbing the attention of statesmen in the United States at that time. That war not only brought desolation and misery to thousands of firesides, but destroyed millions of property, and Sherman's march to the sea itself laid waste more property than would build two Canadian Pacific Railways. But if the great progress to which the hon. gentlemen referred did take place, what was the cause of it? Did the Americans, at the close of their war, adopt the policy of free trade? No; they adopted the opposite policy. They found they had five millions of negroes on their hands, and they found it necessary, in order that they might provide employment for these negroes, to adopt a policy which would create industries and give employment to these people; and the result of that policy has been that the United States has progressed so much that the debt is almost wiped out, and that the progress is going on day by day. And, though hon. gentlemen opposite may say that because the Democratic party has got into power they are going to adopt a different policy, we know from all sources of information that that is not the case, and that the American people are wedded to the system of protection to American industries, and will not give it up. The hon. gentleman was not satisfied with making an unfavorable comparison between Canada and the United States, but he also made a comparison between England and Canada. It is manifestly unfair to make a comparison between an old country like England and a young country like Canada. We are all proud of old England; we are proud of being a loyal dependency, if I may say so, of that great country; we are proud that our nation places us under the protection of its flag; we are proud of the great energy and enterprise of the British people, and of the way they have carried their commerce on every sea of the world; but while we are proud of England we must also be proud of Canada. Canada is our home, Canada is where we expect to live, and while we love the old country we should love Canada more. The hon. gentleman makes a comparison between the trade of England and Canada. I deprecate the action of an hon. gentleman who professes to be patriotic, and in making a comparison, distorts the figures, for the purpose of making his own country appear in a bad condition as compared with the country to which he is referring. He says:

"We find that the volume of our trade to-day is not as great as it was in 1873. In 1873 the volume of our trade was \$217,000,000; to-day, instead of its having advanced by leaps and bounds, as we had a right to expect, and as I do not hesitate to say it would have had there been ordinary prudence exercised in the management of affairs in the North-West, had there not been reckless extravagance shown in the administration of our affairs, the volume of our trade is but \$207,873,000."

Then he went on to say:

"I find that in 1867 the total trade of England was £501,000,000. In 1881, instead of remaining stationary, as ours had done, the total trade had gone up to £720,000,000."

Now do you not see the injustice of that comparison? He takes from 1873 to 1884, eleven years of Canada, and compares it with sixteen years in England, and because the sixteen years of English trade has shown a greater increase than the eleven years of Canadian trade, he says we are not making as great progress as they are. This is the way in which he distorts his figures. To show what the trade of Canada is, and to make a fair comparison, I will take it from 1873; and give ten years. The aggregate trade of Canada in 1873 was \$217,801,203; in 1883 it was \$230,339,826, or an increase of \$12,538,623 in the ten years. That is quite different from the statement made by the hon. gentleman. He took one of our best years in the past and compared it with one of our worst years at present, and he took one of the worst years of England in the past and one of the best years at present, in order to make it look as bad as possible for Canada. But, if we look at the exports of the country, which are more important in this connection than the aggregate trade, we find that the exports of the products of Canada in 1873 amounted to \$89,789,922, and in 1883 to \$98,085,804, an increase in our exports of \$9,295,882, or a yearly increase of nearly a million dollars. The imports of England in 1873 amounted to £371,287,372, and the exports to £255,164,603, the exports and imports together making a total of £626,451,975. In 1883 the imports were £426,891,571, and the exports £239,799,473, making a total of £666,691,044, showing an increase in 1883 over 1873 of £40,239,069. But, while the total trade had increased, the exports had decreased. In 1873 they amounted to £255,164,603, and in 1883 to £239,799,473, or a decrease in the ten years of £15,365,130, as compared with an increase in Canada during the same period of about \$10,000,000. This is quite a different statement from that of the hon. gentleman, but it is a correct statement, and it is the only way in which you can apply a fair test to the trade of the two countries. But the gist of the hon. gentleman's argument was to prove that our trade had fallen off under the National Policy; that is what he was driving at all the time, and to show that he was quite incorrect in his statement and that the trade of Canada has advanced under the National Policy, I will take the five years of the Mackenzie Government and five years of this Government, and compare the two. The figures are these:

<i>Mackenzie Government.</i>	
Aggregate trade, 1874	\$117,565,510
do 1875	200,957,262
do 1876.....	174,176,681
do 1877.....	175,203,355
do 1878.....	172,405,454
Total	<u>\$940,308,362</u>

<i>Present Government.</i>	
Aggregate trade, 1880	\$174,401,205
do 1881	203,621,683
do 1882	221,556,703
do 1883.....	230,339,826
do 1884.....	207,803,539
Total.....	<u>\$1,037,712,936</u> 940,308,362

This shows an increase of trade amounting to \$97,404,574

under the National Policy, in four years, or an annual average increase of \$19,480,905. This, I think, is a fair way to state the trade of Canada and to place its condition before the countries of the world, and not the way in which the hon. gentleman from Queen's has done it. But the hon. gentleman was not satisfied with comparing the trade of Canada with the trade of England and placing our trade in as unfavorable a position as possible, in comparison with the trade of the old country, but he made a comparison of the workmen of Canada with the workmen of

England, and he endeavors to show us that the workingmen of England were better clothed, better fed, and better paid than the workingmen of Canada. I will read to you what he said with regard to that matter. He is referring now to a pamphlet on political economy by Mongredin, and he says :

"The poor people in England have better food and the purchasing power of their wages enables them to buy double the quantity of food they did ten years ago. I may be pardoned for reading the figures in regard to five articles. In 1871 they consumed per head of bacon 1 38 lb., and in 1877 8 lbs.; of wheat and flour they consumed 150 lbs. in 1871, and 203 lbs. in 1877; of raw sugar they consumed 41 lbs. in 1871, and 54 lbs. in 1877; of tea 3 92 lbs. in 1871, and 4½ lbs. in 1877; and of tobacco 1 36 lb. in 1871, and 1 49 lb. in 1877. Here we see that this coarse, good food—leaving out the article of tobacco—bacon, and wheat, and flour, and sugar, are consumed per head in double the quantities in England to-day that they were ten years ago. The wages of the English workingman enable him to buy better and more food for himself and his family than he could ten years ago. Can you say as much for Canada to-day? I say you cannot."

That was the statement of the hon. gentleman, and you will notice how unfair he is again. He takes the period from 1871 to 1877, in England, and he compares that with the Canada of to-day. If he wanted to make a fair and impartial statement of the condition of the workingmen of the two countries he ought to take the workingman of England of to-day and compare him with the workingman of Canada of to-day. But I do not think, looking at his list of articles, that the English workingman could suffer much from indigestion; at all events, I do not think that a pound and a-half of bacon in a year would overload his stomach to any great extent. I would be sorry to see the workingmen of Canada obliged to live on so small a quantity. But, to show the condition of the workingmen in England to-day, I will read you a cablegram, published in the press of this country, dated London, 17th January, 1885, which shows that there is not that great prosperity in England amongst the working classes that he would have us believe :

"A mass meeting of unemployed workingmen was held in front of the Royal Exchange this afternoon; 10,000 people were present. Henry George, Helen Taylor, William Saunders, and other well known Radicals were loudly cheered as they appeared."

You will note it was the hon. gentleman's friends who were the orators of the day on that occasion—Radicals. The hon. gentleman loves to be called a Radical, and his friends were to the front orating to the workingmen of London on that occasion :

"The speaking began at 3 o'clock. Radical pamphlets of the most advanced description met with immense sale. Some of these were headed in bold type with the words 'Blood, bullets and bayonets,' and presented an extraordinary appeal to the 'half starved, herring-gutted, poverty-stricken, parish-damned inhabitants of the Disunited Kingdom.' A resolution was passed declaring 'That the depression in trade and the chronic poverty and difficulty of finding work are intolerable evils which those who suffer them ought not to tamely endure.'"

There is the condition of the workingmen of England at the present time. The hon. member for Hants (Mr. Allison) read an extract from a newspaper this evening, showing that the industries in Windsor, in his county, were in a prosperous condition, and stating that there were few or no unemployed people there. I believe the same may be said with regard to the rest of the country. When you compare that with the statement I have just read from England, I think it is favorable to our country. But we know the workingmen of England are not employed to-day. We are sorry for it, but still we ought not to endeavor to make it appear that these workingmen cannot find anylum in Canada, or that if they come over here they will find it much worse than it is in their own country. We know that a large delegation of workingmen waited on Lord Granville, and stated that 30,000 men were out of employment in London alone, and asking how to find employment for them, that they might be able to support themselves and families. When we know this we should not conceal the facts; or, if we state them at all, we should state them in such a manner as to show that the

Mr. HACKETT.

workingmen of Canada are not in such a bad position as the workingmen of England. The hon. gentleman must know that the agricultural industry in England is very much depressed; he must know that free trade, that great nostrum which his friends would apply to this country, has not worked beneficially to the farmers of England. He stated that the farmers of this country were the bone and sinew of the Dominion. I agree with the hon. gentleman, and I believe that is the case with regard to every country. They are the producers of wealth, and on them, to a large extent, must depend the prosperity of the country. We know that the agricultural industry in England is very much depressed. I have here another cablegram, dated London, 12th December, 1884, which is published in the *Toronto Globe* :

"The Central Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution asking for parliamentary enquiry into the cause of the agricultural depression, with a view to protection."

That is a singular resolution, in view of what we had the other evening, from the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Gillmor), who lauded the free trade policy adopted in England forty years ago. The Central Chamber of Commerce has a different idea of the matter :

"An amendment in favor of free trade was rejected by 28 to 9."

Then again, the hon. gentleman says that protection has reduced the value of real estate in Canada. Well, I find another telegram dated at London, 1st December, 1884 :

"An estate in Devonshire, one of the most beautiful and fertile counties in England, has been sold for £8,000, for which £18,000 was refused a few years ago."

This is the condition of commercial affairs in England, and if we were to have the same nostrum applied to our country which hon. gentlemen opposite say is working so well in England, I think it would be found by the farmers of Canada that real estate would depreciate in value, and that the country would be in a much worse condition than it is now. In fact, I am of opinion that were it not for protection at the present time the country would be in a very deplorable condition indeed. I believe it is the protection of Canadian industries that has tided Canada over the present crisis which has existed all over the world; and that the fact that our working people are able to deposit their earnings in savings banks, instead of sending them to the United States to buy foreign commodities, has been largely the means of keeping up the trade of the country and carrying Canada through the commercial crisis. Another statement has been made in this House, with regard to our shipping. The shipping interest is a very important one in this country. Those of us who come from the Maritime Provinces know the value of that great industry, and while we see it is declining we know that it is impossible to assist it in any way. The fact is, that iron vessels are superseding wooden vessels; steamships are superseding sailing vessels, and the carrying trade of the world will shortly be done by iron steamships. Now, England has the greatest mercantile marine in the world, and in the Statesman's Year Book for 1885, I find that the registered vessels belonging to the United Kingdom, in 1883, as compared with those in 1868, show, in the fifteen years, a decline of 7,382 in the number of sailing vessels, and of 1,364,285 tons; and in steam vessels an increase of 3,316 in number, and of 2,805,971 in tonnage. We must devise some means by which we can build iron steamers in this country, for wooden sailing vessels must go down before iron steamers. The hon. gentleman from Queen's, P.E.I. (Mr. Davies) also referred to the fact that the deposits in the savings banks in the country were no index of the state of the country; that, in fact, an accumulation of deposits in the savings banks would indicate a commercial depression in the country. He says, in regard to that :

"I tell hon. gentlemen, those of them that come from the Maritime Provinces, at any rate, that we know, every one of us knows, that it is a fact that these saving banks deposits are not the savings of the labor-

ing classes at all, to any appreciable extent. They are the moneys belonging to trustees, to well-to-do farmers and others, to lawyers and those kinds of people. We know that the laboring classes do not, to any appreciable extent, deposit in them."

I do not think the hon. gentleman is correct—I am quite sure he is not correct. I saw a statement the other day made, that the largest proportion of the deposits in the post office saving banks of the country is made by the working classes, and that the merchants and capitalists are to no great extent depositors in those banks. I presume the hon. gentleman will not be satisfied with my version of the story, so I will give him the highest authority that, in the estimation of the hon. gentleman, can possibly be given. I will give the hon. gentleman himself. Last year that hon. member, in this House, was advocating the establishment of savings banks in Prince Edward Island, more especially at Summerside, which I represent. The hon. member was not aware, at that time, that a savings bank had been established there about a year before. I had no idea of informing him of the fact; I thought it better to leave him in blissful ignorance of it. That bank was established a year before the hon. gentleman spoke, and at that very moment there were in the vaults \$100,000 of the savings of the people of Prince county, of the farmers, fishermen and mechanics, and not of money belonging to merchants, traders or manufacturers. But the hon. gentleman, in his zeal for savings banks, made an interesting statement on that occasion. He said:

"The object of these banks is to enable small farmers and laborers to deposit their savings in them."

The hon. gentleman made a very different statement here to-day. I am quite willing to take the statement last year and place it against the statement this year and leave the House and the country to judge between them. But the hon. gentleman also made a reference to the fact that shortly before the famine in Ireland very large accumulations were made in the savings banks. I think that was a very unfortunate reference to an unfortunate circumstance. There is no country in the world which he could have used to worse advantage in illustrating his case than that of Ireland. If any country affords an example of the curse of free trade it is Ireland. Free trade has killed Ireland. There was a time when the manufactures of Ireland were found in the markets of Europe and even of the United States. There was a time when Irish linen, poplin and frieze and woollen goods generally were to be found all over the world. But it is not so to-day, under the influence of free trade. When England's manufactures had been established under a system of protection the embargo was removed from Ireland; direct importations were not allowed to Ireland, but goods for Ireland had to be discharged at English ports; after having the capital drawn from Ireland to assist in the development of English industries, the protective tariff was removed and free trade was established, and the result is that the people of Ireland are not in a position to embark in industrial enterprise, but are dependent on the cultivation of the soil for their support. That is how we find that free trade has destroyed Ireland, so that the people have to depend principally on the potato for their living, having no industry outside of the farm to engage in; that the population are idle about nine months in the year, and that when the potato fails there is famine. Had Ireland the opportunity afforded under protection, manufacturing industries would be established. She possesses great water power and valuable mines, and under a fostering tariff manufactures would, in a short time, be established. We know that the people of Ireland were very much troubled when they found that free trade was adopted in England. I find the following queries sent by an English correspondent to the *Nation* newspaper, one of the most influential and ably-conducted journals published in Ireland:

"Q. Is there an entirely free trade between Ireland and England or between Ireland and all colonial ports?"

"A. Yes; quite too free. Your Legislature kept up commercial restrictions only till Irish trade and commerce were finally crushed and the capital which ought to have sustained them effectually secured to England. Then, when the current of trade was established—Irish raw produce to England, English manufactures to Ireland—you offered us free trade. It is not more free trade, but less free trade that Ireland wants now.

"Q. Are there any obstructions to Irish commerce, trade or manufactures, which do not exist with regard to the same in England.

"A. Not now; having stripped us bare and secured the markets of the world to yourselves, you can now afford to say to Ireland: What hinders you from rivalling us? Up, and be stirring. Behold your trade is free."

We know the position of Canada, lying as it does alongside the United States, is similar to that of Ireland to England. We know that they are more favorably situated in Ireland than we are in Canada, because while we allowed American manufactures to come in here at low rates of duty, they built up a wall and kept our manufactures and raw products from the markets of their country. The manufactures of Ireland have free access to the markets of England while we are deprived, as I have said, of the markets of the United States. As a means of self-defence and self-support it became the interest of the Canadian people that we should adopt in a large measure the same kind of policy as prevails in the United States. There is a small book which I see largely distributed through the House—the report of the commissioners appointed to inquire into the condition of our manufacturing interests. That report has received very severe criticism at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite. I wondered why that book of all books had received such sharp criticism at their hands, but on opening it I at once saw the reason. It showed that there are manufactures in the country, and that although a certain amount of depression does exist, yet they are in a fairly prosperous condition; and for this reason hon. gentlemen opposite criticised it most adversely.—

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Is it correct?

Mr. HACKETT. In some respects. The hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Davies) also criticised the book; but he dealt with it very gingerly, and at length threw it down with a sneer. He said it referred to the lobster industry; and he asked: What has the National Policy done for that industry? I am going to inform him. We know that since we have adopted the National Policy we have had sufficient revenue to meet expenditure and had a surplus. As I have had the honor of a seat in this House since 1879, I know that deputations waited on the Finance Minister for the purpose of taking 5 per cent. duty off tin plates, and thus relieve the lobster packers of a certain amount of taxation. For tin is not manufactured in this country, but is brought from England, and this duty of 5 per cent. was a direct tax on the lobster packers and the people of the country. Owing to the operation of the National Policy the hon. gentleman has been able to relieve the packers of that duty, and he has also been able to reduce for them the duty on other material; and, in addition to that, for the purpose of encouraging and promoting the fishing industry of the country, owing to the National Policy they are able to pay the fishermen—a most deserving class—a bounty of \$150,000 a year. I do not know that I need follow the hon. gentleman to any greater extent, but I want to say a word with respect to reciprocity. Coming from Prince Edward Island, I know that reciprocity of trade with the United States would be of great advantage to the people of that island. We feel there that the markets of the United States are the only ones available for one of the main products of the island—potatoes. If we had reciprocity the farmers of the island might go to raising and exporting them largely, but at present they are debarred from that privilege. The imposition of a duty of 15 cents a bushel has been sufficient to shut them out of the American market. And while a great deal has been said with regard to

who pays the duty, the people of Prince Edward Island, who export their potatoes to the United States, know very well that they are called on to pay the duty. The consumer there is not called upon to pay it; if he were, reciprocity would be of no advantage to the people of this country. They know, when they take their potatoes there, and enter the Custom house and pay 15 cents a bushel in gold, and go to the wharf and sell them, the American potatoes are there side by side with theirs, and the American producer receives the same price as they do, and consequently pockets the 15 cents. I trust, therefore, the Government will take every means in their power to obtain reciprocal trade with the United States. I know it is the desire of the Government, but while this standing invitation, of which we have heard so much, has been on the Statute Books of the country, I think that the Government should go further. It was impossible to get it while the Republicans were in power, because they rejected the overtures of hon. gentlemen opposite when they sent the Hon. George Brown to negotiate a treaty, and I think it is scarcely possible that, having rejected those proposals, they should accept the proposals of another Government. But now there is a change of Government in the United States; the Democrats are in power, and it is believed the Democrats are favorable to extending the trade relations of the United States, and it is therefore quite possible that reciprocity might be obtained from them. I have noticed lately that a number of reciprocity treaties negotiated or inaugurated by the Republican party have been allowed to drop out, and nothing more has been heard of them. I trust the Government will endeavor to secure reciprocal trade with the United States. But, Sir, while we should endeavor to obtain a reciprocity treaty with the United States, we should also remember the important interests which are involved in our trade relations with the West Indies. The Government should not allow this matter to rest. The people of Canada are interested in that trade; a large amount of trade is done with those islands, and I hope the Government will use their efforts in this direction also. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail), said, this evening, that the National Policy had utterly killed the trade between Canada and the West Indies. Surely he did not consider the expression he used, for he must be aware that the trade has increased materially between Canada and the West Indies, and that the aggregate trade with those islands is one million more than it was in 1878. I trust the hon. gentleman will see that he was misinformed, and that the National Policy has not destroyed that trade, but on the contrary has fostered it, and I hope that measures will be taken by the Government to extend our trade in that direction, and thus secure for us a market for many of our commodities in the West Indies. Another matter to which I would refer is the protection of our fisheries. We know that the Washington treaty expires on the 1st of July, and that, from information we have lately received as to the action taken by the American fishermen, in calling meetings and passing resolutions declaring that the treaty was injurious to them, there is no possibility of the treaty being renewed at present. I trust, therefore, that the Government will take energetic and active steps to protect our fishermen and keep the United States fishermen outside of the three-mile limit. I am also glad to see, by the resolutions before the House, that the Government propose to place a duty on American fish, similar to that which exists on our fish going into the United States. This will be to the benefit of the fishermen of the Maritime Provinces. A large quantity of fish is brought into Canada and sold in the western Provinces, but by the imposition of a duty the people of the Maritime Provinces will be able to supply the western Provinces—the markets of Ontario, as well as Manitoba and the North-West Territories—to some extent, I believe, without an increase of price to the

Mr. HACKETT.

consumer. I am glad to see that this system of the protection of the fishermen is receiving so much attention from the Government. The hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) says that the great cause of the discontent in the Maritime Provinces was that so large an amount of money was thrown away on the Canadian Pacific Railway. He said that millions and millions were thrown away on that work. Now I think that was a rash statement for the hon. gentleman to make. He was a member of the late Administration, in which he held an important position, and he knows it was the policy of his Government to build that railway. He knows that they entered into large expenses for building the line from Port Arthur to Selkirk. He knows they expended a large amount in making that famous historical work, the St. Francis locks. He knows they sent rails to British Columbia to build the railway west of the Rocky Mountains. He knows that they sent surveyors out to survey the line across the mountains; and while all this was being done, surely it was not done to deceive the people; surely there was some intention to honestly and faithfully carry out this work to which the Dominion was pledged. I am sorry indeed to find the hon. gentleman now find fault with the expenditure of money in the same way in which it was intended to be spent by the Government of which he was a member. But the hon. gentleman, to show that there is great discontent prevailing in the Maritime Provinces, stated that a resolution was before the Prince Edward Island Council and Assembly, looking to the placing of the claims of Prince Edward Island for steam communication with the mainland, winter and summer, at the foot of the Throne. That is a fact; the resolutions are there. The people of that island have suffered for want of this steam communication; they exhausted the constitutional means for the purpose of endeavoring to carry out that work, and they are now seeking constitutional redress by going to the foot of the Throne. But it is not because of any commercial depression in the island, or any discontent with the Confederation. The people are loyal and true to the Confederation. They accepted the terms with loyalty, and they remain loyal and true to their country. To show that there is no widespread discontent on the island, and that the people there are fairly prosperous, I will read an extract from the speech of his Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, at the opening of the Sessions, on the 11th of March instant:

"Although, in some respects, the harvest was not so abundant as in other years, yet no cry of distress has been heard; while the steady advance which our people are making in material prosperity, the undisturbed public health and general contentment that prevails, are blessings for which we cannot be too heartily thankful and which it is our duty to acknowledge with feelings of the most sincere gratitude."

This shows that there is no discontent on Prince Edward Island, but, on the contrary, that there is general prosperity and that the people are content and happy. He goes on to say:

"It is indeed pleasing to notice, year after year, the advancement which is being made by our farmers in the science of agriculture as well as by other classes of the community in various manufactures and industries."

Thus showing that the people of Prince Edward Island are progressing in agricultural science, and that other industries are springing up over the island. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I need trouble the House at any greater length. I felt it my duty to make these few remarks, and I thank the House for the patient and considerate manner in which they have listened to me.

Mr. COCKBURN moved the adjournment of the debate. Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 12:15 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, 23rd March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

CONSTRUCTION OF DRY DOCKS.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 108) to amend the Act to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance on certain conditions to companies constructing them. He said: An Act was passed in 1882 to encourage the construction of dry docks by granting assistance under certain conditions. The intention of the amendment is to provide for the case of the city of Halifax, by adding after the words "such work," in the original Bill, the words "or in the case of a dock constructed at the port of Halifax by the city of Halifax." The law at present provides only for the case of incorporated companies, and this amendment is made to enable the city of Halifax to enter into an agreement for the construction of a dock.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

TROUBLES AT PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to make enquiry respecting some information I have received. I have been informed that the half-breeds and Indians of Prince Albert, under the leadership of Louis Riel, have combined against the lawful authorities, have taken possession of the settlement and imprisoned a number of officials and others refusing to join in the movement. It is also stated that the Government has been informed of what is going on, that assistance has been asked for by the settlers, and that the demand of these half-breeds is that some recognition or action shall be taken by the Government upon a Bill of Rights which was submitted, as we were informed by the newspapers, last season. I have also been informed that the Winnipeg Field Battery has been ordered to proceed to Prince Albert.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. It is true that a number of half-breeds, led I believe by Louis Riel, have cut the wires and stopped communication between Qu'Appelle and the crossing of the south branch of the Saskatchewan. It is alleged that they made prisoners of several of the telegraph operators, that the wires have been cut, but one of them has been repaired. The immediate cause is not known. A telegram says it is believed that the proximate cause of the rising, was a letter stating that Riel was not a British subject. I made enquiry, and I cannot find that any such letter has proceeded from any quarter within my cognisance or the cognisance of the Government. Whether such a letter has existed or has been alleged as the cause of complaint, I do not know. There are certain questions connected with the half-breed claims which have been in process of settlement. Some of the claims are exceedingly unreasonable; others are in process of adjustment. The Bill of Rights has never been officially, or indeed in any way, promulgated so far as we know, and transmitted to the Government. The field battery has not been sent. I may say, however, that it was thought prudent last summer to have some additional force in the vicinity of Prince Albert, and we asked the Hudson's Bay Company to give us Carlton, which is a station and post of that company, the buildings of which are comfortable, and in the vicinity of the settlement of the half-breeds at Duck Lake. Captain Crozier has been there and has now 100 men at Carlton; and there is a force of ninety men within striking distance, to use a military phrase, of Carlton,

and we believe they will join Captain Crozier at Carleton to-morrow night or Wednesday morning.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. LISTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called I desire to offer a personal explanation. When the Minister of Marine was speaking the other day with respect to the road between Emerson and Winnipeg, I used these words:

"I just wish to say, in answer to the hon. Minister of Marine, that I went to Winnipeg in July, 1878, and the road was then open."

I desire to say that when I made that statement I believed it strictly correct; but I have since made enquiries and have satisfied myself that as to the time I was in Winnipeg I was in error. It was 1879, not 1878. I owe this explanation to the Minister, the House and myself.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 48) respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell).

Bill (No. 49) to incorporate the Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell).

Bill (No. 53) respecting "La Banque du Peuple."—(Mr. Girouard.)

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association, Limited.—(Mr. Curran.)

Bill (No. 84) for the relief of Amanda Esther Davis—(from the Senate).—(Mr. White, Cardwell.) On division.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH OF CANADA.

House resolved itself into Committee on Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell, for Mr. McCarthy.)

(In the Committee.)

Mr. MACKENZIE. I desire to call attention to the third section of this Bill. In my opinion it is beyond the power of this House to pass the section as it stands. I would like to hear the mover of the Bill give some explanation of this clause. I think it undertakes to confer powers that we have no right to confer.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What clause is that?

Mr. MACKENZIE. The clause giving power to enforce discipline in churches.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). Did we not pass a similar clause in all the church Bills before? Was it not in the Methodist Church Bill?

Mr. MACKENZIE. I do not think so.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In the Methodist Church Bill we confirmed certain regulations which had to do with the question of discipline.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Well, if we undertake to give powers to a church to enforce discipline amongst its members, we may do anything. I do not think we have any right whatever to do that. I would ask the attention of the hon. leader of the House to this point.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I would suggest that the Bill be allowed to go through Committee, and that concurrence should not be moved until Mr. McCarthy is here to defend his own Bill.

Mr. EDGAR. The hon. member in charge of the Bill stated in the Private Bills Committee that that was the usual clause which was inserted in church Bills before.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Under these circumstances we had better let it go through.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The mere fact that other Bills contained an improper provision is no reason why we should perpetuate it.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh, no; only it leaves an inference that the House has not passed illegal Bills before.

Committee rose and reported.

DIVORCE BILLS.

Mr. EDGAR moved the second reading of Bill (No. 106) for the relief of Alice Elvira Evans—(from the Senate).

House divided.

YEAS:
Messieurs

Abbott,	Homer,	Robertson (Hamilton),
Allen,	Innes,	Robertson (Hastings),
Armstrong,	Irvine,	Rykert,
Bain (Wentworth),	Jackson,	Scott,
Baker (Victoria),	Jenkins,	Shakespeare,
Blake,	Kilvert,	Small,
Bowell,	King,	Somerville (Brant)
Burpee,	Kinney,	Somerville (Bruce)
Cameron (Middlesex),	Kranz,	Springer,
Campbell (Renfrew),	Lister,	Sproule,
Carling,	Macdonald (Sir John),	Stairs,
Cartwright (Sir Rich'd),	Mackenzie,	Temple,
Cochrane,	Mackintosh,	Tilley (Sir Leonard),
Davies,	Macmillan (Middlesex),	Townshend,
Dodd,	McCallum,	Trow,
Dundas,	McCraney,	Tupper,
Edgar,	McDonagald (Pictou),	Tyrwhitt,
Ferguson (Welland),	McLellan,	Vail,
Fisher,	McMullen,	Wallace (Albert),
Fleming,	McNeil,	Wallace (York),
Foster,	Mills,	Watson,
Gault,	Moffat,	Weldon,
Gillmor,	Mulock,	White (Cardwell),
Gordon,	O'Brien,	White (Hastings),
Hall,	Paint,	White (Renfrew),
Harley,	Paterson (Brant),	Wigle,
Hay,	Pruyn,	Williams,
Hesson,	Ray,	Wilson,
Hilliard,	Reid,	Woodworth.—87.

NAYS:
Messieurs

Amyot,	Dugas,	Langevin (Sir Hector),
Auger,	Dupont,	Macdonald (King's),
Béchar,	Gagné,	McMillan (Vaudreuil),
Billy,	Geoffrion,	McGreery,
Blondeau,	Gigault,	Mclsaac,
Burns,	Girovcard,	Massue,
Caron,	Grandbois,	Pinsonneault,
Catudal,	Gunn,	Pope,
Chapleau,	Hackett,	Riopel,
Cimon,	Hurteau,	Taschereau,
Costigan,	Landerkin,	Tassé,
Daly,	Laundry (Kent),	Wright,
Dessaulniers (St. M'rice),	Langelier,	Yeo.—40.
Desjardins,		

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Bill (No. 107) for the relief of Georg Louis Emil Hatzfeld—(from the Senate).—(Mr. Kilvert.)

Read the second time on same division.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—GRADES, TANGENTS AND CURVES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What is the number and what the aggregate length,—1, of the level parts of the Canadian Pacific Railway; 2, of the grades with the average grade; 3, of the tangents; 4, of the curves with the average curvature?

Mr. POPE. I have not got all the information desired, but will give all the information I have. Level parts, Mr. EDGAR,

length 641; 2,737 in number; changes of grade, 5,832; length, 1,909 miles, 20 feet per mile.

Mr. BLAKE. You have got to a tangent; I suppose you will give me the rest another day?

Mr. POPE. I will try.

FISHERIES INSPECTOR, BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) asked, What is the name of the Inspector of Fisheries for the Province of British Columbia; when was he appointed; upon whose recommendation and what is his present salary?

Mr. McLELAN. The name of the Inspector is Geo. Pittendreigh. He was appointed 10th August, 1884; he was promoted from fishery overseer to the inspectorship on the death of Mr. Anderson, on the concurrent recommendation of the hon. members for New Westminster (Mr. Homer) and Vancouver (Mr. Gordon). salary, \$800.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Which are the branch lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway whereof 269 miles were stated in the papers laid before Parliament last Session to have been constructed, and what was the constructed mileage of each such line?

Mr. POPE. Algoma Branch 93 miles, Selkirk 23, Pembina Mountain Branch 103, Stonewall 22, Emerson 15, Greta 14.

CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH RAILWAY.

Mr. YEO asked, Has the Government paid the contractors for the construction of the Cape Traverse Branch Railway the balance due on their contract? If not, what amount yet remains in the hands of the Government? Is it the intention of the Government to insist on the payment of the workmen engaged upon the road before paying the balance (if any) due contractors?

Mr. POPE. The Government have paid the contractors. Nothing remains in the hands of the Government. The contractors say they have paid all the men, but if any should turn out not to be paid, they are ready to pay them; they are quite able to do so.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—GRADES AND CURVES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What are the maximum grades and minimum curves which are within the conditions imposed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Act as understood by the Government, and referred to in the various documents approving of the location of sections of the line?

Mr. POPE. Maximum grades 16 feet; minimum curves 11 degrees.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—AVALANCHES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the attention of the Government has been called to the published reports of avalanches in the Selkirk range close to the Canadian Pacific Railway works, and whether any reports of engineers or experts or witnesses have been ordered or have been received by the Government bearing on the question involved?

Mr. POPE. The attention of the Government has not been called to published reports. The inspecting engineer has been ordered to take careful notes as regards avalanches in the Selkirk range and to report upon the same. The instructions were given last fall.

DUTY ON RICE.

Mr. SHAKESPEARE asked, Is it the intention of the Government to increase the duty on rice this Session ?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is not the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to increase the duty on rice this Session.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—CHANGE IN ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr. BLAKE asked, Whether the Government, or any Minister, has as yet received any written communication from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company proposing any change in the existing arrangements? If so, when? Will the paper be laid on the Table ere long?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government on Thursday received an application from the Canadian Pacific Railway proposing a change in the existing arrangements, which was taken into consideration on Saturday; it has not been accepted.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the papers be laid on the Table ere long?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. They will, but perhaps we may receive another application.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE NORTH SASKATCHEWAN.

Mr. McCALLUM, in continuing his remarks on the motion for copies of reports, etc., as to the improvement of the North Saskatchewan River for the purpose of navigation (page 615), said: When you declared it six o'clock on Wednesday last, I had not concluded my remarks in making this motion. I brought it up with a view to the improvement of the North Saskatchewan, and in order to urge upon the Government the desirability of putting a sufficient sum in the estimates to get a thorough survey to lay before Parliament at its next Session. I have every confidence in the North-West, I have every confidence in the Pacific Railway, I know the North-West is destined to be a great country, and I am satisfied that this country cannot expend any money for any purpose that would be more beneficial to the interests of the country than the improvement of this river. It runs for 1,000 miles parallel to the railway, at a distance of from 100 to 200 miles from it. That will give another route which is a water route from Edmonton, at the head waters of navigation, to Winnipeg, and all the branches to be built from the Canadian Pacific Railway into the Peace River country will cross this river, and in summer time this river will become a feeder to those branches. In other words, they can go on by water and transship at Winnipeg. I was up there last summer and I ask you to look at this country. Some people appear to have no confidence in that country at all, and think we are going to ruin this country by building the Pacific Railway. I would like to say a word on the future of that country. Let anyone look at the vast extent and resources of that country, and let him look back at the United States and what it formerly was. Let him look back at Chicago, and I expect that at no distant day we shall have another Chicago at Thunder Bay. I venture to make the prediction that, if the Government and the people of this country have confidence in themselves and do all they possibly can to settle that country, to encourage immigration and settlement, in less than five years a single track railway will not be able to do the business between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, and in less than ten years you will want four tracks. I do not look for more than one track to do the business north of Lake Superior which will do the service in the winter time, but you will want in ten years time three or four tracks from Port

Arthur to Winnipeg. Then, when we have our elevators built, Port Arthur will become an important point, giving employment to Canadian shipping, and will be the means of reimbursing us for the large expenditure on the Welland Canal. I would urge the Government to give us at least \$25,000 or \$30,000 to get a survey of this river. I hold in my hand all that I can find in the way of information concerning that river. I hold the report of the Minister of Public Works, and I may read an extract from it. It says:

"The navigation between the mouth of Red River and Fort Edmonton is performed by three steamers of the Hudson Bay Company, one of which plys between Red River and Grand Falls, near Lake Winnipeg. These falls are impassable for vessels. Here the company has built a tramway, about four miles in length, to overcome the falls, which involves the transshipment of passengers and freight. A second steamer runs from the head of the falls to Carlton House, say 400 miles. A third steamer completes the journey, thence to Fort Edmonton, 410 miles. The entire journey of 1,073 miles is said to occupy about a fortnight. The depth available during low water is said to be from three to four feet or less."

"Three to four feet or less." Now, if it said three or four feet or more, I would be perfectly satisfied, and I would not have brought this notice before the House, but it says, "or less," all I ask the Government to do for the interest of that country is to give them four feet of water, and my information leads me to believe that the expenditure of a million of money would give a continuous navigation for over 1,000 miles and make another outlet for the products of the North-West to come this way. I believe \$20,000 has been expended in removing boulders and so on in that river since Confederation. The Government placed that in the hands of the Hudson Bay Company. I do not say it has not been expended all right, but I would prefer to see it expended under the Department of Railways or under the Department of Public Works. I do not want any of our moneys to be handed over to the Hudson's Bay Company to be expended as they think proper. The report also says:

"At the Session of 1883 the further sum of \$10,000 was voted to continue the improvements to this river, which are being carried out by the Hudson's Bay Company under an arrangement with this Department, which sum, added to \$4,178.77 carried forward from 1882-83, made \$14,178.77 available for this purpose. During the fiscal year the work of removing obstructions between Edmonton and the mouth of the river were carried on under the direction of Mr. O. J. Brydges, and will be continued during the current year, an appropriation having been made for that purpose. Expenditure during the fiscal year, \$14,900. Total expenditure on the river, \$20,537.71."

Well, whatever expenditure is made in the future I want it to be made under the supervision of the Government. I believe if the Government of this country would do their duty by the North-West, they would encourage immigration into that country. I see the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) is looking at me now, and we all had pleasure in reading his account of that country after he had come back from it. He deserves a great deal of credit for making that trip, and I wish that every hon. member on the other side of the House would also visit that region and they would cease belittling their country. I believe the Government of this country, and the members of this House will do their duty by encouraging immigration and by pushing forward to completion the great Canadian Pacific Railway, and I venture to say if they do so, at no distant day the country along that great river would be the happy home of millions of people.

Mr. ROYAL. It is a matter of great gratification to the members from Manitoba to hear the expressions used by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, about the prospects of the North-West and the duty of the Government to encourage immigration into those parts of the country. It is equally gratifying to us to know that every hon. member who goes to Manitoba and visits the North-West comes back next Session fully impressed with the importance of that country; and we are sure that every hon. member who comes up to the North-West and visits us will make a speech in the House the next Session dilating upon the im-

portance of the agricultural resources of that wonderful country. With regard to the motion just made by my hon. friend, I believe that no one can deny the importance of opening up the navigation of the Saskatchewan River. But, Sir, apart from that I believe that it is very important that the North-West should be opened up by railways. We know that railway facilities are much more prompt and much cheaper than navigation facilities, and as soon as the railways at present under construction are completed they will certainly meet all the requirements of the country for a few years, at least. However, this would not prevent the Government, if there is sufficient money in the public coffers, from improving the navigation of the Saskatchewan. I believe, also, that if the Government would spend a sum of money in opening up the navigation of Lake Manitoba, I believe it would be equally as well spent, because opening up certain districts of the Carrot River, for instance, which empties into Lake Manitoba, would develop the timber resources of the Porcupine Hills. A petition to that effect has lately been placed before the Minister of Public Works, who takes such a deep interest in the development of Manitoba and the North-West, a petition signed by all the merchants and traders who have anything to do with the navigation of that river, or with the development of the timber interest in that part of the country. The petition called the attention of the hon. Minister of Public Works to the importance of opening up the navigation of Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipegosis, with that of some of the rivers which empty into those lakes. Without wishing in the least to detract from the importance of improving the navigation of the Saskatchewan, a navigation, which, so far, is rather spasmodic and uncertain during portions of the year, I believe if the Government could afford to cut a canal between these two lakes it would open up a very large, growing, and most valuable section of the country; it would open up the valley of the Carrot River, and tend to develop the timber resources of that part of the country. I repeat in conclusion that it is very gratifying to the members from Manitoba to know that whenever an hon. member has an opportunity to come up west and visit us, he comes back with his mind fully impressed, and at the same time totally unprejudiced, with regard to the importance of paying more attention to the development of that country.

Mr. WATSON. I desire to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) who has brought this matter to the attention of the Government. We can hardly realise the importance of improving the navigable streams for the development of that country. I also endorse the sentiments of the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) as to the desirability, not only of improving the navigation of the Saskatchewan, but of Lake Manitoba, and the opening up of the timber limits on the Porcupine Hills, and Lake Winnipegosis north of Lake Manitoba. Last year there was an appropriation made for the improvement of the Waterhen River. I am aware that none of that sum was expended in improving the Waterhen River, but the money was spent in preparing for dredging, and it is to be hoped that the dredging plant will be of some service. I think the Government was wise in coming to the conclusion that it would not be right to spend any money on the improvement of the Waterhen River. I made a trip up that river last year, and I think that any money spent upon it would be thrown away.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. What you want is a canal.

Mr. WATSON. We want a canal across Meadow Portage, which is only one and three quarters of a mile wide, with no engineering difficulties in the way, and having a fall of only 19 feet, which would require two locks to overcome the
Mr. ROYAL.

difference in levels. If this canal was built, and the Saskatchewan improved in the way mentioned by my hon. friend, we would have a water stretch from White Mud River on the Manitoba and North-Western Railway, to Edmonton with the exception of Mossy portage. It will open up a large trade. I believe there is a company formed with the idea of building a tramway from the headwaters of Lake Winnipegosis to the waters of the Saskatchewan, and such an enterprise would open up a considerable traffic in that direction. Some improvements have been made on the White Mud River connecting Lake Manitoba with the Manitoba and North-Western Railway. I hope that the hon. Minister of Public Works will see his way clear to put a sufficient sum in the estimates to start this work this year, if not complete it. There are large tracts of timber limits granted, but they are not being operated, and the leases of some of them have actually expired. These people claim that the reason for not operating the limits is that they cannot handle their lumber with any convenience or profit. I hope that before this Session closes the Minister will bring down an amount for the purpose of cutting a canal across Meadow portage.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I am glad the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) has brought this matter before the House. I have not myself had an opportunity of visiting the Saskatchewan region, but in the various trips I have made to the North-West, I have made a great many enquiries about it, and I believe he is perfectly correct in saying that a moderate expenditure of money would be likely to open up several hundred miles of navigation whether to the extreme length mentioned or not, I do not know. At present, if open, it is only for a very brief season at all events. I was informed that in addition to the boulders, which are comparatively easy to remove, a good many shifting sand bars and deposits of mud occur from time to time, which are not so easily dealt with. In any case I think I may fairly say to the hon. member for Monck that although on this side of the House we have entered very strongly our dissent as to the wisdom of the steps which the Government have taken in the development of the North-West, we feel as deeply impressed as he can wish us to be with the enormous importance of developing that country, and to any measure which we believe reasonable and likely to promote the real welfare of the North-West we are as desirous of lending our aid as are hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. BLAKE. We always thought well of the magnificent water stretches.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course the Government will bring down any papers in their possession; but I am sorry that we have not many bearing on the subject. The fact is we have not had a survey of the river, which surely, according to the member from Monck, would involve work on 1,000 miles. No doubt the hon. member would scarcely expect the Government to make the whole survey at one time, but he would be willing that they should do the work by degrees. This, as well as the other question of the canal between the two lakes, will no doubt come before the Government when we take up the supplementary estimates. The question in regard to the canal is one more within the Department of Railways and Canals than in my Department, though I must say the matter was brought very specially before me the other day by a deputation, the members of which thought that as I had visited the North-West I would take special interest in the development of that country. As the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Royal) has stated, the more we go into that country the more we become convinced that it is a country with a great future before it. There can be no doubt that millions of people will find happy homes there, and with a proper administration, as I hope we are giving and will give that country, this Government with the help of Parlia-

ment will be enabled to throw a large immigration into the North-West which is required to open it up and develop its resources. The question of the Waterhen River was brought before us several times, but the amount of expenditure supposed to be required for that work was rather too large for the present. We thought it might be postponed for that reason. The other question as regards the canal may be in a different position, but we have not given it that attention which it must receive when we consider the public works that may be undertaken either next year or the year following. As regards the survey of the North Saskatchewan, if we were to undertake the whole survey of the 1,000 miles, it would be beyond our means this year; perhaps we may give some help in that direction, though I am not in a position to pledge the Government to even that just now. At all events the matter will not be lost sight of, and I will take care that when we take up these matters, the North Saskatchewan survey, which has been brought forward by the hon. member for Monck, will not be forgotten.

Mr. MACKENZIE. There are already surveys in the Public Works Department of the region around Lake Winnipegosis.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I did not say otherwise. We have those surveys; they were specially prepared in order to show the difference of levels and so on. I do not think the work is a very difficult one. I understood the hon. gentleman spoke of Lakes Manitoba and Winnipegosis.

Mr. MACKENZIE. A lock might be built between Lake Winnipegosis and the Saskatchewan River.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I was looking at the surveys the other day. It will be more a financial than an engineering difficulty.

Mr. MACKENZIE. One lock might do. 18 $\frac{7}{8}$ feet was the difference in the levels. There is no difference between the Saskatchewan and Lake Winnipegosis. So if two small cuttings were made navigation would be open from the south end of Lake Manitoba all the way to the Rocky Mountain House during the season of navigation, even without any material improvement in the Saskatchewan River itself.

Mr. McCALLUM. I do not ask the Government to expend a large sum this year, but I urge the Government to place a sum for this survey in the estimates and lay the matter before Parliament next Session. I ask \$30,000 or \$35,000, and I am credibly informed that that sum will be all that is necessary to make the entire survey from Lake Winnipeg to Edmonton. The hon. gentleman has spoken about difficulties occurring in the river that may involve a large expenditure. We do not know about that matter; but owing to the interest involved, the Government and the House will be justified in expending \$25,000 or \$30,000 to secure a survey of a river which, in a state of nature, is now navigated for 1,000 miles. The Government should not hesitate to expend that money if we even have to borrow it and pay large interest on it. We should have the survey made and the report laid before this House at its next Session.

Mr. IVES. I did not quite understand whether the hon. member for Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) concurred with the hon. member for Monck (Mr. McCallum) in the opinion that it would soon be necessary to provide for a four-track road from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. I should like to understand whether the ex-Finance Minister agrees with that part of the hon. member's speech?

Motion agreed to.

SUMS PAID TO JUDGE G. M. K. CLARK.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT moved for:

Return of all sums (apart from his salary as County Judge) which have been paid to G. M. K. Clark, in each of the years 1879, 1880, 1881,

1882, 1883 and 1884, respectively, and for what services in each year; also what sums, if any, have been paid to him from the 1st January, 1884, to this date.

He said: In moving this resolution I desire to call the attention of the House to an entry which hon. members will find in the Auditor-General's Report, which reads as follows:—

G. M. K. Clark, County Judge, salary.....	\$2,000
do fee as arbitrator, Canadian Pacific Railway.....	1,200
do Intercolonial Railway Commissioner, 9 months, at \$450.....	4,050
	<u>\$7,250</u>

I do not know that there is any grave objection to be raised to the Government, in a special emergency, availing themselves of the services of a gentleman like Judge Clark for a particular purpose. But this is not the case here. Judge Clark appears to have been employed for a period of five years, if not for six years, practically as a Government official. I am not sure whether during that time Judge Clarke paid out of his own pocket for the discharge of the duties of his position as County Court Judge. I rather believe he did, but in such a case it would be as well that the facts should be known and stated, because I should be very sorry to prejudice that gentleman in any way. I dare say Judge Clark may have discharged the duties which were assigned to him very well, but it appears to me that this system is entirely wrong in principle. It appears to me that to take a county judge away from his own county, practically for the greater part of five years, or it may be six, is a disturbance of, or it may be an interference with, the course of justice, and the better that judge may be why of course the more the county suffers. This thing appears to have been growing up into a practical abuse. There are other gentlemen who appear to have been discharging two or three offices at the same time, though I see none in which a sum has been paid so largely in excess of their original salary as was paid in the case of Judge Clark. We have always laid down the principle that the Government should interfere as little as possible with the judiciary, and although the County Court Judges have not the same duties to discharge as those of the higher bench, everybody who knows anything of the administration of judicial duties in the Province of Ontario, knows that they have important duties, and that it is not desirable that the Government should take any member of a county bench and assign him duties which bring in a salary three or four times as large as he would ordinarily expect to receive in the discharge of the duties of his office. I do not want to enlarge on the matter, but I think a very injudicious act has been committed in this case, and I think it is desirable that the attention of Parliament should be called to the matter, and therefore I move for a return which I have given notice.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the whole the hon. gentleman is right in stating that we should not interfere with the judges in the performance of their judicial duties—at all events, there should be no sacrifice of the public interest in the employment of a judge, in taking him away from his judicial duties, or if those duties are neglected and the county or locality suffers by the absence of the judge. But in this case no such difficulty arises. The counties of Northumberland and Durham are fortunate in having a junior judge of as great industry as the senior judge—Mr. Benson, who performs all the duties to the satisfaction of the locality.

Mr. MACKENZIE. One judge is enough then.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Judge Clark is not absent continuously; he has been sitting while these matters have been going on from time to time. Judge Clark was appointed to one of these Commissions in the first place, and he was found to have performed his duties admirably—

because besides being a good lawyer, as he is well known to be—he is a man who understands business in a commercial sense, a thorough business man—that he has been a great protection to the public revenue against the continual demands of the contractors and sub-contractors who had to do with the public—the continual assaults which the hon. gentleman opposite me (Mr. Mackenzie) knows are made by all contractors for public works in the way of claims on the public Treasury. Judge Clark has been invaluable in that regard, and while I believe he has done full justice to those parties who have had claims against the Crown, he has, from his happy combination of a commercial ability and legal knowledge, protected the Crown to a large extent. It has not escaped the Government that it would be well if we could find another man to fill his place, but we have seen and known his abilities, and so for the purpose of protecting the public interests he has been employed. But one reason why the Government have brought down a Bill to establish a Court of Claims was to cure this anomaly. We hope to have a judge at the head of that court, with assessors similar to the official arbitrators under the Board of Works and the Railway Act, who will deal with all such subjects in a very satisfactory manner, and prevent what we consider almost a necessity of having a proved man at the head of these Commissions, to look into these very large claims brought against the Crown.

Mr. MACKENZIE. You have taken cases out of the Exchequer Court and placed them before Judge Clarke.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, these cases were in the Railways Department; they were claims of all kinds, and the Commission was framed for the purpose of examining them.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The late Government provided that all claims should go before the Exchequer Court, but the succeeding Government deliberately took cases out of that court and sent them to arbitration, causing a loss in one case to the country of several hundred thousands of dollars. This was an utterly indefensible proposition; and now the hon. gentleman is coming back to our ground, but instead of the Exchequer Court, he is establishing a court for the purpose—one which will only take the place of the Exchequer Court. I cannot understand the hon. gentleman's persistency in the matter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Of course one does not like to say anything about the Exchequer Court, but the result has been that the country has lost exceedingly by the judgments given by that court.

Mr. MACKENZIE. On what judgments?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I do not like to bring that up; it is rather a delicate matter to impugn the judgment of the court. The hon. gentleman will understand that the Judges of the Exchequer Court have written evidence before them, and not seeing the witnesses but reading the evidence and giving the same credence to all statements made by all witnesses, whether defendants or not—

Mr. MACKENZIE. The hon. gentleman is mistaken; they see the witnesses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD—but with one judge sitting who is a business man, with assessors, they will be able to have the case examined carefully, and I think there will be a great saving to the public by the new Bill.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course we are not discussing a new Bill, but I may say that the course which the hon. gentleman adopted was to place before a set of arbitrators or commissioners, of whom Judge Clark in his capacity of arbitrator was one, a very large number of claims which had

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

already been disallowed by the Exchequer Court. I think it will be found that something between three and four million dollars—perhaps I am understating the mark—have been disallowed. What the hon. gentleman did was to submit them to a second adjudication, and several hundreds of thousands of dollars were ordered to be paid by these second arbitrators. The only case that I have heard complained of, with reference to a decision of the Exchequer Court, or a judge of the Exchequer Court, was the case of the Prince Edward Railway accident, in which we heard Sir Charles Tupper very vehemently denounce the principle of action upon which the learned judge who tried that case proceeded. In the cases which have gone before the Exchequer Court in its original jurisdiction, as well the railway cases as others, the judge did hear the witnesses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. A single judge.

Mr. BLAKE. Yes, certainly. The single judge did hear the witnesses, and it was only by way of appeal that the question could come before the other court; and the hon. gentleman's present proposal is in accordance with that practice. Now, my hon. friend has brought up a question which is really of very grave consequence. I esteem it to be of very, very grave consequence that the Government of the country should withdraw from his proper judicial functions for a period of years one of the judicial functionaries of the country. With regard to the County Court Judges, I cannot speak for the other Provinces, but I will say that, in the Province of Ontario, I believe that more of those matters of litigation which affect the mass of the people—having regard to the great number of matters which come up, and the standing and means of those in litigation—come before the County Court Judges than before those of the Superior Courts. I esteem it to be quite as important—nay, more important—that the County Court Judgeships should be as well officered as the Superior Court Judgeships for the practical administration of justice in the Division Courts and the County Courts. Of course, we know that a considerable portion of the County Court administration has changed hands, but there is a large amount of Division Court administration to be attended to. But it is important that the Judge should be left to the discharge of his judicial functions. It is further important that he should not be a pensioner or servant of the Government, to perform duties assigned to him by the Government at a much higher reward than he receives for his whole services as a County Court Judge. The public accounts of last year show that Judge Clark has been for nine months at \$450 a month a servant of the Government, as arbitrator; and he has been paid \$300 a month in former years. That is not a position in which a judge should stand. He ought to stand in an independent position; and it is impossible to regard a judge as independent of the Government when the Government is at liberty to employ him at a salary or an extra remuneration between twice and three times as great as that belonging to his judgeship, his judicial salary going on all the time. I am very glad to be able to confirm what the hon. gentleman has said with reference to the character and industry in the discharge of his duties of the present junior Judge of the united Counties of Northumberland and Durham. I think that appointment made by the hon. gentleman's Government did it very great credit, and I am sure it must have been eminently satisfactory to the people. But either a junior Judge is wanted in these counties or he is not. If he is, it is quite clear that the senior Judge is wanted too. If the junior Judge is not wanted, no junior Judge ought to have been appointed, as was done not long ago, when Judge Clark was appointed senior Judge in place of Judge Boswell, who resigned, and Judge Benson was appointed junior Judge. If two judges are wanted, there is a lack of judicial power in these counties, because Judge Benson, however great his assiduity, cannot do two men's work, nor ought he

to be called on to do it. These two counties, I suppose, number 80,000 souls; therefore the district is a large one, and requires proper attention. I judge the Government by their own act. I say their act in appointing a little while ago a junior Judge to these counties is conclusive proof that one man was not sufficient to perform the judicial duties there, and that being so, they acted wrongly in withdrawing one of the two men who they said were necessary. This system is a bad one; and it is growing. I see that in one of the Provincial Legislatures there is a Bill to authorise the appointment as a commissioner, with a salary I believe of \$3,000 a year, a Judge appointed by this Government and having certain duties to discharge. You cannot object to that, if you establish the precedent in this Parliament of withdrawing the Judges from their judicial functions, and making them paid functionaries of your own; you are not in a position to object to the Provinces becoming masters of their paid officers, the Judges. That is a most undesirable thing. It is a thing that was protested against in the early days, when the hon. gentleman disallowed an Act of the Ontario Legislature which was designed to give the Judges an addition to their salaries. He disallowed it on general principles—which I believe to be sound, whatever may be the defects in our present system of appointing under that system—that a Judge appointed by the Federal Government ought to be paid by it. We know that there is a law on the Statute Book, which was invoked by this Parliament two years ago, when the Government proposed to appoint Judge Johnston, I think it was, to an office in Manitoba, and it was pointed out to be against the law which existed there before Confederation, to give the Judge two paid employments, and the Government was obliged to cancel Judge Johnston's Commission. Then, in the Statute Book, we have recorded a rule, because we have forbidden the Judges of the Supreme Court to accept any other paid employment. That is the rule we lay down with reference to the very highest Judges of the land; and if we say that they ought not to be exposed to temptations and placed in compromising positions *a fortiori* we ought to observe the same rule as to the lowest.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. With the permission of the House, I would say one thing. It is true, the independence of the Judges ought to be respected, but as a matter of fact, we know that the matters that come before the County Judges are matters in which the Crown cannot in any way be interested, and the independence of the Judges cannot arise in the same way as it might with respect to the Superior Court Judges. However, I believe the country has gained a great deal by the appointment of Judge Clark, and if the policy of the Government is carried out, there will be no necessity for this question to arise.

Mr. BLAKE. As the hon. gentleman has made that observation I may make this further one—that in the very case of the learned Judge whose name has given rise to this discussion, he was actually called upon to decide whether one or another man was to sit in this House.

Motion agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF J. E. COLLINS.

Mr. McMULLEN moved for:

Return showing, if any, and if so, what sum or sums of money have been paid to J. E. Collins for services rendered to the Government, also showing travelling and other expenses paid him, if any, and showing in what position or capacity he is employed.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I do not often speak on motions of my hon. friends for papers, but in this case I will venture to depart from the general rule. I quite recognise my hon. friend's excellent intentions in moving for this return, but although I fully admit he is entitled to all information, I fear this motion may be a little hostile

to Mr. Collins. There are circumstances which, I think, I will be able to show to my hon. friend, which may make him inclined to agree with me that an exception to ordinary rules should be made in this case. Mr. Collins, I have reason to know, is a person of great literary ability, of rare insight into character, and of no small political sagacity. The name of Mr. Collins is, perhaps, more familiar to me than to my hon. friend from North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Mr. Collins understands thoroughly this great truth, that the world knows very little of its greatest men, and he has taken, as part of his mission in life, to instruct the world as to the greatest men it possesses. I am not at present referring to the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir John A. Macdonald). The particular greatest man whom he has at present undertaken to enlighten us about is no less a person than my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Sir Hector Langevin). Now, persons of a censorious turn of mind may think that the fact that Mr. Collins is in my hon. friend's Department and enjoys, I understand, the benefit of frequent intercourse with him, may, to some small extent, prejudice Mr. Collins unduly. I do not take that view of the case; I think that Mr. Collins is probably better able to estimate the great value and the great merits of the Minister of Public Works than any of the rest of us; and in proof of this, I would like to call attention to an article which has been very recently put in my hands, and of which I am credibly informed Mr. Collins is the author. It reads, with your permission, Sir, as follows:—

"Upon Sir Hector's right, in the Commons, sits Sir John A. Macdonald, and upon his left Mr. Caron, the Minister of Militia. He is somewhat below the middle height, but is well built and exceedingly graceful and courtly in his walk and movements. His head is markedly intellectual looking and distinguished in its pose and shape. His face is clean shaven save for a small goatee; and his skin is clear, fresh and beautiful, the forehead is high and broad, and the eye, which is a dark violet, is rather steadfast and contemplative than wandering or flashing."

Mr. Collins, you will observe, goes in for something like pre-Raphaelite details, but that does not in the slightest degree detract from the merits of his work.—

"He is the one Minister who never gets idle at his desk. When he is not listening to debate in which himself or his Department is concerned, he is engaged writing letters or attending to official communications. It is really a pleasure to hear him answer formal questions."

Now, I quite concur in that.—

"His replies are nearly always full and almost invariably satisfactory; but he never says more than is necessary and pertinent; never opens doors through which eagle-eyed opponents may enter and give worry to the Minister and to his Government. Two Ministers there are who are always opening their mouths too wide Mr. Caron and Mr. Pope. Mr. Blake, or Mr. Mill, or Mr. Casey or some other oppositionist will first worry them off their guard, get them to make statements that they didn't intend to make, and so put the Government "in for it," on these occasions you can notice Sir John fidgeting in his chair annoyed at the blundering and indiscretion."

So far Mr. Collins has me with him, but I must draw the line here. As for my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Mr. Caron), he is a man of war and therefore quite able to take care of himself and Mr. Collins too, but I really object to this slighting mention of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Pope). It may be, as Mr. Collins seems to insinuate, that he is rather a rough diamond and does not shine with the gemlike lustre of that polished jewel, the Minister of Public Works, but the Minister of Agriculture is not to be lightly spoken of either. In some important respects, and notably in that, the most important thing, perhaps, which distinguishes the practical politician as he is wont to call himself, the ability to take care of number one, the Minister of Agriculture is not far below even his colleague, the Minister of Public Works, and might possibly, perhaps, give him points. Mr. Collins is a man of considerable foresight; it has not escaped his attention that there is a little uneasiness in political circles. This is a delicate question I know, but Mr. Collins handles

it so well that I think I cannot do better than give the case in Mr. Collins' own words :

"I have already characterised Sir Hector as the successor apparent to Sir John. He is the only man in the Ministry or in the ranks who could with success conduct the fortunes of the party if Sir John were off the scenes. His ability and diplomacy are very great, and it is said he is hardly second to the Premier himself in his ability to smooth rough water and manage wranglesome followers."

And so on. Well I submit to my hon. friend for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) that a man like Mr. Collins must not be rudely or rashly dealt with. He has appreciated the uneasiness of the public mind, he has apparently understood that there are some people who think, and I agree with him, that it would be very difficult to replace the First Minister, but he thinks there are as good fish in the sea as ever were caught and he wants to reassure us. Hon. gentlemen may recollect that it was my pleasant duty last Session to call the attention of the House to the terms in which a gentleman named Thibeault had dealt with the predecessor of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works; and I hail it as a happy omen that as it took a gentleman of French origin to do justice to Sir Charles Tupper, it required a gentleman of English origin to do justice to the surpassing merits of the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend from Wellington may think there are objections to a gentleman in the Minister's Department taking all these pains to make the Minister's merits known, but that is a narrow and conventional view. If my hon. friend would only put himself in the place of the Minister of Public Works, and just consider the question from his point of view, he would appreciate the position in its proper light. The Minister of Public Works has a logical mind, and probably the way in which the question presents itself to him is somewhat like this: The very best use to which you can put the public money is to advance the public interest; to advance the public interest in the best way possible, you must have the best man at the helm; and in order to attain this end you must instruct the public as to who is the best man. Therefore I say the Minister of Public Works is logically justified, being convinced, as he undoubtedly is, that he is the best man in the emergency, in retaining Mr. Collins to instruct the people as to his merits. The case is clear, and I have no doubt my hon. friend (Mr. McMullen) will see it. Had we not already a poet laureate in the person of Mr. Nicholas Flood Davin, regardless of expense, I would be disposed to recommend Mr. Collins for the place, in return for this specimen of his literary excellence, but I do not wish to interfere with Mr. Davin. In any case, however, I would just say to my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works, that I hope he will not allow any scruples or delicacy to cause him to incommode Mr. Collins in the slightest degree; I hope he will keep Mr. Collins.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. John Collins.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Hon. gentlemen will recollect that I ventured to make a proposal last year, with regard to Mr. Thibeault, that if Mr. Thibeault would produce another life of another distinguished gentleman on the Treasury Benches I would supplement the Parliamentary grant myself. I will make a somewhat similar offer now to my hon. friend opposite (Sir Hector Langevin) in Mr. Collins' case; if he will keep Mr. Collins, and if Mr. Collins will produce similar articles, say one every fortnight, and let me see them, I will use all my influence to prevent any question on this side about Mr. Collins, even if he gets 75 cents extra per hour for all the time he is employed in compiling these essays and keeps his own time, as I understand is the custom of the Department. Then there is another argument which the First Minister very nearly anticipated me in, and I may say that I have

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

kept my strongest argument to the last. I understand that Mr. Collins is the Collins who has already immortalised himself by producing a life of the right hon. gentleman opposite.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. No, he has immortalised me.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. It was couched in equally chaste and elegant language, and no doubt it will be very satisfactory to the hon. gentleman's friends, because I observe from it that, in all the acts of the hon. gentleman's career which evil-minded persons have misinterpreted, he has been actuated by the purest and most patriotic motives, and has even sometimes allowed his reputation to be tarnished for the general welfare of the country. It is a happy association of ideas, and what a lamented friend of mine called "the eternal fitness of things," that a gentleman who in his life has done justice to so many John Collines should at last in his declining years find a John Collins capable of doing justice to him.

Mr. McMULLEN. I did not anticipate the discussion which has taken place when I made my motion. I simply wanted to get the information, and, since the gentleman who has just sat down gives such a strong recommendation to Mr. Collins and says he has rendered such services to the Government, I have no objection to withdraw the motion.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have no objection to the motion as made by the hon. gentleman, and the return will be brought down. So far as the hon. gentleman (Sir Richard Cartwright) has thought proper to amuse himself, and try to amuse the House by reading an article which he says has been written by Mr. Collins, I have not a word to say. It is his business, and, should he amuse himself at my expense, I will not complain; but, so far as I am concerned, I was not aware of this article, I was not aware before the hon. gentleman said so—I do not know what information he has—that the article was written by Mr. Collins who is mentioned in this motion. As to this gentleman's connection with my Department, I may say that Mr. Collins was appointed in the Department as an extra clerk on the 12th February, 1885, has been 16 days at work, and has been paid \$28, and is not employed by the Department any more. That is the whole he has received as a clerk of the Department or in any capacity, and he has not received travelling expenses of any kind. He has received \$28 all told.

Motion agreed to.

PROTECTION OF FISHERIES IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. HESSON moved for:

Copies of all correspondence and reports of fisheries inspectors, overseers of fisheries, or other persons, in Manitoba and the North-West, in relation to the destruction of fish and the necessity of enforcing the clauses of the Fisheries Act in said Provinces and Territories.

He said: Early in the Session I asked the Government whether it was intended to extend the operations of the Fisheries Act to the new Provinces west of Manitoba, and the reply was that an inspector, Alexander McQueen, had been stationed at Winnipeg, and an overseer, P. C. Gilchrist, at Fort Qu'Appelle. I desire to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to the fact that I have not been able to ascertain that either of the gentlemen appointed to these important duties in the North-West has so far made any report to the Government as to this important question of the protection and preservation of the fishing interests of those Provinces. I am in possession of letters addressed to myself from that Province which have led me to consider that, unless some steps are taken at a very early date indeed, this

important interest, the preservation of fish in the waters of the North-West, those streams will soon become as they have unfortunately become in the Province of Ontario, not only fishless streams, but polluted streams. We have good reason to know how important that interest can become in a country where proper facilities are given and proper attention is paid to it. I find that the total catch of fish in the Dominion for five years has been no less than \$77,628,679, an advance of \$15,525,736 worth of fish. The export of fish during the past five years has been no less than \$36,867,439, an average export of \$7,373,487. Now, an industry that is so valuable to the country as that is certainly worthy of the attention of this House, and the protection of the waters in the great North-West is certainly of very vital importance to that country. We know that those mountain streams abound with very valuable fish. We know that it is considered a very great luxury in that country as it is in this country. We know that the Indians, as well as the white population of that country, will be largely dependent upon that for some years to come, and it ought to be the duty of the Government to look carefully that there is no violation of the Fisheries Act. I have reason to fear that no attention whatever is paid to the Provinces west of Manitoba, and, whilst the inspector may be confining his attention to some extent to the streams immediately in that Province, that very irregular, in fact very loose, arrangements, if any, exist in the North-West, and that the destruction of the fish in those Provinces west is going on very rapidly indeed. I have received a letter from a gentleman who resides in Regina, who states that he caught, or employed parties who caught, no less than 25 tons of fish in Long Lake from the month of November to some period in February when he wrote. I placed that letter in the hands of the Minister. It was also pointed out by the same gentleman that other parties had caught about 15 tons of fish in the same lake, and in almost every case the fish were being caught at the wrong season of the year, as they were all full of spawn. If that is the case, and if the waters of the North West freeze up very much earlier than the waters here, as is more than probable, if that system of fishing is permitted to go on in the early part of November, the whole fishing interests of that country may be destroyed in a very short period indeed. You can imagine what would be the effect of putting 40 tons of fish from one small lake into the market. The price was \$75 per ton. A large portion, I believe, was sold to the Government, for the Indians, and the price, which I estimate at 3½ cents, is certainly very low. I fear the time will come at no distant day, if some effort is not made by the Government to protect those streams and small lakes in the North-West, when they will not be able to obtain fish at all, and those steps should be taken very quickly, because mills are being erected on those streams, and we know how sinuous they are, and the shoals and eddies that form in them, and the probability, therefore, of offal from the mills being deposited which the current may not carry away. Everybody here knows what the effect of that is upon our beautiful streams in Ontario, and for an instance, we have only to step to the Ottawa River, within a few yards of this building. We know that fish are not caught now as they were in the early days. I know that the same thing is going on in all the newer parts of Canada, and if mills are not prohibited from being erected upon these streams and throwing their offal into them, the effect before long must be disastrous to the fishing interests of this country. I heard a gentleman who had travelled in the North-West say that he was personally cognisant of the fact that nets are being used, or meshes with the holes only one inch in diameter, and he had travelled along the shore of one of those beautiful lakes and found them actually littered with small fish, so that he walked through them for some hours. Now, if this is permitted to go on it will terminate,

in a few years, in the total destruction of the fisheries of the North-West. I had the pleasure of spending a few days among these mountain streams in the neighborhood of Calgary, and I know there is no water so pure and so clear as that of these streams, which is probably the best on this continent. We know for a fact that mills are being erected upon them which are having a very disastrous effect upon the fish. This is particularly the case in the hilly sections where the course of the stream is swifter and where it is easier to get water power. But mills are being erected even in the prairie section of the country, on the flat lands, in the proximity of streams, and the offal is being deposited in the streams to some extent. I hope the hon. Minister will see that the officers whom he appoints will do their duty and that they will investigate these charges and see if it is possible to prevent this destruction of fish in the future.

Mr. KAULBACH. I am sorry to learn from the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that the fisheries in the North-West are being injured to so great an extent. We, of the Maritime Provinces, have experienced the same inconvenience, and I hope that the Government will offer the same protection to the fisheries of the tidal waters as to those of the inland waters of this Dominion.

Mr. MULOCK. Can the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson) say with what appliances those 40 tons of fish were caught.

Mr. HESSON. I believe, though I am not positively informed, that it was by spearing them through the ice. I think that has been the usual custom, and I think that is the danger to be apprehended.

Mr. WATSON. They catch white fish during the winter by cutting holes in the ice some distance apart and by dragging a net by a rope between the two holes and so drawing the fish out. It has been reported to me that fish are caught to some considerable extent in the North-West out of season. Quite a large business is being carried on this year on Lakes Manitoba and Winnipeg in catching fish for the Chicago market. Of course the industry is principally confined to the jack fish, or what is known in the east as pike. With regard to the season for catching the white fish, I am not very well posted in the matter, but I believe a certain quantity of white fish is caught out of season on these lakes, and it would be well for the Government to see that they are protected.

Mr. MULOCK. I think we are all agreed that it is wise to protect the fishery interests both in tidal and in inland waters, but I do not think it would be wise on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to construe the Fisheries Act, in its application to the North-West, as he has done in its application to the inland waters in the Province of Ontario. A couple of weeks ago I had occasion from my place in this House to call the attention of the hon. Minister to the regulations enforced for the protection of the fisheries in certain of our inland waters in Ontario. I was in hopes, from my remarks then, that long before this he would have seen his way to removing the grievances complained of, but as yet I am not aware that the first step has been taken towards correcting what I think is a misapprehension of the powers conferred upon the Governor in Council by the Fisheries Act—I refer to the regulations enforced since last fall in regard to the fisheries in Lake Simcoe. I do not understand that the Governor in Council is obliged either to prohibit absolutely all fishing or to allow unlimited fishing; but I think that a reasonable construction of the Act leads to but one conclusion, and that is that the Governor in Council can pass such regulations as to him may seem fit for the proper preservation of the fisheries. Now this does not involve total prohibition. What ought to be

prevented is unwise fishing, such as wholesale slaughter by netting and otherwise. But to deprive settlers along the waters of the right to take, in a comparatively harmless way, sufficient for their own use is to interfere with an almost natural right. I hope the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has, since this matter was up a couple of weeks ago, seen his way to grant relief to the section of country to which I refer. Whilst we are interested in the proper preservation of fish it seems to me that these regulations might be so modified as to permit comparatively harmless modes of fishing.

Mr. McLELAN. The hon. gentleman who has moved for the correspondence has not overstated the value of the fisheries in the North-West. The view that we took of this matter was that it was unwise strictly to apply the rules and regulations in the case of the settlers in the North-West, the same as they are applied in the older Provinces. I considered that the settlers going into that new country would, perhaps, have to depend largely upon the catch of fish for their subsistence for some considerable time, and therefore I thought it best to go slowly and cautiously in the enforcement of the Act. But the time has now arrived when some measure of protection should be given to the fish in the waters of the North-West, and I have selected a general officer for the Province of Manitoba and such portions of the North-West as may be allotted to him, and another officer for the Qu'Appelle district; I propose gradually to enforce the regulations in those districts where we may judge it desirable. The hon. gentleman will understand that throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion the close season for fishing varies very much; and that what would be a proper course with respect to Ontario would be improper with regard to the North-West. The Government will obtain information and endeavor to adopt the proper time in each case as the close season. In regard to Lake Simcoe, I may say that last season very large petitions were presented to the Department asking that that lake be set apart for the propagation of fish, on the ground that it had been over-fished and the supply considerably depleted. Acting on the prayer of those petitions an Order in Council was passed, and the lake was set apart for a certain period for fish-breeding purposes. Applications have been made since that time to allow certain parties to fish in the lake merely for domestic purposes. I do not know how far that can be done without leaving the permission liable to be abused. I am making enquiries into the matter, and if it can be possible to allow residents on the lake shore to fish simply for their own use, I see no objections to that being allowed, because I do not suppose that would be done to any extent to greatly interfere with the purpose for which the lake is set apart.

Mr. MULOCK. The hon. Minister will remember that, since the Order in Council has been in force, permits have been granted to fish during the summer. It seems impossible to understand how, if it was legal to grant permits to fish during the summer, it is illegal to grant permits to fish during the winter.

Mr. McLELAN. I am not prepared to say for what purpose permits have been granted. I do not know what the local officer may have granted, contrary to orders, or because he was not informed in time that the lake had been set apart for fish-breeding purposes, I will make enquiries.

Mr. HESSON. It was not my wish in any way to prevent a settler from obtaining such quantity of fish as he might require for family use. But I pointed out that quantities to the extent of twenty-five tons in one case had been contracted for between November and December.

Mr. WATSON. I hope the remarks made by the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) will receive the attention of the Minister.

Mr. MULOCK.

tion of the Minister and that settlers will not be prevented from taking a reasonable amount of fish for their own use. I am not very well posted as regards the spawning season; but I was informed that with respect to the white fish in Lake Manitoba, fishing could be allowed one month later than at present. The Minister, no doubt, will know the proper season, and will look into the matter. I hope that the privilege of the settler to catch fish for his own use will not be overruled.

Mr. CAMERON (Middlesex). I think there are some neighborhoods in Ontario which will be very glad to know that the Department of Marine and Fisheries is exercising some control over fishing in those sections. I know of one place, where the fishing is supposed to be of some magnitude, which only knows of the existence of fishery inspectors when the departmental reports show that they have drawn their salaries. There have been frequent complaints, I am given to understand, made to those fishery inspectors in regard to dams in that particular locality, but no attention has been paid to those complaints by the inspectors. Whether the representations have reached the Department or not, I am not prepared to say. I am glad to have this opportunity of drawing the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the fact that in one or two sections of western Ontario very serious complaints have been made, and persistently made, in reference to the obstructions of rivers by dams and other obstacles, thus preventing free fishing in those waters that would otherwise be afforded to the people of those localities.

Mr. ALLEN. A great many complaints have been made by the fishermen on Georgian Bay and Lake Huron. In regard to the use of pound-nets I would recommend the Minister to make enquiry among the fishermen who work on these lakes and others connected with the fishing business. It appears pound-nets are the great cause of complaint. The legal size of gill-nets is five inches, through which small fish pass and only the large ones are taken, while those pound-nets, I understand, are in some cases only 2 or 2½ inches. The fishermen of course complain of the advantage given to those using pound-nets, who catch all sizes of fish and destroy more young fish in a single pound-net than ten miles of gill-nets. I ask the Department to make enquiries into this matter from the parties interested, those who are thoroughly acquainted with the importance of the fishing business in those waters, and I believe the Department will obtain information of very general interest and advantage to the fisheries of the Province.

Mr. EDGAR. As the discussion has taken a somewhat wide range, I want to put in a word for a class of fish not alluded to here—the speckled trout, the beautiful *salmo fontinalis*. I am sure there is scarcely a county in Ontario where there are not streams which were once stocked with this beautiful and useful fish. If the inspectors, under the Minister's direction, would pay some attention to prevent people taking those fish off their spawning beds, a great boon would be done to the country. I also think that sportsmen and proprietors of farms all through the country would deem it to be of great advantage if the Government would take care to have some of the best streams restocked with spawn or the young of speckled trout. That fish is a great source of pleasure and delightful sport to great numbers of people, and if it was thoroughly protected it would increase the food supply of the country. This is a matter which does not appeal to the House so prominently as the great fishing interests of the tidal waters or the great lakes and rivers, but it is a matter which appeals to hundreds and thousands of people in the different Provinces.

Mr. HILLIARD. I cannot altogether agree with the remarks of the hon. member for North York (Mr. Mulock) that the restrictions in regard to fishing should be with-

drawn. I object to spearing fish even for a person's own use during the close season. I consider the protection of fish in the close season is of great advantage in our section of the country, and since the regulations have been in force, the quantity of fish has been largely increased.

Mr. FISHER. I agree with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and I can speak from experience in my own county. I am aware that in consequence of the action of the Minister of Marine in protecting fish, there has been a great increase in the number of fish there, to the great material advantage of the people of that community.

Mr. McLELAN. The meaning I intended to convey was not that these waters should be closed entirely to spear fishing, but that no one should be permitted to spear fish during the close season.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC RESERVES OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) moved for:

Return of all correspondence, papers and documents which have passed between the Imperial Government and the Dominion Government, or the Dominion Government and the Government of British Columbia, relative to the public reserves of British Columbia and to the claim of the Crown to the land between high and low water mark, and generally all information as to "Fore Shore" rights of the Dominion.

He said: It is not my intention to detain the House more than two or three minutes upon this subject. The reason I call for this correspondence is partly upon the solicitation of many influential people in the Province of British Columbia; partly on a telegram recently addressed to my colleague and myself by the hon. the Premier of British Columbia, and partly from a thirst for knowledge relating to that element which I ploughed for so many years, and consequently obtained a reasonable nautical knowledge of, and which I am desirous of having backed up by possessing the necessary legal knowledge. This subject may be divided into two divisions, and each division into three sub-divisions. As to the two divisions, the first refers to lands generally, and the second to tidal waters. As to the first sub-division of the land I desire to obtain information, particularly in regard to what lands belong to the Imperial Government or lands that at one time belonged to the Imperial Government before Confederation; next, those lands which belong to the Dominion Government, and information regarding them; and lastly those lands which belong to the Province, or are known as provincial lands. As to the second division—waters—the sub-divisions are, first, those having reference to persons who have been utilizing certain portions of certain harbors, by erecting piers and docks upon them, and thereby arrogating to themselves that they have some prescriptive right to the bed the sea in those localities. The second sub-division is the foreshore, or such lands as have at different times been submerged, or are lying between high and low water mark; and lastly the riparian rights, or those rights which individuals may possess with reference to the banks of rivers and pertain to them. Now these are matters that it would be difficult possibly for a nautical man to elicit information upon without engaging legal assistance; but I hope if the Government bring these papers down—which will no doubt be ere long, though I hope not too long—I shall then be in a position to state my views and cite instances where difficulty has arisen owing to the absence of knowledge on these subjects.

Motion agreed to.

RECORD IN THE MATTER OF EUGÈNE GOSSELIN.

Mr. AMYOT (Translation) moved for:

Copy of the record in the matter of Eugène Gosselin, of St. Charles de Bellechase vs. The Queen, as it stands in the office of the Supreme Court of Canada, including the proceedings before the Exchequer Court and before Dominion arbitrators.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not see why, the other day, when motions to be adopted without discussion were presented, this motion was not allowed to be presented as well. I do not see what objection there can be to this motion. At all events, since its presentation was objected to, it must be that somebody had something to say on the subject. I am bound to say that my object is to show to this House that the Board of Dominion Arbitrators does not at all carry out the object for which it has been created, at least in the Province of Quebec. It appears from the records asked for that these commissioners have no idea whatever of what is legal evidence. They know neither the French language by themselves nor the English language by their secretary. It is absolutely impossible for any party to obtain justice before that court. For some time past several of the cases heard before that tribunal have been brought before the Exchequer Court, and not one of their decisions has been maintained; in each case the decision has been against the Government. It is well known that these commissioners always decide in favor of the Government; and so true is this, that in each appeal the amount awarded by them has been considerably increased. In the present case, in the case of Mr. Eugène Gosselin, the proceedings are perfectly absurd on the very face of them, and their absurdity is only excelled by the decision of the arbitrators. It is a fact that this tribunal has become a constant danger in our part of the country. I have obtained recently the papers respecting the loss of horses belonging to a man named Plante, and I will give you an idea of the conduct of these arbitrators. The investigation was regularly held before them; the counsels for the Government and for the prosecution were present. The judgment of the arbitrator in charge of the case was favorable to the prosecutor, and the records were transmitted to the Minister of Justice, I believe. Subsequently it was ordered that a new witness should be heard, but this witness was examined *ex parte*, without notice being given to the prosecutor or to his lawyer; and it was only several months afterwards that it was learned that a judgment, contrary to the first one, had been rendered. I ask that the papers mentioned in my motion be brought down, in order to show that the Bill which is now before the House, and which provides for the establishment of another court, is a justifiable change, and a change in the interest of the public. I will now listen to what there is to be said on this motion, and I shall answer if necessary.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentleman does not seem to have been able to guess why anybody should have objected to this motion. The objection to which he alludes, I suppose, was the fact that several of us called "stand" the other day when it was proposed to pass this as a motion without debate. It is evident from the explanation which the hon. gentleman made that there was room for explanation with regard to the motion; and so far as I can understand the explanations he has made, they are to the effect that he wishes to show by a copy of this record for which he asks that the procedure before the Dominion Arbitrators, and before the Supreme Court was not of a character to do justice to those who have suits against the Crown. The reason why I thought this motion required explanation, and the reason why I still think it requires further explanation, and is open to objection is this: This is a case in which I believe the hon. gentleman is interested for the parties concerned—at least I have been so informed by some parties who appear to know. The record asked for is one which can be obtained from the proper officer of the court on paying the usual fees. The record asked for is one which is required, I believe, to carry the case further. At all events, it would be useful for the further conduct of this particular case, and I object to this House being made the means of obtaining records from any court to be used in the conduct of a case before

that court. I think it is unfair to the court, it is unfair to other lawyers concerned in these cases, who may not have the privilege of being members of this House, and it is unfair to this House, whose officials are already, it is said, overburdened in the preparation of returns concerning matters of purely public interest. When a case is one of private interest only, in which private litigants are suing the Crown, and where the record will be useful for carrying on the case, it should be obtained in the usual way from the officers of the court. I hope the hon. Premier will give attention to the case, and, after looking into it, will decide, calmly and judicially, whether this is such a return as needs to be brought down in the public interest, or whether it is merely a return required for the conduct of the case itself. In the latter case I think it is one that should not be granted.

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

After Recess.

Mr. AMYOT. Before six o'clock I had the honor to move for certain records, and I stated in the French language what was my object in doing so. It was to prove that the court of the Dominion Arbitrators does not give justice, and that the law proposed by the Government to replace that court is expected by the whole Province to which I belong. The hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey) opposes my motion, stating that my object was not what I had said, but was to obtain gratuitously a copy of a certain record, and he strongly objected, stating that I was personally interested as attorney in the case, and that the expense was large. I am very thankful to him for giving me the occasion to say a few words about an order given by the Supreme Court concerning the records to which he refers. But I must state first that the person who gave him the information concerning this affair gave him false information. I wish to state, as a matter of fact, that I am not interested in that record, and am no party to the case. It is true, Mr. Gosselin is one of my clients; it is true, I know all about the affair; but I would not mix up in it as attorney, because he belongs to my county, and I do not practise in my county; and besides, it is likely to give rise to difficulty with the public if a member of Parliament interests himself in a case for or against the Government. So that my hon. friend from West Elgin has been misinformed, and has falsely and wrongly informed this hon. House. I am sorry he is not in his seat, or I suppose he would apologise at once. Suppose for a moment that my object was to obtain a copy of that record against the rule laid down by the Supreme court. What is the object of that rule? I think the party who gave that wrong and false information must be the party who obtained the passage of that rule, which says that no record shall leave for one minute the custody of the clerk of that court. There is no court in the Province of Quebec where such a rule prevails. The officers and judges of the courts in the Province of Quebec have generally confidence enough in the attorneys practising there to give them access to the records on mutual consent; and if the Registrar of the Supreme Court thinks that the lawyers who practise there are not honest enough to be entrusted with the records, I think his opinion must give a very poor idea of those with whom he has been dealing up to the present time. Such an order, I know, exists in the Supreme Court, but it is an absurd order. Suppose I were interested in a voluminous record, I would have to go to the court to take communication of the record every time I wanted it. I would not be allowed to take it to my office or have it removed in any way. Well, I have been interested in lawsuits involving millions of dollars, and never has such a thing occurred in my practice. Such a rule adopted by the

Mr. CASEY.

Supreme Court is an insult to the bar; it is an injustice; and I am sure, as soon as the attention of the learned judges who preside over that court is drawn to that order, they will cancel it. The fact is that the one who must have given that false information to the hon. member for West Elgin is the same one, I suppose, who does the best he can to make that Supreme Court disagreeable to a great portion of this Dominion. He forces lawyers to choose agents here at a great expense, and when the bill of costs is taxed he gives one-tenth of what should be allowed, and of what we have to pay to the agent imposed upon us. That great magnate will not allow us to do anything without having an agent. I think this officer, who has so many good friends here, might do something better than send delegates here to prevent what he thinks is not in the public interest. Now, it might be asked, what would be the cost of that copy? Well, it will cost from \$4 to \$5; and the amount of time we have lost in this House in discussing it, perhaps half an hour, will cost let us say, \$500 to the country. So, the hon. member for West Elgin may go back to his constituents and tell them, "through a blunder and a mistake I wanted to save \$5 to the country, and in order to do that I got the country to incur an expense of \$500!" For the future, he had better mix up in things he knows better, and take his information from more reliable sources. I am sorry to have to go into these details; but I wanted the opportunity to say what we think in the Province of Quebec of this by-law, for which I do not hold the Judges responsible. *En résumé*, I may say that my object is, first, to establish that in the interest of the Dominion we want the new law which is proposed by the Ministry. In the second place, it was given the occasion to my hon. friend to learn that when he receives information from anybody he had better see that the information he receives is reliable; and in the third place, in the future, before bringing on these discussions and making small economies at great expense, giving an ox to have an egg, he will, perhaps, deem it more prudent not to try to prevent other gentlemen from obtaining justice in this House. We have not been so exacting when voluminous records have been asked for by him often for useless purposes.

Mr. BLAKE. A sound rule laid down by the House is that proceedings before a court of justice are not obtained in the House, except for public purposes.

Mr. AMYOT. This is for a public purpose.

Mr. BLAKE. I know. That is the general rule; still more is it the rule when a case is pending and the ultimate decision not reached. The hon. gentleman says he wishes to have this record in order to prove that injustice has been done his friend, Mr. Gosselin, by the Dominion Arbitrators. But the effort to establish whether justice or injustice has been done is now being made before the Supreme Court or the Exchequer Court, which, I understand the hon. gentleman to say, is the court before which this case is pending, and that tribunal will dispose of the question whether there was error in the decision of the arbitrators or not. If the gentleman will reflect he will see that though he may be able to prove that the officers this Government appointed as Dominion Arbitrators are incompetent, and that through their incompetency a miscarriage has ensued, that will not dispose of the principle of the case. The hon. gentleman spoke as if it were admittedly a proper thing that the records of a court should not be merely investigated by members of the bar at the office of the court, but should be also delivered over into their custody. That may be the course adopted in Quebec, but it is not the course adopted in Ontario, and it is not deemed an insult in that Province that the records of the court are not entrusted in the hands of the profession. I know it does sometimes happen that records disappear.

Mr. AMYOT. My object is not to decide the principle of the case at all, but to prove by the record itself the incompetency of the Dominion Arbitrators. As to the handing over of the records, that is done in the Province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman says it is not done in Ontario. Well, we object to the customs of Ontario binding us; we want our own customs to prevail with us.

Motion agreed to.

BOUNDARY LINE—ALASKA AND BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. GORDON moved for :

Copies of all correspondence having reference to the appointment of a Joint Commission with the United States Government for surveying the boundary line between the Province of British Columbia and the United States territory of Alaska.

He said: It is very important that the territorial limits of Canada should be clearly defined at the earliest practicable date. You are aware, Sir, that the boundary line between British Columbia and the United States territory of Alaska is practically undefined. Questions of jurisdiction may arise at any moment, which may cause trouble between the two Governments. For my own part, I do not anticipate any trouble as likely to arise, so long as the people who go in to the undefined territory are from the law-abiding classes of the two countries; but other persons may go in, of a different character, who may cause trouble, out of which questions of civil and criminal jurisdiction may arise. Other considerations to which I need not refer, point to the desirability of having the boundary line clearly defined by actual survey. The truth of the old adage, that you must travel from home to get the news, has, strange to say, been brought to my notice to-day. Some trouble seems to have occurred between the United States and Mexico, with regard to the boundary, through military parties of the one or other nation crossing in to each other's territory in pursuit of horse thieves and marauders, and with your permission I will read the article, taken from the *New York World*, dated the 15th inst. :

"I don't clearly see what sense there is in making such a fuss about Mexicans and Texans crossing an imaginary boundary line after horse-thieves and murderers. We have established precedents enough for it in British Columbia. A military expedition was sent from Washington Territory to Alaska, across lots, as late as 1883, by order of the Department Commander and in defiance of British law and rule. The same year Lieut Schwatka crossed for nearly 1,000 miles on British soil, with an armed body of United States troops, by order of Gen. Miles. Schwatka might have had the flimsy excuse that he didn't know where the boundary was, because it had not then been surveyed; but expeditions have since been ordered over the same route and there is at this moment an expedition in Alaska under Lieut. Allen, with orders to cross over to the Youkon and follow it for three or four hundred miles into British territory. This is a wanton invasion of neutrality, but our Canada neighbors have got used to it and seem to like it."

That is news to British Columbia. We have been under the impression that no trouble whatever has arisen between the two Governments on that coast since the settlement of the San Juan difficulty. For my part, I have never heard that any permission was asked, granted or taken, to cross with a military expedition through British territory to Alaska, and I must say that, if there had been, it would have been very hard upon the military, as far as my knowledge of the country goes it is a most difficult country for military transportation. The *Montreal Herald*, commenting upon the above, states that :

"Such statements can scarcely fail to attract the attention of the Canadian Government and elicit explanations in Parliament. If a foreign power has been making such free use of Canadian territory, without permission asked or received, it is well we should have the information from some official source, and learn the why and wherefore. When Canada was sending troops from the east to put down the Red River rebellion our Government asked permission of the United States Government to be allowed to pass the force through the Sault St. Marie canal, and the favor was refused. As a consequence, the troops had to follow the Dawson route, at a great cost to the Dominion Treasury. Under these circumstances it would have been only proper in the United States authorities

to have acted somewhat differently from what the *World* represents them as having done. It is possible that the *World* is mistaken and that the United States Government is innocent of the gross discourtesy of which the *World* appears to boast."

So far as my observation has led me, the Government of the United States and Canada on the Pacific coast have been working in the greatest harmony, and I am sure the friendship existing between the two peoples is of the most cordial character. We had an instance of the courtesy between the two Governments in the case of the naval force of each Government, on different occasions, rendering aid to the citizens and subjects of the other. In one case, one of Her Majesty's ships was sent to Sitka, when the United States citizens were afraid of an Indian war, and prevented any trouble amongst the Indians as against the citizens of the United States; on another occasion, when there was a report got up in the papers of British Columbia that dangers of an Indian war at Metlakatla was imminent, the United States sent their revenue cutter *Oliver Walcott* to the scene promptly, and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, the feeling which was exhibited on those occasions by the two Governments found hearty sympathy amongst all classes of the people on both sides of the line, and I am sure that the article in the *New York World* cannot possibly have any foundation in fact. The Government will be able to explain whether there is any foundation for such statements, and I am sure, if there is any correspondence upon the subject of the boundary, they will bring it before the House. I also believe they will deem it their duty, in the interests of Canada, to have a practical survey of that boundary established as early as possible, in order to avoid any complications arising in future.

Mr. HOMER. As seconder of this motion, I will say that we, in British Columbia, consider it very important that the boundary line between the United States Territory of Alaska and British Columbia should be surveyed and marked out as early as possible. That country is supposed to be rich in mineral wealth on both sides of the line, and in the case of rich discoveries being made, a large influx of miners and other people would take place, over whom it would be necessary for this Government to extend its jurisdiction; but, in the absence of a boundary line being established, it would be quite impossible for these miners and other people to know whether they were occupying United States territory or the territory of the Dominion. Complications might therefore possibly arise, of a very serious nature. We all know, and I believe our hon. friends from the Province of New Brunswick particularly, the disastrous results occasioned by the delay in the case of the northeast boundary, which was finally settled under the Ashburton Treaty; and to prevent a similar result in the north-west part of the Dominion. I hope the Dominion Government, in connection with the Government of the United States, will, at the earliest possible moment, take steps for the purpose of surveying and marking out the boundary line between the United States territory of Alaska and British Columbia.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I have listened with attention to the remarks made by the hon. the mover of this resolution, and especially to the extract he read from an article or a correspondence in a United States paper. That article had already received the attention of some of the Ministers. I had seen it myself and had enquired about the truthfulness of the statements made in it. We found no trace of any such statement being correct. This matter never came to our cognisance, and therefore we must consider it as not being founded in fact until the contrary is proved. On the other hand, I will say that, so far as the relations between the United States Government and Canada are concerned, the most amicable relations have existed and exist now. Whenever the United States Government have wished to cause some of their troops to pass over our terri-

tory for survey, or for some other reason, special permission has been asked and has been granted, in the same way as the request has been made, and I have no doubt that, if a similar request were made on the part of our Government, the same permission would be given. Of course, there was an allusion made to the time when we had troops to send to Manitoba, and to the fact that these troops were not allowed to go through the Sault Ste. Marie canal. That may be, but things at all events have changed since that period, and I must say that the relations between the two Governments are of the most friendly nature possible. The hon. gentleman says that a survey ought to be made, and another hon. member from British Columbia, who has spoken, has dwelt upon the necessity of having a survey of the boundary line between British Columbia and the United States territory of Alaska. Well, this matter has been brought to the attention of the Government several times, and I have no doubt that one day a survey will have to be made. But the absolute necessity of such a survey has not yet appeared; and as the Government had to make a great many other expeditions of a more pressing nature, we have thought this matter might be delayed. However, the Government will not lose sight of it. There is no objection to the address.

Mr. MILLS. This matter was under the attention of the Government some years ago. After some correspondence with the American Government on the subject, it was found that the survey of this boundary would cost between \$3,000,000 and \$4,000,000, and on account of the very serious expense it would entail, neither Government was disposed to carry on the delimitation of the boundary between the American possessions and British Columbia. I think in 1877 a Mr. Hunter was appointed by the Canadian Government to mark the boundary, according to the treaty of 1825, at certain important points. That was done, and the American Government agreed to accept that, for the time being, for all practical purposes, as the limitary line between their possessions and our own. There is no doubt that if the country is occupied by miners on both sides, in so far as the territory is occupied, it will be necessary to ascertain where the true boundary is; but considering the very large expense that will be required for the purpose of laying down the boundary, I do not suppose that either Government are disposed at the present time to undertake that survey.

Motion agreed to.

RETURN TICKETS ON GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. WELDON moved for:

Return of any orders or instructions of the Railway Department as to the sale of return tickets, limiting the periods in which such tickets can be used; also, of any claims made by persons holding such tickets for damages for being ejected from the cars, and what amounts, if any, have been paid for such claims.

He said: I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Railways to what has caused a great deal of annoyance in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, with regard to return tickets on railways. At one time, a regulation was passed, by which parties could get a return ticket and use it at any time; but, some time ago, regulations were made, by which the time of using tickets was limited from three to seven days, if I remember aright, and after that time had expired the tickets could no longer be used. This has been a cause of a great deal of trouble. Some time ago, a gentleman holding a position under the Provincial Government, came from Newcastle to Moncton, and happened to stay over two days. Going back he offered a return ticket, and the conductor said he must pay his fare. He declined to pay it, and was ejected from the cars; he was not even allowed to return for his valise, and it was lost. Whether he has made a claim on the Government for damage I do not know, but I under-

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN.

stood he is about to commence an action. Another case was one, an account of which I will read from a local paper:

"A young lady from some part of Cumberland county went to Truro to make arrangements for attending the Normal School during the present winter. After making the necessary arrangements in town, she deposited her money in the savings' bank, bought a return ticket, and went home to remove her effects to town. While at home her mother unfortunately was taken ill, which detained the girl at home some days beyond the time marked on her ticket (she did not seem to be aware of the limitation). Finally she came to Wentworth station, on her return to Truro, got her trunk checked and took her seat in the car. Soon after the train started the conductor came along."

Then, after some remarks concerning the conductor:

"On looking at the young girl's ticket, he pompously told her it was no good; that the time had expired. She explained to him the circumstances, told him her money was in the savings bank in Truro, and that her bank book was in her checked trunk. The great man with the rotund figure, blue coat and brass buttons was inexorable; he would not listen to any explanation; and savagely told the girl that unless she paid the fare into Truro he would put her off the train at the next station. The girl offered him her waterproof as security, but he refused to accept that, and finally demanded the check of her trunk, which she gave him, he telling her that she could redeem it at the station in Truro. On getting to Truro he handed the check to an official, with instructions as to its disposal. Next morning the young girl came to the station to redeem her trunk, and explained the circumstances to the officer to whom the conductor had given the check. The officer in question, feeling annoyed at the conductor's attempt to make him a party to so ungentlemanly and boorish a trick, promptly handed the girl her check, and when the pompous conductor subsequently returned and demanded the fare which he supposed would be collected from the girl, he was properly snubbed and informed that Truro station would not be made a pawn shop for him. As might be expected, he went off mad and crestfallen."

Several other instances of a similar nature have come to my notice. It seems to me that when a person takes a return ticket he ought to be able to use it at any time; it makes very little difference to the railway, and it is a great accommodation to the public, because persons are frequently detained. If I am correctly informed, persons going from Newcastle to Moncton can only get a ticket for only two days. It may be alleged that there may be frauds by persons disposing of return tickets. That, of course, may happen even with limited tickets, but in these cases the conductors of the train, knowing the parties who travel, can easily check any fraud of that kind. The circumstances to which I refer took place in November or December last; but I find that even so late as the 10th of March another instance took place, as follows:—

"It is said that a bailable writ has been served on a conductor on the Intercolonial Railway, who runs on the northern accommodation train between Moncton and Campbellton, for putting off a passenger who tendered a return ticket, the date of which had run out, and who had refused to pay the extra fare. Probably no regulation on the road has caused so much trouble and annoyance to the travelling public and to the passenger department of the Intercolonial Railway as the enforcement of the rules respecting the time of use of return tickets. Since it has been put in force the general ticket agent at Moncton has been repeatedly threatened with legal action for the recovery of extra fares exacted from passengers, and it is said settlements have been made, in order to prevent the matter going into court. Conductors have several times been instructed to give one, two and three days grace to passengers travelling on return tickets, with the view of arriving at an amicable settlement of the difficulty, but there seems to be as much difficulty experienced as before. The public will watch with interest the result of the case in which proceedings have been taken."

I trust that some regulations will be made which will give more accommodation to the public and prevent this annoyance and inconvenience. Not only so, but the Department may be involved in considerable expense in defending suits for damages, as this extract shows a case will probably be brought against one of the conductors, in order to test the legality of such action. It seems to me that in order to avoid any litigation and to prevent annoyance to the public, the Government should alter this regulation and allow return tickets to be used at any time, thereby giving more accommodation and facility to the travelling public without causing any detriment or loss to the railway.

Mr. FOSTER. I rise merely to endorse, so far as I can, the remarks which have fallen from the member for St.

John (Mr. Weldon). I have heard a great many complaints with respect to the annoyance caused by these return tickets. I do think that the Intercolonial could, by some means or other, look after what cases of fraud might be liable to occur, without making and maintaining a regulation which causes so much annoyance to a great many people who live alongside the railway and travel on the road. It would not be so bad if the regulation were carried out. I remember, when passing over a part of the line last year, after the regulation had been made, asking the conductor if he rigidly adhered to that rule. He said he did not. The rule either should not be made, or it should be regularly maintained. I think there is no necessity for the rule being made. It has the effect, I know, in the country through which the railway passes, of making farmers who go to St. John, and are in the habit of buying return tickets, fearful as to buying them. They do not know at what date they will be able to return. They want to take advantage of the return tickets, yet they dare not, for fear of trouble arising. This drives many of them to take passage in second-class cars when they would otherwise ride first-class. I sincerely hope this regulation, if it has been made by the Minister, may be reconsidered, and if it has been made simply by the officials, it may receive the careful consideration of the Department and, if possible, be changed.

Mr. WOOD (Westmoreland). I desire to add my testimony to that of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. The system in question is giving rise to a great deal of dissatisfaction, and giving rise to a great many complaints in the section from which I come. For my own part, unless the present rule can be changed somewhat, with respect to return tickets, I think it would be well to abolish them altogether. I can hardly see, in the case of the Intercolonial, why the system of return tickets should be adopted. The object of return tickets with ordinary railway companies is to give the traveller an advantage and secure his return by the same road, and not by some competing road. In the case of the Intercolonial there is no competing road; the travel both ways has to go over the same road. If the rates charged for single tickets can be reduced, a reduction should be made and return tickets abolished. But if return tickets are to be issued at all, they should allow the purchaser to return at any time he chooses.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There is no objection to the adoption of the motion, and I am sorry the Acting Minister of Railways is not present in his seat, at the moment, to speak on this subject. Of course, it is the duty of the Government to see that, while all reasonable accommodation should be given to the public, the Intercolonial should be made as profitable as possible. I presume that, in the regulations for return tickets and the limiting of the time, the Intercolonial is doing as other railways are doing. I find the practice obtains on other railways of the country which are run on commercial principles, and they have, from experience, found out how best that advantage can be secured by a limitation of time. We will bring down the returns asked for by the hon. member who made the motion and those who spoke in favor of it.

Mr. BLAKE. I cannot agree with the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Wood) in his idea that there is no necessity for return tickets on the Intercolonial, as it is a local road. As I understand, the commercial principle on which return tickets are issued is, that more people can be induced to travel if you give them the inducement of cheap rates. You say to a man, you can go to St. John and back for so much. But there is not the same inducement if you say he can return at any time. In such a case all the tickets bought would be return tickets and no single rate tickets would be purchased. We must establish some general principle as applying to the railway. We must

give inducements to the people to travel over the road as much as possible, but with a reasonable limitation, as regards return tickets, which will give travellers the benefit they expect to obtain, namely a cheap rate. Hon. gentlemen are aware that we do not make a great deal of money out of the Intercolonial.

Mr. POPE. I am sorry I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman made his motion. The time for which return tickets were given has been almost doubled. But finding abuses arose from the issue of return tickets, the Department determined that the time for which tickets should be issued would depend on the length of journey—a short time for a short distance. We have nearly doubled the time for which those tickets were formerly available, but we have determined that the time shall not be exceeded.

Mr. WELDON. Up to a short time ago there was in practice no limitation as to the time for which return tickets were available. Since a change was made the annoyance has been very great. The time allowed from St. John to Sackville is four days, and that only gives a traveller two days in St. John. From Newcastle to St. John the same time is allowed. Where four or six days only are allowed, circumstances may arise by which a person is detained, and he may lose his ticket. Such a regulation renders it much more likely for return tickets to be sold. That would be avoided by the Government giving the public the benefit of a longer time.

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman seems to suppose that we have restricted the time, compared with what it was formerly. He is very much mistaken. We have nearly doubled the time for which the tickets were formerly available.

Mr. BLAKE. The time allowed on return tickets from St. John to Sackville, four days, is a very short time, compared with what we obtain on commercial railways in the west, where it is six days, exclusive of Sunday.

Mr. POPE. I am not saying anything as to that; I say the hon. gentleman has no reason to complain, in comparison with what previously existed. I do not remember now what the previous time was, but I do know that it is now nearly double.

Mr. BLAKE. It does not seem to be long enough.

Mr. POPE. It never would be.

Mr. BLAKE. I mean, compared with the experience of other roads, which I think very reasonable. Take, for instance, the Great Western division of the Grand Trunk. On short distances on that line you get six days, exclusive of Sundays, as the ordinary time.

Mr. POPE. What distances?

Mr. BLAKE. I have travelled 50, 60, or 100 miles.

Mr. POPE. We have nearly doubled the time, but if experience shows that the time is not long enough, we will give longer time; but we must insist on that time, whatever it is, being observed.

Mr. VAIL. I think my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Railways is mistaken as to the time. I know that a short time ago I expected to go to Montreal. I enquired of the ticket agent at Halifax the time I would have for a return ticket, and he told me the number of days, and I think it was less than half the time formerly given.

Mr. POPE. That is just where the hon. gentleman is wrong. The fact is, it is double the time formerly given. We found that abuses were creeping in under the old arrangement, and we extended the time, nearly doubling it.

Mr. SPROULE. I think the principle of giving return tickets is a very good one, but I imagine it would be in

the interests of the travelling public if the same system were adopted in this country as prevails on some American roads: that is to sell a book of tickets, paying so much per mile and travelling when you like, or in whatever direction. I cannot understand why there should be any distinction between a person travelling one day and a person travelling on another. If a person pays for 100 miles of travel he should be able to take out the value of that ticket and there would be no trouble or expense to the company; there is no difference to the company whether he travel on the 1st of the month, the 15th or the 30th. There might be some difficulty in making up the books, but I think that might be done away with by selling, as is done on the St. Paul and Minneapolis, and other American lines, ticket books, containing a number of tickets, each one representing a mile of travel. Under such a system there would be no difficulty about passengers coming back within the time they expected, or not. I must say I think that the Bill passed last year or the year before, destroying the right of a passenger to be carried over a road when he paid for the whole trip, unless he kept within the stipulations and limitations of the company, was a great mistake; and I think the day will come, at no distant time, when railway companies will be compelled to carry passengers over their roads for the distance they paid for their ticket, no matter whether it is within the number of days specified on the ticket or not.

Motion agreed to.

CHARLINCH POST OFFICE.

Mr. BLAKE moved for:

All papers, reports, correspondence, Orders in Council and departmental orders with reference to the appointment or removal of the postmaster at Charlinch post office, or as to a change in the office.

He said: My hon. friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Amyot), objected to this motion passing the other day, so I suppose I must give some explanation with regard to it. My explanation is, that I have been informed by a person residing in the locality that this removal of the office, or change of the postmaster, has taken place under unjustifiable circumstances. It is said that the ground upon which the change is made is that the office is now in a more convenient situation. Some years ago the Post Office Department stated that they would move the post office on this account, but since that time the road by which access was had, and which was said to be a bad road, has been improved, under the arrangements made by the Ontario Government for attending to the colonisation roads in these remote districts; and there no longer exists any ground of complaint, and the inspector stated that in consequence the post office should not be removed. Last fall, it is said, notice was received on the subject again, and following on that, a petition was prepared and sent down, with no less than forty-four signatures—a very large number from a sparse rural community, such as that in which the post office is situated—but the petition does not seem to have had the effect of averting the decision of the Government to remove the post office for some distance. It is stated that unfortunately the old postmaster has not the same political proclivities as the hon. the Postmaster General, and that he has been taking his part as a Canadian in some of the violent contests which have taken place in the district of Muskoka; and though I do not say that the Postmaster General himself has been influenced by that consideration—I know he is above that—some of his ardent supporters, who look at these things on a lower level, have, it is said, been moved, on that ground, to make representations to bring about the change. I know that the postmaster has very great claims for consideration; for it seems, from the papers which have been put in my hands, that he was so poor that he was not able to pay his taxes, and the

Mr. SPOULL,

council agreed to grant a postponement of the payment, by reason of his circumstances.

Mr. CARLING. I have no objection to bringing down the papers. I was not aware of the political proclivities of the gentleman in question, but I know that application was made to have the post office removed to a more central situation, for the convenience of the public, and that with the concurrence of the inspector, and on his written report the post office was removed, I believe, to the satisfaction of the neighborhood.

Mr. O'BRIEN. I suppose that on the principle that no one of Her Majesty's subjects should be deprived of the right to have his wrongs brought before the tribunal of the House of Commons, the hon. member for West Durham (Mr. Blake) may consider himself justified in bringing this very small matter to the attention of the House. I may briefly state the circumstances of the case, in my own justification, because I would, no doubt, be held responsible in connection with the matter—to some extent, at all events. This post office, as first established, was midway between two settlements, one on the east and the other on the west. The one on the east grew larger and more important than the other, and it became entitled to have a post office, and one was established there. In consequence of this, the post office now called Charlinch became of less value to the settlement generally, and it was inconvenient in all respects. In the first place, it was entirely on one side of the remaining portion of the settlement, and it was also a considerable distance off the road by which the mails were carried, and the mail carrier had to go very considerably out of his way to serve this post office. On these grounds, therefore, the post office was inconveniently situated. But for my own part, I was very unwilling to disturb the postmaster, more especially, if the hon. gentleman will give me credit for the sentiment, because he was a political opponent, and I give my word that in no single instance have I opposed the appointment of a postmaster on political grounds. On the contrary, I have recommended an opponent, when he has been able more conveniently to serve the public than one of my own friends would be. However, the matter came to be discussed in the settlement, and the postmaster of Charlinch agreed to remove the post office to the main road. He gave me that pledge himself. He was allowed more than a year to carry out that pledge. He failed to carry it out, and after that, in consequence of the remonstrances made by the settlers, the Postmaster General had the post office removed. The postmaster therefore has no one to blame but himself; and the change was made entirely in the public interest. The man who has the post office now is perfectly qualified. As to his not paying his taxes, that I know nothing about. On the recommendation of many of the neighbors I think the Postmaster General will find that he was perfectly justified in making the change. So far as I am concerned, I am prepared to take all the responsibility that rests upon me in the matter.

Motion agreed to.

THE LAW OF COPYRIGHT.

Mr. EDGAR moved that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider the following resolutions:—

1. That the present position of the copyright law in Canada is anomalous and unfair to the public, to the printing and publishing trades and to the authors of this country.
2. That without further legislation in the Imperial Parliament the Parliament of Canada is powerless to make laws to deal with the whole question of copyright in Canada, because it has been authoritatively decided that any person who obtains a British copyright possesses the sole and exclusive right of reprinting the work in Canada, and that no legislation of the Dominion can effect such right.
3. That in order to place Canadian publishers upon the same footing as American publishers, in regard to the reprinting of British copyright works, a Bill was unanimously passed by the Dominion Parliament, in

the Session of 1872, and reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon.

4. That Her Majesty's assent was not given to the said Bill, and by the correspondence on the subject which was laid before the House, the reason for the refusal was alleged to be that the provisions of the Canadian Bill were in conflict with Imperial legislation.

5. That an humble Address be presented to Her Majesty, praying that Her Majesty may be graciously pleased to invite Her Imperial Parliament to except Canada from the operation of the statute of the United Kingdom, respecting copyright, so far as is necessary to give the Parliament of Canada a clear authority to legislate upon all matters respecting copyright in Canada.

He said: In connection with this notice I think there are two questions that will arise, one of a constitutional and the other of a commercial character. If there were no other ground than the broad question of the right of Canada to make laws for itself upon this subject, I do not think that I should have felt at all called upon to bring the matter before the House, but there are practical grievances connected with the present position of the copyright law. There are important trade interests suffering every day. The reading public of this country do not possess the same facilities for a cheap and plentiful supply of literature which I think they ought to have, and the position of Canadian authors is a very unsatisfactory one. Now, I do not at all seek to cast blame upon the Government in this matter. I am perfectly well aware that the hands of the Government are tied behind their backs, just as the legislative powers of this Parliament are fettered by the present condition of the law; and it is in order to relieve the Government and this Parliament from that condition of affairs that I have brought forward this motion. In 1872, when the present leader of the House occupied the same position, it will be recollected that a Bill was passed to remove some of the same grievances which we have to consider to-night. That law was passed under the leadership of the right. hon. gentleman, and was reserved for the signification of Her Majesty's assent. Afterwards, in 1874, when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was leading this House, the assent of Her Majesty had not been given, and an Address was unanimously passed by both branches of this Parliament, urging Her Majesty to do so. So that both sides of the House and everybody concerned in Canada seem to be only too anxious to arrive at a solution of this difficult question. I know that no audience has yet been discovered who ever could conscientiously say that copyright was a cheerful subject for a speech. In fact, it is a rather abstruse and difficult question. A story is told of a distinguished British statesman, who was waited upon by a deputation who wished to present their views upon the subject of copyright to him. After listening attentively to them for an hour, and hearing all they had to say, he is reported to have said: "Gentlemen, when you began I did think I knew a little about copyright, but now I am perfectly sure I do not know anything about it, and what is more, I never shall." Now, I dare say I should produce the same result on this House if I went into the whole question of copyright; but I do not intend to do so, and it is not at all necessary that I should. All we require to do is to consider a few points in connection with the application of the law to Canada. They are rather interesting, and not at all abstruse, and I will try to make the discussion as brief as possible. Since this notice has been put upon the paper, several hon. members have asked me: Why is it necessary? Surely this Parliament has the right to make laws upon the subject of copyright? Well, at first sight it would certainly seem that this Parliament had the right to do so, because, by the 91st section of the British North America Act, among other subjects which are placed under the exclusive jurisdiction of this Parliament, there is the subject of copyright; and it was at first undoubtedly supposed that copyright was entirely within the legislative jurisdiction of this Parliament. But it was discovered afterwards that since 1814 the English law upon

the subject related not only to British dominions in Europe, as it did before that date, but also extended to all the dominions of the Crown, the colonies and dependencies, wherever they existed. That law was reenacted substantially in 1812. Now, it was claimed that the British North America Act, being more recent, did in effect, repeal that law; it was claimed that the 91st clause of that Act had the effect of overriding previous legislation in England. But that point has been positively decided in the negative. The law officers of the Crown, when they advised Lord Carnarvon as to the question of giving the Royal assent—because the proposed Canadian legislation would interfere with the Imperial Act—to the Act of 1872, which was sent over for that purpose, and was not assented to, advised him to refuse assent, and the same question came up in the Court of Appeal for Ontario, where it was positively and clearly settled that the English copyright law is in force in Canada. What is the result of that? The result is, that the English Act, being a very broad and liberal one, allows foreigners, allows anyone, to take the benefit of it, and it gives anyone the right to copyright in Canada, without reference to any copyright laws which we may choose to put on the Statute Book. It gives them the absolute right to copyright in Canada. We have a Copyright Act, that of 1875, but it is subject to the Imperial Acts, and applies only to those persons who choose to take out a copyright in Canada. Under our Act, any person domiciled in any British possession or in any country that has an international copyright law with England, can take out a copyright in Canada, but on the important condition that the author shall publish his work in Canada. But the English author will not take out a Canadian copyright and will not publish in Canada so long as he has the right to copyright in Canada, without doing so, under the Imperial Act. It is certainly a great hardship to our publishers, that an author should have the right to copyright in this country without being compelled to publish in it. No other country in the world would tolerate such a condition of affairs. There is another provision, with reference to English copyright in Canada, relating to the importing of foreign reprints into Canada. Under the Imperial Act, passed in 1817, and the Order in Council which was passed under it, foreign reprints could be introduced into any colonies which made provision for compensating British authors, whose works were copyrighted in Great Britain; and under that, Canada, in 1850, passed an Act for compensating British authors. They did so by fixing 12½ per cent. *ad valorem* as an authors' tax, to be paid at the frontier, in addition to the Customs duty on books, and to be collected by the Government for the benefit of the English authors. That was a very good thing for the Canadian public, as far as it went; and it was under it that we have been able to get cheap American reprints of British copyrighted works; but it was very hard on the Canadian publisher, that he could, under no circumstances, reprint the British copyrighted book, while the American publisher could do so, and sell it in Canada under the nose of the Canadian publisher whose hands were tied. It would surely be a good thing for the Canadian publisher if he could also reprint a British copyrighted book on paying the British author the 12½ per cent. authors' tax. That would be good all round. It would be still better if the Canadian publisher could reprint the book that is copyrighted in London and not pay any tax at all, because the publisher in London can reprint a Canadian copyrighted book and pay no authors' tax to the Canadian. In order to try and put the Canadian publisher on something like a level with the American publisher as to these reprints, the Act of 1872 was passed. It certainly seemed very reasonable that while the English copyrighted books could be reprinted in the States and brought into Canada on payment of 12½ per cent. authors' tax, it should be lawful for the Canadian

publisher to reprint the work here on the same condition. That was the object of the Act of 1872, which was reserved, and in reference to which this Parliament passed an Address in 1874, unanimously requesting Her Majesty's assent to it. The Address was as follows:—

“Resolved, — That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying His Excellency to be pleased to convey to Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies, the respectful expression of the anxiety of this House, that a Bill intituled ‘An Act to amend the Act respecting Copyrights,’ passed in the Session of 1872, and reserved on the 14th June in that year, for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon, should not be allowed to elapse by the expiry of the two years limitation specified in the 57th section of ‘The British North American Act, 1867,’ and further to assure His Excellency that important interests in this Dominion are prejudiced by the absence of legislation such as this Bill contemplates.”

Now, Lord Carnarvon replied to that Address, and in his reply he gave the reasons why he could not advise Her Majesty to assent to that Bill. He substantially stated them to be that he had been advised that the Imperial Act of 1842 overrides the Canadian Act and will not allow this Parliament to legislate in the direction of a copyright Act which may in any way affect the British author; and he said that upon this question he was supported not only by the opinion of the then law officers of the Crown, but by the opinions of those eminent lawyers, Lord Selborne and Mr. Herschell, Q.C. So it is perfectly clear how we stand in that matter. There is a provision that the American publisher can reprint and send into Canada, when the British author registers his copyright here, paying the authors' tax; but when he does not register, the American can reprint the work and it will come in here without paying the 12½ per cent. authors' tax. The effect of that seems to be this. The English author makes arrangements with the American publishers and sells him advance sheets, and then he agrees not to register or copyright in Canada. The result is, that the American publisher, who has the advanced sheets, has a great start over all other publishers in the United States, and gets besides, the whole Canadian market, and no Canadian publisher can publish the book. That is not a fancy picture, but it is a case of every day occurrence. The operation and effect of that has been very well described in the judgment of that learned and lamented judge, the late Chief Justice Moss, in a case, the case of Smiles and Belford, which came before the Ontario Court of Appeal. The Belfords were a firm of Canadian publishers who had undertaken to publish a work called “Thrift,” of which Mr. Smiles was the author and owner of the English copyright, and they supposed that the British North America Act gave them ample authority to do so. However, the Court of Chancery granted an injunction, deciding that the Imperial Act of 1842 enables the British author to prevent the Canadian reprint of his work. The Court of Appeal unanimously affirmed that decision, and Chief Justice Moss said:

“I confess that it is not without reluctance that I have arrived at the same conclusion. I fear that the state of the law which we find inflicts a hardship on the Canadian publisher, while it confers no very valuable benefit on the British author. Its effects, if I rightly understand the matter, is to enable the British author to give an American publisher a Canadian copyright. It is no very violent assumption that every American publisher, who treats with a British author for advance sheets of his work, will stipulate for the use of the author's name to restrain a Canadian reprint. By this arrangement he will be enabled to secure the practical monopoly of the Canadian market, for which he may be induced to pay the author some consideration; but however small this consideration may be, I apprehend it will be found sufficient to induce the author to concede the privilege rather than receive Canadian copyright by treating with the Canadian publisher. But I need scarcely remark that the possible or probable effect upon a branch of industry, however valuable or important, cannot affect the interpretation which the court is bound to place upon the statutes by which the subject is governed.”

Now, this extract shows more clearly than I could express it, the unfortunate condition of the law in that point also. Then there is another feature of the case, which presses very hardly upon Canadian publishers. I mentioned before that the English law is very broad and liberal. Under that,
Mr. EDGAR,

American authors secure both English and American copyrights, while an English author cannot possibly secure an American copyright, because their law is much more stringent. It only allows citizens or permanent residents in the United States to obtain copyright. On the other hand, the American author can obtain his own copyright in America and also in England, and thereby he gets Canada thrown in. Without taking out a copyright here, without publishing here, and without paying the slightest attention to the Canadian people, he holds us in the hollow of his hand. He can then sell at the highest possible price. He has an absolute monopoly, which there is no possible way of getting over or breaking, and he can sell his work here, without any possible competition from any quarter, at the highest price that can be obtained for it. For instance, we all know that Mr. Marion Crawford, who is a rather popular recent American author, has published some novels, which have had an extensive sale, such as “Mr. Isaacs” and “Doctor Claudius.” Well, he is in that happy condition as to Canada. He is an American, he gets his American copyright, he gets his English copyright, and he covers Canada, and nobody can introduce reprints here under the provisions I referred to awhile ago, as his American copyright prevents that. He sells his books at a dollar. You cannot get one of those books for less than a dollar, which, I suppose, he thought the maximum price at which it was possible to sell them. The Canadian authors have no opportunity of getting American copyright; but, if we could legislate on the matter ourselves, I think we could very soon make some reciprocal arrangement with our neighbors, by which Canadians would have the benefit of their copyright; and, if we could not do that, we could at any rate, if we had the control of our own Canadian market, reprint their American copyrighted books, even if they did go to England and take out a copyright there. The result of the position is that we are taxed for the English author and our Acts are disallowed for his exclusive benefit, and we have neither the privilege of taxing ourselves nor of legislating for ourselves. It would surely be no hardship upon an English author to have to take out a Canadian copyright before he secured control of our country. He could find Canadian publishers just as well as he can find American publishers to publish his works. I do not think there is any other remedy in this matter than for us to obtain the right to legislate upon this subject. Ever since the Act of 1872 was disallowed, the publishers in this country have been almost in despair. They felt that nothing could be done, and they have come to the conclusion—a great many of them, who have spoken to me on the subject—that the only possible remedy is for us to get the power into our own hands, and make our own copyright laws, just as we do our own laws about patents and everything else. During this Session a petition has been presented to this House from the Toronto Board of Trade, on the subject, by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Beaty), which seems to me to cover the ground very well indeed, and to voice the general opinion of the large publishing and printing interests of this country. The memorial is as follows:—

“That the Imperial copyright law, which has jurisdiction in Canada, presents many anomalies in its operation in the colonies; is prejudicial to the interests of British authors and publishers, whom it is designed to benefit; limits the operations and retards the development of the Canadian book trade, and has an injurious effect on all the industries connected with native publishing.

“That the proximity of Canada to the neighboring Republic, where there is unrestrained license in reprinting English copyrights, and every freedom in sending them into this country, makes the position of Canada an exceptional one in calling for relief from these anomalies, and in asking the Home Government to concede to Canada the privilege of legislating on copyright in accordance with our special needs, and for the protection of such interests as it is desirable to make provision for, and with the same freedom we now possess in legislating on patents.

“That while the present copyright law prohibits the Canadian publisher from reprinting English copyrights in Canada, and places him

under penalties for violating the Act, it suffers American reprints (which, in the main, pay no royalty to the author or copyright owner) to enter the country, and practically gives the supplying of the entire book market of Canada to a foreign people.

"That common sense as well as policy dictates that the privileges we give to the foreign manufacturer should be given to the native publisher, while the effect of this would speedily be seen in the development of our own publishing industries, and would enable the English author to derive some benefit from the sale of his works in Canada.

"That were the Canadian publishing trade free to reprint English copyrights, with due recognition of the author's rights, he would not only be in a position to supply the wants of our own people (now supplied by the foreigner), but it would be within his power to extend the area of his operations into the United States, and there endeavor to compete with the piratical American reprint.

"That the effect of this might sensibly aid the efforts now being made in Congress to do justice to the British author, by passing of an International Copyright Treaty.

"That so long as the United States makes no reciprocal concessions in the matter of literature to Britain or to British colonies, Canada should be exempt from respecting the copyright privilege granted by the mother country to American writers, who may produce their works first in England.

"That for all these reasons assigned, your memorialists pray your Honorable House to press upon Government the wisdom and policy of securing from the Home Government the right to legislate upon the whole subject of copyright, domestic and foreign, as may be deemed best for all interests concerned, and with due regard to Canadian publishing industries, and the intellectual and social benefit of the Canadian public."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that sets forth the case, from a Canadian point of view, in a very clear and unanswerable manner, and I do not see that there is any remedy possible for us, other than the one suggested by these resolutions, namely, that we should ask the Imperial authority to except Canada from the operation of the Copyright Act, so as to enable us to legislate for ourselves. I have read a story told of Mr. John Lovell, the well-known Montreal publisher, who went over to London, in 1873, to try to make arrangements with the firm of Longman's, for publishing some of their copyright works in Canada. His overtures were not at all favorably received. The member of the firm to whom he addressed himself is reported to have told him that he would not allow his books to be published in the colonies, and he added: "Thank God, he had got the power now, and he intended to keep it." Now, Mr. Speaker, if that language was used it was only the utterance of an individual and of a snob, and did not in any sense express the feelings of the English people towards Canada; and much less did it indicate the enlightened views with which British statesmen regard us to-day. All that is necessary is for us to point out to the Home Government that in order to remedy the grievances that are every day pressing injuriously upon the reading public, upon our large printing and publishing institutions, and upon Canadian authors, we absolutely require the right to legislate upon this subject of copyright ourselves. I would go a little further, Mr. Speaker, and I would represent to the Imperial Parliament that the people of Canada have understood, and understand now, that all matters relating to the peace, order, and good government of Canada should be legislated upon exclusively by this Parliament, and that this is one case in which we have not that power, and for practical business reasons we require to have that power now. I think we ought to unite in sending this message to our kin across the sea, and I am perfectly satisfied that the Parliament of England, sitting at Westminster, will give a prompt and speedy consideration to the fair and reasonable request that may be made by this Parliament of Canada sitting at Ottawa.

Mr. DESJARDINS: I have accepted with much pleasure the invitation to second the resolution moved by the hon. member for West Ontario (Mr. Edgar). I consider that if this resolution was carried by this House, and the Government were to act upon it, a further step would be taken in the extension of the National Policy of this country. I thank my hon. friend for having contributed, in this manner, his share towards fortifying the policy that we have been trying to consolidate since 1878.

It was easy for the hon. member to lend us his aid on this question, because it has always united both sides of the House, whenever the matter has been brought before us. In 1872 a Bill passed unanimously both Houses of Parliament, and was reserved for the sanction of Her Majesty. In 1874 a resolution was passed unanimously by both Houses, asking Her Majesty to confirm the Bill, and allow it to become the law of this country. So this cannot be considered a party question, and it is in that sense that I have seconded the resolution of my hon. friend, and in that sense, I am sure, he has proposed it. The reason given for reserving the Bill of 1872 was that it was *ultra vires*. It had been thought until then that copyright having been one of the matters mentioned in the 91st section of the British North America Act, as coming within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament, no more difficulty would arise if this Parliament legislated in respect to that matter than with respect to any of the other matters mentioned in that clause. Patent rights, for instance, were placed in the same category with copyrights, and the power of the Federal Parliament to legislate with regard to patent rights has never been questioned. Now, what is the effect of the interpretation given by the Imperial authorities as to the power of this Parliament to legislate in those matters? It has been this: that while our editors have been prevented from reprinting, under any condition, the works of English authors, we have been flooded with American editions, and American publishers have reaped all the benefits in our own country from the exercise of a privilege of which we have been denied. Under such circumstances it is not to be wondered at that all those who have had to deal with this question have come to the same conclusion, that since, according to Imperial interpretation, the British North America Act had not, in reality, conferred upon us the power to legislate on this question, as on others mentioned in the clauses to which I have alluded, the only remedy was to make another move: have a declaration made by this Parliament expressing our desire to that effect, and ask the Government to request the Imperial authorities to pass such legislation as would amend the British North America Act, so as to grant us the power that we understood we had obtained by that Act. In fact, what do we claim by the resolutions now being submitted to the House? We claim only to be put in the same position as the Americans now occupy in our markets. We claim to be subject to the same conditions for printing English or foreign works under international copyright in England as the Americans have been admitted in our markets; and this would have the effect of giving to parties interested in our publishing establishments the means of extending their business, and put them in a position strong enough to enable them to give that encouragement to our native literature which is so much needed, and so incidentally to grant such protection to the productions of native talent which would ensure success. Since Confederation we have obtained much from the Imperial Parliament. In fact, the British North America Act itself was a great step towards giving us independent power of legislation in this country in all matters of our own concern; every occasion that was offered since has been taken advantage of to develop that independence of legislation. In 1875-76 we obtained for our Government the right to advise the Governor General on and take the responsibility of exercising the prerogative of mercy, which was always before acknowledged to be a strictly Imperial power. From time to time our independent legislative power has been conceded, so that now, when we come to this simple question, we naturally ask why, when our right and power to legislate on matters that were certainly more important to English industries than the question of copyright, was acknowledged; when we have been conceded the power even to tax the products of England; when we have been conceded the right to legislate on patents and inven-

tions, we should be prevented from giving to our own population the benefit of a law that would increase our power of disseminating literature and science among our population, and should be obliged to borrow from our neighbors the power we want for the publication of works which we ought to be entitled to publish here as well as our American neighbors to sell. Under these circumstances, as I mentioned at the opening of my remarks, I have much pleasure in seconding the resolution, and I hope no objection will be found to prevent its adoption by this House.

Mr. CARON. The hon. gentleman, the mover of this resolution, stated in his opening remarks, and it certainly did not apply—that the subject he was treating was not one that appealed to most audiences. I can tell the hon. gentleman and the hon. member who has just taken his seat, that they have succeeded in making what I consider most interesting speeches upon a most important question. I claim that in the matter of copyright we, as Canadians, are as interested as any other people in protecting, to the very utmost limit, the property in copyright which exists in this country. But I cannot agree with my hon. friends in the conclusion at which they have arrived, that the law, as it exists, is anomalous or unfair to anybody or any interest in the country. It is well known that the Act of 1875 was passed when the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was at the head of the Government, after much consultation, correspondence and discussion, with the representatives of the book-printing and book-publishing interests of this Dominion. By the operation of this Act many English authors have, from time to time, taken copyrights in Canada, on editions printed in Canada by our printing and publishing establishments. And I cannot see how the hon. gentleman can state that the public here are not protected, in so far as getting reprints of books into Canada. As I understand it, when British authors do not care to take out Canadian copyrights, or when it does not suit our printers or publishers to take them here, the public get their works in the cheap editions as reprints. Our Canadian authors are protected to the very extreme limit. They have absolute sway and control of the Canadian market, and as I understand it, it is now contemplated in England to accept Canadian copyrights in the same way as copyrights are made to apply to the British Empire by International Copyright Treaties. The British copyrights extend to all British possessions, and as I have already stated, it is contemplated to give the same sway to Canadian and colonial copyrights in England. The British Copyright Act at present is limited in its extent in favor of the Canadian public, in so far as by the Imperial Act, 10 and 11 Vic., supplemented by our legislation, cheap foreign reprints may be imported into Canada, so that the English copyright owner, if he does not choose to reprint the copyright in Canada, must suffer the competition which is created by cheap reprints that are brought into the country. It will be remembered that the Bill of 1872 was refused the Royal assent. One reason why the Royal assent was refused was, that it was an attempt at the piracy of British authors' works in British territory. The Copyright Act of 1875 was accepted as the result of negotiations, and it solved the difficulties which up to that period had existed. It was considered at that time that the Act of 1875 was not trespassing on the rights of property, and in consequence was not refused the Royal assent, which had been refused to the Act of 1872. The Copyright Act of 1875, it will be remembered, was also the subject of a good deal of discussion at the time. It was also in conflict with Imperial legislation affecting this important subject, but it was considered a fair measure, respecting all rights, and it was accepted and assented to. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to be understood as saying that there is not a great deal in what has been stated by the hon. gentlemen who have respectively

Mr. DESJARDINS.

moved and seconded this resolution, but I believe at present the Act of 1875 is working satisfactorily, and I do not believe that the reopening of the question at present would lead to any better results than were obtained by the Act of 1875. If the resolution which is now moved were accepted, I believe that Canadian authors and Canadian copyright owners would lose the benefit contemplated, of having their rights co-extensive with the British copyrights—that is, of being made operative in all British possessions and eventually in all countries having a copyright treaty with the United Kingdom. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I think that the resolution, which affects most important interests, might be considered for the present to be premature. The hon. gentleman, in the remarks which he made, stated, if I correctly understood him, that the foreign reprints came into Canada without any duty being paid upon them.

Mr. EDGAR. I did not say that; foreign reprints pay 15 per cent. duty.

Mr. CARON. Then I misunderstood the hon. gentleman. I understood him to say that these reprints came into Canada without paying any duty, and the hon. gentleman who seconded the resolution stated that one of his objects was to apply to the copyright question the National Policy, which had been introduced as the policy of the country. Well, I think the Tariff shows, in so far as the interests of these copyrights purchased by Canadians are concerned, that these rights are protected to the very utmost. Upon that question I may say that I was informed that when Dawson Bros., of Montreal, purchased the copyright of "Endymion," in Canada, and the "Seaside" edition of "Endymion" came into Canada, this "Seaside" edition was confiscated, because the copyright had been purchased by a Canadian, and the full protection created by the National Policy was applied in that case, as it is in every other case. Under the circumstances, I believe that the resolution which the hon. gentleman has moved, and which has led to the interesting discussion which we have heard, is not one which, at present, should be passed by the House.

Mr. EDGAR. I do not see, from anything the Minister of Militia has said, what remedy he proposes for the two main difficulties that the publishers and the Canadian public have to face in this matter. We know that there is nothing in the Act of 1875 that meets these difficulties. It is true that the Canadian public can get cheap American reprints of American copyright books. That is all very well, so far as it goes. But why should not the Canadian public get the benefit of Canadian reprints of British copyright books as well as the benefit of American reprints? I can see no reason why they should not.

Mr. BOWELL. He can, if he obtains the right from the English holder of copyrights.

Mr. EDGAR. Yes; a Canadian copyright can be taken out, but I say that Canadian copyright is not taken out.

Mr. BOWELL. What I say is this: that if the owner of an English copyright sells it to a Canadian, he has the right to publish and to control the sale of the book in this country, to the full extent of prohibiting its importation into Canada at all.

Mr. EDGAR. Of course he would, and that is what I would like to make him do. I want to make him come here and publish, either by taking out a copyright directly, or selling to a publisher who would take out the copyright directly. But he is not compelled to do that. He can prevent a single copy of his book being published in Canada, without taking out a copyright here at all, merely by getting an English copyright; and I do not see that we should go back on what we decided in 1872, that Canadian publishers should stand on the same footing as American publishers, in respect of

American reprints of British copyright works. The Canadian publishers are to-day, every one of them, ready to pay the 12½ per cent. authors' tax, as the American publishers have to do, if they are only allowed to reprint British books. But they are not allowed to do it, in the present condition of the law; and there is nothing in the Act of 1875 that affects that difficulty in the slightest degree. Then there is the other case: where an American author takes out an English copyright of a book, we cannot have a Canadian reprint at all. The Canadian publisher cannot touch that book at all, except at the will of the author. The trouble has been so great that Canadian publishers have tried to get over it in several ways. They have established printing houses on the other side of the line, so that the printers who might have been employed in Canada, and the paper that might have been bought here, have been employed or obtained there. Toronto publishers have sent the books over to Buffalo or somewhere else, in order to publish there, and then run them back to Canada as foreign reprints. It is a pity we have to do in a clandestine way what the Canadian law ought to permit us to do. The hon. member for Hochelaga (Mr. Desjardins) and the hon. Minister of Militia, referred to the National Policy, and I admit that it would be something like a National Policy to pass these resolutions. Let the Canadian publishers get the benefit of the 15 per cent. duty on books. If they were permitted to reprint here a British copyright book, on paying the 12½ per cent. authors' tax, they would have 15 per cent. advantage over the American publishers, who have to pay not only the 12½ per cent. authors' tax, but the 15 per cent. duty, too; I admit that. Now, the suggestion which the hon. Minister of Militia has given to the House is, of course, entirely new to me, namely, that there is some prospect of having a modification in the copyright law in England, to meet some of the grievances we suffer from in Canada, and he leads us to hope that there is a prospect of having an early reciprocity with England in the matter of copyright. I certainly suppose the hon. gentleman would not have made that statement without being satisfied that something of the kind would be done. If that is done, it is certainly something in the right direction; but I am very strongly of opinion that if this House passes these resolutions, and in the most respectful way requests the Imperial Government to place us on a free and independent footing with respect to copyright, Her Majesty's Government will be readier to make whatever concessions ought to be made to Canada in this matter than if we leave it as it stood when the Royal assent was reserved from the Act of 1872. The publishers are feeling the grievances practically. Hundreds of printers would be employed in Canada that are not employed, and we should have competition in Canada with American reprints, if we could legislate in the direction even of the Act of 1872. Therefore, I still strongly press upon the Government the propriety of allowing these resolutions to carry.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The object of this motion I heard the hon. gentleman state in the speech with which he introduced it. I have lost the greater part of the discussion, as I was called away on business; but I have spoken with my hon. friend who has addressed the House, and, with his consent, I would ask that the matter be allowed to stand over. I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE EASTER RECESS.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. I asked the hon. gentleman, at an early period of the day with reference to a rumor about events in the North-West that he did not know much about.

There is another rumor in the corridors, of practical consequence to us, and that is, as to the proposal of the Government with reference to Easter.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government proposes, with the consent of the House, to move, that when the House adjourns on Thursday before Good Friday, it stands adjourned until the Tuesday following, at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, 24th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND LAKE OF THE WOODS RAILWAY AND NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. WATSON moved:

That that part of the report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, relating to the report to incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway and Navigation Company, and declaring that the preamble of said Bill is not proven to the satisfaction of said committee, be not adopted, but that said Bill be referred back to the said committee for further consideration.

Mr. BLAKE. It is quite clear that the report must go back to the committee. The 65th rule of the House states:

"When the committee on any private Bill report to the House that the preamble of such Bill has not been proven to their satisfaction, they must also state the grounds upon which they have arrived at such decision."

No ground was given in this report.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I understand from the Clerk of the House, to whom I spoke on the matter, that the report must go back—that the clerk of the committee did not give the reasons in the report which was presented. Of course, therefore, the hon. gentleman is perfectly in order in making this motion, which I think should carry.

Mr. BLAKE. It is the committee who have to arrive at the conclusion.

Motion agreed to.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. JAMIESON. I should like to ask the Government whether it is possible to fix a day for the second reading of Bill (No. 92) to amend the Canada Temperance Act.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I have no objection that a day should be fixed. I would fix to-morrow.

Mr. MACKENZIE. The House does not sit to-morrow.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Well, we will have it to-morrow week.

Mr. BLAKE. Perhaps the best plan would be, as there is a Bill already named first on the Orders, that is, the Bill of the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin), the Factory Bill, to make this Bill the second. We have no right to interfere with the preference we gave to that hon. gentleman's Bill, and these are the two most important Bills in the hands of private members, I fancy.

Mr. SPEAKER. There must be a motion.

Mr. IVES. There are several other Bills on the same subject, in which I think the House has as much interest as the Bill which the hon. gentleman refers to. If a special day is fixed for this Bill, I think it should be understood

that all other Bills on the same subject should be taken on the same day.

Mr. McCARTHY. I would adopt the suggestion of my hon. friend. There are other Bills here with reference to the Canada Temperance Act—

Mr. BLAKE. Have a sort of temperance's feast.

Mr. McCARTHY—and I think all these Bills had better be fixed for the same occasion.

Mr. IVES. I think it requires the pretty unanimous consent of the House that the Order paper should be interfered with in any way.

Mr. JAMIESON. I move that the second reading of Bill No. 92 be the second Order of Public Bills and Orders.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I object unless the hon. gentleman will consent that all these Bills on the same subject should come up at the same time. It is a question for the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Let them be moved one at a time as the third, fourth, fifth or sixth Order. They cannot come up all at a time; that would be contradictory.

Mr. ORTON. As there are several Bills, I think preference should not be given to one Bill over another. We know that the Canada Temperance Act, which this Bill is intended to make more emphatic, is regarded by a large number of our people as an unjust and tyrannical Act. There are several amendments to that Act before the House, and there are many who think that this whole question requires revision. Therefore I object to any preference being given to this Bill over others on the same subject.

Mr. BLAKE. I think it would be extremely reasonable that the measures which take the other view of the subject should receive a preferential place on the Order paper as well as this Bill. My hon. friend's motion may be adopted, and then any other member who desires to have a Bill placed in a high position on the Order paper may move to that effect, and I think the House will agree to it.

Mr. CAMERON (Victoria). If the practice be adopted that any member who has a Bill that he thinks of special public importance, may rise and move that it be given precedence, the result will be to destroy the regularity and upset the order of the proceedings of this House. As I understand, my hon. friend's motion is irregular without notice, and I object to it on that account.

Mr. FISHER. This Bill does occupy an exceptional position. As a matter of fact, we know that it is the Bill embodying the opinions and desires of the Dominion Alliance, a body representing one of the most important classes of people in the country. The Bill is one which has been placed before the Government for their approval, and it is only in consequence of the fact that the Government delayed giving their answer upon that question for no less than a fortnight, that the Bill is so late in coming before the House. Had it not been for that, the Bill would have been before the House and ready for discussion before now. There is another reason why I say this Bill occupies an exceptional position. The hon. gentleman opposite has said that this Bill makes more emphatic the Scott Act. That is not the case, so far as any matter of principle is concerned. This Bill is simply intended to carry out the original intention of the Scott Act, and it is only introduced by the temperance people of this country because in some minor particulars the Scott Act has been proved a little defective, and the temperance people simply wish to make that Act as workable and efficient as possible, not to introduce any new principle. This being the case, I conceive that this Bill occupies an entirely different position from the other Bills alluded to. Still, I have no objection, and I

Mr. IVES.

am sure the temperance members of this House would have no objection, to those Bills all coming up together and being all discussed at one time.

Mr. SPEAKER. The order of our proceedings is regulated by our rules, and rule 24 says that all items standing on the Orders shall be taken up according to the precedence assigned to each on the Order paper; and I do not think the order can now be changed without notice. It will be in order on Wednesday of next week for the hon. member to move that the Bill first on the Order paper be not now proceeded with, but that this Bill be taken up instead. The House can then order that that should be done.

Mr. McCARTHY. Notice must be given then.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, a majority of the House will decide that.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. On the motion for considering any Order, a member can move that that Order be taken up this day six months.

Mr. BLAKE. For instance, we have the Bill of the hon. member for Cornwall and Stormont (Mr. Bergin) as the first Order; that is disposed of, and we may put that aside; but when the second Order is reached it will be for the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Jamieson) to move that instead of that, his Bill be taken up, and the majority of the House will determine that question?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. JAMIESON. I ask leave to withdraw the motion. Motion withdrawn.

ANNUNCIATION DAY—ADJOURNMENT.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved:

That when the House adjourns this day, it do stand adjourned until Thursday next at three o'clock.

Motion agreed to.

TARIFF CHANGES.

Mr. BLAKE. I observe that the hon. Minister of Finance has given notice of some very important changes in the proposed tariff resolutions. I presume it is his intention to make some explanation before the House goes into committee, as to the effect of these alterations, so that the House may understand their bearing.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It is my intention to do so.

DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. I would further ask the hon. gentleman if he has additional intelligence or communication with reference to the state of affairs in Prince Albert.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The Government have no further communication.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. VAIL. I would ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries when we may expect that return with reference to the Hudson's Bay steamers' supplies?

Mr. McLELAN. Some of the staff are at work copying the account, which is very voluminous.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether the return I moved for with respect to the number of depositors holding certain amounts in the savings banks is ready or when it will be ready.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot say when it will be ready, but will make enquiries, and let the hon. gentleman know on Thursday.

Mr. BLAKE. I moved, a long time ago, for papers and correspondence connected with various subsidies, either land or money, to railway companies in the North-West. I observe the hon. gentleman has a notice on the paper to grant subsidies to several railway companies in the North-West.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will have the papers laid on the Table to-night.

Mr. MILLS. When will the papers with reference to the Manitoba boundary and Indian title be brought down?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will make particular enquiry into that.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. COCKBURN. I apprehend that a short contribution to the debate at this juncture will be more in accord with the sentiment of the House than any elaborate statement of the question now before us, and I therefore claim the indulgence of the House while I briefly give my views on public matters according to my light. Sir, the people of Canada are having rare opportunities of studying the political ethics of the country. We have had this question discussed for the past seven or eight years; but notwithstanding all the discussions, I daresay it will be difficult for people to arrive at a definite conclusion amid all the contradictory statements made. However, experience, which is the best educator of all, has cleared up several points in this controversy, and to some of these points I propose to address myself. Ever since the change of Government, in 1878, we find hon. gentlemen opposite attributing lack of patriotism to hon. gentlemen on this side when we say that matters are not so prosperous and are not satisfactory, not only in respect to the National Policy but also in respect to several other matters, which come within the domain of Dominion administration. These gentlemen are troubled with rather short memories, because if they would consider the attitude they assumed in 1878 and contrast it with our attitude to-day they would find that while in our case there is magnanimity, there is in the other the opposite quality. Our attitude is much more lenient than that of our hon. friends opposite. It is within the lively recollection of hon. gentlemen in this House that the line taken by hon. gentlemen opposite during the *régime* of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), was to state that ruin was broadcast and the Government of the day were responsible for the depression of trade then existing. In fact every business trouble was made known and heralded abroad, and whenever a manufacturing establishment had to close, either for repairs or other reasons, its closing was heralded from the house-tops in and just prior to 1878. Hon. gentlemen opposite also made special promises then which I need not recapitulate; they almost promised everything. The people in some sections of the country owing to the hopes held out as to the effect of a high protective tariff, and by misleading statements in other sections of the country, were led to accept the promises of hon. gentlemen opposite and placed them in the position they now occupy. At that time hon. gentlemen opposite were pointing out all the derelictions of the Mackenzie Administration, charged that Administration with being the cause of widespread ruin—a ruin which did not exist. They failed to point out that we had many industries, and they failed also to state that depression existed in a more intense degree in the country to the south of us, which was largely protected; they only told half the truth, and half the truth is said to be at times the most dangerous sort of falsehood. It

did not suit their purpose then to tell the truth but to hold the Mackenzie Government responsible for all the ills which overspread the country. We find on the contrary, instead of matters being depressed as represented, even by this report of the commissioner on the industries of the country—only a partial report because all the manufacturing centres were not visited—but even this report shows that instead of all manufacturing establishments going out of work prior to 1878, and during the *régime* of Mr. Mackenzie, no less than one hundred and six were started during his term of office. It may be said that this is not a very large number, but it is the number shown by this one-sided report. Hon. gentlemen opposite acceded to power in 1878, and no sooner did the change take place than old establishments, which were in operation for a number of years, were claimed as new industries. It is quite true, however, that the sugar refinery resumed operation after the change in Government. Shortly after the present Government came in, their organs and their speakers said: Behold the National Policy; but some of us kept a record of the actual experience from that time forward. The Government passed a measure known as the National Policy in 1879, but it was two years from that date before the times got better, before there was any change. For the first two years of the present Administration, in 1879 and 1880, they had a deficit. They were confronted with this, and told: Your policy is not doing anything for us; what about those promises? The Administration had promised to bring about a change directly they got into power, they had promised that as if by a magic wand they would bring prosperity in every possible way as the result of their accession to power, but it was two long years before matters got better. During that time, when they were reminded that things had not got better, they said it was owing to the footprints of the Mackenzie Administration still existing, and that things had not had time to get better. I recollect perfectly well when the first lifting of the cloud took place. It was in the fall of 1880, when a demand sprung up for our lumber and other exports. The American demand for lumber sprung up in the fall of 1880. We have a large domestic market for lumber in Canada, but the domestic market did not improve until the foreign demand created an export, and then the domestic market followed. The brief period of prosperity we have had since has been due entirely to our exports. In 1878, the gentlemen told us that we could do all our business within ourselves. They seemed to borrow the Celestial idea, "What need we care for foreign commerce?" We were to have home markets. Wherever there was water-power, we were to have manufacturing industries built up. But this has not been the case. On the contrary, the effect of the tariff has been to centralise those establishments. The commissioner very conveniently omitted to visit some of those places which have lost their factories by their being removed to Toronto, such as Newcastle, Woodbridge, and some other places, though they are counted in Toronto all right for the National Policy. The home markets were not created. We were promised that the price of our farm products would be very much increased. It has already been stated that our manufacturing had, in 1878, assumed considerable proportions. The member for Brant has already informed the House that our importation for home manufacture in raw cotton alone had increased from three and a half millions in 1874, to seven and a quarter millions in 1878. That did not show that the factories were languishing to any great extent. As to the markets for farm produce, I have a carefully compiled report of the prices of grain in Toronto during the two periods. The average price of fall wheat under the Mackenzie Administration was \$1.16, and under the present Administration \$1.12, 4 cents a bushel less than formerly, though it was to be increased by 15 cents according to the promise. The prices of spring wheat were about the

same, though in 1883 the price did run up during the time of scarcity. It is only during a time of scarcity that the tariff can possibly help the price of wheat. We had a time of scarcity in 1883, and the price did run up, but that is not to be depended upon. It is very seldom that we have times of scarcity. The crops in this country do not fail very often, and we ought to be thankful for that. There is a clause in the National Policy Act by which the Government can remove the tariff on wheat without any legislation, so that there is no guarantee for the farmers. I heard my friend from North Bruce ask the member for Norfolk a question as to the price of oats in Toronto. The average price under the Mackenzie Administration was a shade higher than it is now. Peas were 75 cents a bushel under the Mackenzie Administration and 73 cents under the National Policy. The barley cry got more votes for the National Policy perhaps than any other. Well, the price of barley averaged 80½ cents under the Mackenzie Administration and 70 cents under the National Policy. Wool is about half the price it was under the Mackenzie Administration.

Mr. IVES. You are trying to pull the wool over our eyes.

Mr. COCKBURN. No, I will simply give the facts. We are told now that we argued in 1878 that the effect of the policy would be to make goods dear. We did argue that, but we argued more. The effect of the policy was to run goods up a little at first, though of course they came down very much afterwards, but in the future we may yet find that the policy may be the means of raising the price of goods, if they are able to bring about any combination. But we stated that there were different phases or stages through which such a policy passed. We also stated that goods would be made ridiculously cheap at other times, so that some factories would have to close up and not employ their men. We must all admit that the effect of the tariff was to stimulate manufacturing—there is no doubt whatever about that. It had the effect of over-stimulating it, and caused a large amount of capital to be locked up and considerable capital to be lost. I can speak on behalf of myself and on behalf of my colleagues here, that the Liberal party are not opposed to manufacturing, that we recognise its utility, and that it is a great factor in making up the sum of the prosperity of the country. But the manufacturers are safer under a revenue tariff than under a high protective tariff, as times change. Oats do not grow tough or sturdy when raised in hot-houses. One great claim for the proposed tariff at that time was that it would retain our people in our own country. That has not been the case, I am sorry to say. The figures quoted against the previous Administration were taken from the American Trade and Commerce Returns. I take the last year of the Mackenzie Administration, and I find the number of people reported by the American Trade and Commerce Returns as leaving in 1878 was 26,100. In 1884, the last year, we have returns of those who left amounting to 60,580, more than twice as many. Therefore the tariff is a complete failure in that respect. It may be said that these people have gone to a highly protected country. We have nothing to do with that. I do not think that they have improved their prospects by going there. We have a splendid country ourselves. We have plenty of territory, and a country in which the crops can be relied upon more than in almost any other country I know of. We have fewer failures of crops, and epidemics among domestic animals are very rare indeed. Therefore I contend that these people have not bettered their condition by going to another country, but the fact remains that the National Policy was powerless and did not perform what they claimed it would do to keep our own people in our own country. It was also stated that our trade with

Mr. COCKBURN.

Great Britain would be promoted, that the tariff was so framed that it would bear more heavily on American manufacturers than on British manufacturers. Now by the last Trade and Navigation Returns of my hon. friend, the Minister of Customs, we find that we imported from Great Britain \$43,000,000 worth of goods on which we collected a duty of \$8,000,000; while we imported from the United States \$50,000,000 and only collected \$7,000,000 of revenue. This showing does not take into account the smuggling that is carried on from the United States by these National Policy men, who are protectionists in the day time and free traders after sundown. In saying this I mean to cast no reflection upon the Customs Department, because I believe the hon. Minister of Customs is a very faithful public servant, and his Department is very well administered so far as I know, but it is impossible for him to keep watch over a frontier of 3,000 miles.

Mr. IVES. How is it in Muskoka?

Mr. COCKBURN. I daresay the hon. gentleman knows more about the smuggling business than the people of Muskoka. It is claimed that taxation has not increased, but I find by the Customs returns that the amount collected from Customs duties is 71 cents per head more under the present Administration than it was under the former Administration. That does not seem to be a very large amount, but it is considerable for a whole family. I am not able to gauge exactly how the people are taxed in other ways, but I know they pay higher prices for many of the articles they consume. We know that rubber goods and stoves, for instance, have increased in price. Stove manufacturers are more fortunate than cotton manufacturers, for they have been able to keep up their prices. The Gurney wood cooking stove has increased in price \$3 or \$4. The old-fashioned stoves have gone out of use and can be bought cheaply, but the modern saleable stove is about \$4 higher than it was before the National Policy was introduced. The only respect in which the Gurney wood cooking stove is claimed to be worth more now than it was then, is in the addition of a little nickel ornament worth about 30 or 40 cents. Rubber goods have also increased in price and have deteriorated a good deal in quality. Now, our hon. friends on the Government side laughed at us when we spoke about the necessity of having a cheap country to live in. We find that they are adopting these tactics themselves of dodging the principal issue by calling our attention to present prices. Some hon. members have quoted the prices of certain staple articles to prove that the National Policy has lowered prices. The tariff has nothing whatever to do with respect to the prices of sugar and cotton. Although those articles are extremely cheap in this country, they can be laid down after paying duty just as cheap from other countries. Goods that are higher are higher in consequence of the tariff, and goods that are lower are not lower in consequence of the tariff. It is said to be a poor rule that will not work both ways, but in this case the rule works against the public every time. We are told by the right hon. gentleman that times are better in Canada than they are in the United States or England. That may be, but if that is the case now it was also the case in 1878, and why was not the right hon. gentleman honest enough to have stated so then. Now, we find the hon. gentleman for Cardwell (Mr. White), and some of the leading Conservative papers, gloating over the depression that exists in England. I do not myself think the depression so bad there as they represent it to be, but it would not be any great wonder if it were when we consider the dense population of England, and the circumstances under which they live. It is said that there are large monsters of the deep, iron steamships, lying idle at the docks. But that is in consequence of the dull times in other countries. Those

ships are built to do the business of other countries, or to be sold to residents of other countries to carry their commerce, and when times are dull in other countries there are fewer English steamships employed. Then we are told how bad matters are in England under a free trade policy. I am not advocating free trade; we cannot have free trade here. I advocate a revenue tariff. Would those hon. gentlemen be kind enough to tell us of the depression that existed throughout England before that country adopted free trade? I will ask the members to listen to me while I read from some reports of the state of things that existed prior to the abolition of protection in England:

“EXTRACT from a report upon the condition of the manufacturing industries in England in 1841, under protection.

“BOLTON, December, 1841.—50 cotton mills, formerly employing 8,000 hands, 30 of these mills either standing idle or working 4 days in the week. The Poor Protection Society had 6,995 applicants for relief, whose net earnings were only thirteen pence per head per week. 53 families had no beds at all, and there were an average of 10½ persons to each blanket; 511 families had resorted to pledging or pawning; 609 families had no change of underclothing. There were 1,500 houses uninhabited and a large number not yielding any rents.

“MANCHESTER.—116 mills standing idle. 681 shops and offices untenanted; 549 dwellings unoccupied. In one district of Manchester, as reported by Rev. Father Hearne, there were 2,000 families without a bed and 8,666 persons whose weekly income was 14½ pence per head. Patients in hospitals had increased 15 per cent. The number in prison had nearly doubled. Cotton mills that were deemed to be worth £211,000 had been sold for £66,000.

“BURY.—Only about one-third of the hands employed which were receiving but three and a-half pence per day.

“STOCKPORT.—37 master spinners in a state of insolvency; 3,000 dwellings shut up. Mr. Nelstrop, Mayor of Stockport, stated that 73,314 individuals had received relief, whose average weekly income was only 9½ pence. Thomas Carlyle tells that a cynic had in droll earnest chalked upon a cottage shutter, ‘Stockport to let.’

“GLASGOW.—12,000 persons on relief funds.

“ACCRINGTON.—With a population of 9,000 only 100 employed.

“MASLAND.—2,000 have become paupers.

“LEEDS.—10,000 supplied by relief.

“The above are samples of scores of other cases that can be cited. The clergy stated that thousands of the people did not have half decent clothing and had to absent themselves from church in consequence. Some were so much reduced physically as to be past receiving religious consolation. Others remained in bed as the pangs of hunger were not so keenly felt while reclining. The Duke of Norfolk, a protectionist who from feelings of compassion, recommended that the operative classes who were suffering from hunger should take an occasional pinch of curry powder in a little water to allay their craving for food. Speaking of the corn laws, Carlyle said: ‘God declares against them audibly to all just hearts.’”

Now there is a picture of England under protection in 1841. It was not only manufacturers, but the tenant farmers who were in the condition described, and the depression lasted until there was a change in 1844 or 1846.

Mr. RYKERT. Give us something later than that.

Mr. COCKBURN. I suppose it does not serve the purpose of the hon. gentleman from Lincoln to hear these statements, but if hon. gentlemen opposite had not said so much to us about the present depression in England, I would not have quoted these facts. Now, speaking of England, it does not become us very well to gloat over the depression that exists there; England is one of the most wonderful countries in the world. I do not wonder at the greatness of the United States; there is nothing to hinder it. They possess immense natural resources, and the country could not help becoming great. I am almost reminded of the down-easter, who looked at everything from a commercial standpoint rather than the sublime, said he was not astonished to see water pouring over Niagara Falls for there was nothing to hinder it. There was nothing to hinder the United States progressing. These little gems of the sea, the British Isles, are far greater wonders than any other country under the sun. The United Kingdom contains only 120,222 square miles, and sustains a population of 35,000,000, and furnishes capital to build railways and other improvements all over

the globe. That country sustains a population of 290 to the square mile. The United States contain 3,094,000 square miles, and sustain a population of 50,000,000 people or only 16 to the square mile. In other words, in the United States there are only 16 people to each square mile as compared to the United Kingdom, which has to support 290 people to the square mile. We ought to have good times in Canada. We have had very abundant crops, a large amount of public money has been expended on public works and we have a great country to settle. I have faith in this country. I think matters are sound, thanks to the thrift of the people, although trade is very dull and people can hardly understand why there is so little trade doing. There is, however, an abundance of food in the country. We have had a large number of failures, which would not have been the case under a revenue tariff. We find a great many of the employés in manufacturing establishments have been idle or working short time. A great many no doubt returned to work after a time—no doubt the majority of them will return to work; nevertheless the fact remains that a great many at present are unemployed. In Toronto, which is one of the most prosperous cities in the Dominion, and which always thrives, there are many hundreds of people out of employment or working short time. We find our expenditure has been increased very much. It may be that owing to public works it has been necessary to increase the capital account; but there has been a very large increase in the controllable expenditure, some \$4,000,000, which might have been obviated. For this unnecessary increase we hold the Government directly responsible. There is a very strong presumption that the resources of this country have been frittered away, that in some instances the inheritance of the people has been squandered in order to help friends of the Government or reward political supporters. For instance, with respect to timber lands so called, we find a very pernicious system has obtained in that regard. We hear of a party obtaining \$600,000 for that for which he paid a few thousands of dollars. That immense profit belonged to the people, but it is gone now. There is also a strong presumption that contractors have been receiving large extras, thereby enabling them to make large contributions to election funds. I do not state that it is so; but there is a strong presumption in that direction. I have often wondered where the large amounts of money in circulation at election times came from. From what source did the \$25,000 or more which went to Muskoka and carried the local election come? I did not know there was so many patriotic men who were prepared to subscribe private money. I also wonder where the funds came from which were offered for the purpose of bribing members of the Ontario Legislature a year afterwards. Such practices are very wrong. We have had men in our own party, I believe, who have spent large sums of money at elections. That was very wrong. I am very glad I was not among the number. But it is a fact that considerable money has been spent in that way. Who is to blame? Hon. gentlemen opposite, who refused to give us an election law whereby controverted elections would be tried by the judges. Accordingly, that bad habit prevailed, to some extent, at that time. Some hon. gentlemen on both sides spent large amounts of their own money, and they were very much to blame for having done so. But that was not half so bad as to take the people's money indirectly from the public treasury and use it for election purposes.

Mr. BOWELL I suppose you mean colonisation roads?

Mr. COCKBURN. Colonisation roads accounts in Ontario are all right; you cannot make anything out of them. We find the trade policy not a success. We find the railway policy not a success. We find that constant applications are made for large amounts of money; that final arrangements are supposed to be made but

the company come back another year and another final arrangement is entered into. The Government have not carried out their pledges, and have changed their railway policy at different times. At one time they were going to build the road for \$79,000,000; at another time the leader of the Government said he was going to make sufficient money out of the lands to build the road without any expense to this country. He also stated that some \$58,000,000 were to be received from the sales of land up to 1891. They have not yet received \$1,000,000, clear of expenses, and they will have to hurry up in order to obtain the other \$57,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite boast of being the party of progress with respect to this railway. I will not concede that claim, but I think they might appropriately call themselves the reckless party. They should make haste slowly. We all appreciate the advantages of a trans-continental railway, but it should be built as the resources of the country will permit and in a prudent, economical manner. The Government railway policy is very unsatisfactory. Their land policy has also been most unsatisfactory, and the population expected is not now to be found in Manitoba and the North-West. What do we find they now have on their hands? They have a second rebellion in this short history of the country. All this might be obviated by a little care in explaining matters to the people who are not so well versed as we in Ontario are with the usages of land holding. I am sure the first rebellion might have been avoided; and I daresay if the people of that country had proper representation, if they had anyone to see to their wants, or listen to the complaints and alleged grievances, the present trouble might have been averted. It is also to be noticed that the tone of political morality in this country is not in a very satisfactory state. There are too many of our people who have no faith that public affairs can be administered in a straightforward and honest manner, though I do not subscribe to that doctrine myself. We are told that you might as well preach in the wilderness as try to inculcate the doctrines of sound political morality in the country at the present time. I believe this feeling prevails to an alarming extent, though for my part I do not despair of a better time coming, when public matters will be in a more satisfactory state. I am sorry the right hon. gentleman is not in his place, though whether he were present or absent, I should be sorry to say anything disrespectful of him. I hold, however, that there has been and is a great deal of political corruption in the country, and for the last thirty or forty years that hon. gentleman has been the central figure in all political matters. I therefore hold him, to a large extent, responsible for the demoralisation of the rising politicians of the country; the tendency of his tactics has been to develop a very bad school of politicians. However, as the debate is wearing on and hon. gentlemen are very patient, I shall close very soon, though I have a great many more notes.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. COCKBURN. Perhaps the hon. gentleman thinks I cannot go on, and that is the reason he is so liberal on this occasion, but I am not exhausted by any means. I have endeavored to give a fair *exposé* of public matters according to my light. I think the figures I have given will bear investigation, and I challenge hon. members to investigate them, for I am not at all afraid to stand by my utterances. I am also sure that my deductions and general impressions will commend themselves to all intelligent and well informed people who are not biassed by party considerations. I have endeavored to do the tariff as much justice as possible. As I have already stated I believe it has already stimulated some industries of this country and we have had good specimens of manufacture produced in Canada, which is a gratifying circumstance; but I say that, taking the matter all in all, the tariff

Mr. COCKBURN.

has been inimical to the general interests of the country. With regard to the policy we should pursue, I think it would be well for the Finance Minister to return as soon as possible to a revenue tariff. In 1873 we, on this side of the House, stated that the effect of the tariff would be to cripple the milling industries and the carrying trade of the country, and we know that the milling industry is now in a depressed state, and that the carrying trade has been injured. We also stated that the effect of the tariff would be very injurious to the Maritime Provinces. And such undoubtedly has been the case. The effect of the tariff has been to develop some inter-provincial trade, but this has been done by a forcing process, and it has forced out of the Maritime Provinces some of the best men of the country, by injuring various lines of business. We were bidding fair to take the position of being perhaps the greatest maritime people in the world, in proportion to our population, but the attempt to develop this inter-provincial trade has had the effect of injuring the trade of small carriers—men who, with small ships, did the carrying trade for local ports of the Maritime Provinces, and carrying products to the eastern ports of the United States, and bringing back cornmeal and other provisions. I cannot conceive of any tax that could be more unjust than the tax on cornmeal, for it is an article which does not come in competition with us, as we are not producers of cornmeal. I hold, therefore, that the Maritime Provinces have been injured, notwithstanding the remarks of some hon. gentlemen who are more interested in, and should be better acquainted with, those Provinces than I am. There may be some coal producing counties which have been benefitted, but I do not think that even they have realised the benefits to the extent which has been claimed for them. Hon. gentlemen may point to the fact that they carried the country; they may point to the general elections and the bye-elections at the polls, but they do not count for anything. We did not get a fair election. We had not a fair election in 1882, on account of the gerrymander and the sops which were thrown to the Maritime Provinces and to many sections. As to the bye-elections hon. gentlemen opposite act in a very different way from what my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) acted when he was in power. They are very careful about opening constituencies, and when they do open them they put on all possible power to carry them, instead of relying alone on the integrity and intelligence of the people as the hon. member for East York (Mr. Mackenzie) did. Of course the fates were against us at that time, but the one thing needful for the people in the Maritime Provinces is—

Mr. IVES. Money.

Mr. COCKBURN. Yes, I know, that making money is the politics of some hon. gentlemen. The one thing most needful for the people of the Maritime Provinces is a fairly considered reciprocity treaty in the natural products of the country, as this would help the coasting business and other lines of trade in those Provinces. In Ontario they do not care so much about it, though it would be an advantage to the farmers who have horses, barley, &c., to sell and other produce for the American markets; and it would also be a benefit to the lumbermen. There has been discussion in this debate as to who pays the duty. I believe that in some cases the consumer pays the duty, and in others the producer, but it is generally conceded by those who have studied the matter that in barley and in some other articles it is divided, each paying one-half, which would leave a margin for our farmers and lumbermen. I see that my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Mitchell) is present, who has been agitating for the removal of the duty on cornmeal, a movement in which he will have my hearty support.

Mr. MITCHELL. I should be happy to know that we could be successful, but I am afraid not.

Mr. COCKBURN. I am something like the Minister of the Exterior—I am not in the secrets of the Government. I must, however, close my remarks, and though I have taken more time than I should have taken, I felt it my duty to give my views; and though they have not been presented very glibly I felt that I should present my impressions whether they were appreciated or not. And, Mr. Speaker, you will be glad to know that I have not prepared a highfaluting peroration, and so I shall without further remark resume my seat.

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton). I feel that I should apologise to the House for prolonging this debate, but, as is well known, I am not one of those who have, during this Session, taken up much of the time of the House. And I do not know, Sir, that I would be induced even now to say anything on the quest on before you, if it were not for what has fallen from some hon. gentlemen opposite. I have had the satisfaction of listening to and reading a great number of speeches delivered by Finance Ministers on the opening of the Budget, and I must say that I have never listened to or read one with greater satisfaction than the able dissertation which was given to us by the hon. Finance Minister on the opening of his Budget. He had an opportunity then of referring to the progress of trade and commerce in this country for the last five years, and he could do so with great satisfaction, not only to himself and to this House, but to the country generally. Sir, all that the Finance Minister said is capable of being verified, notwithstanding what has been alleged on the other side. I do not purpose, as I stated a moment ago, to enter into a general discussion of all that has been presented in that address; but I mean to offer a few remarks in reference to what has fallen from some hon. gentlemen opposite. Sir, we have learned that if those hon. gentlemen have no other policy to present to this country, they have certainly a policy of detraction. That has been their policy, not only since the time they were consigned to the cold shades of Opposition in 1878, but those of us who are old enough to remember how they conducted themselves in Opposition for 17 or 18 years before they got into power in 1874, will remember that that was the policy they indulged in during that time. It was a policy of detraction, a policy designed to make the people believe that this country was not governed in an economical or proper spirit, but against the best interests of the people; and so long had they harped on that string that the people at last were induced to think they were really sincere, and that the country was not governed so well as it would be if it was governed by those hon. gentlemen. Well, the people gave them a chance to show what they were made of; they had five years of power, and what was the result? They came into power under most favorable circumstances. They assumed the government when the exchequer was full and overflowing; they came into power when this country was in a high state of progress; they came into power shortly after the American war had ceased, a war which had all but exhausted the best energies of that great people, and one which had materially crippled their manufacturing industries, which gave a great advantage to the manufacturing interests of this country. But notwithstanding all that, Sir, before these hon. gentlemen were in power three short years, their policy had such an effect upon the country that it began to go back; and until they were driven out the country suffered. Well, Sir, the people having given these hon. gentlemen a chance to try their hand at governing this country, so soon as they got an opportunity to reconsider what they had unfortunately done in 1874, rejected them and ignominiously turned them out of power, and they are now in the cold shades of Opposition, having had in the meantime another opportunity of getting back into power, but the people thought them unworthy of their confidence. I predict that so long as the generation is in existence which was in existence while these hon. gentlemen occupied

the treasury benches, so long will these hon. gentlemen be kept in the cold shades of Opposition. Until the people can be educated to forget all that took place from 1873 to 1878, so long will these hon. gentlemen remain exactly where they are. Now, Sir, I propose to examine some statements which have been made by some hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this subject. I would not condescend to do so, if some of these statements had not come from one who aspires to be a bright particular star in the Liberal firmament. Hon. gentlemen opposite have not merely considered the question from a national or Dominion point of view; they have not only dealt with the question of trade and commerce as it affects the whole Dominion generally; but the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills), who I regret is not in his place—because I always like to say to a man's face what I would say behind his back—in fact, I would say more to his face than I would behind his back—the hon. member for Bothwell, I say, descended from Dominion politics down to what might be called the local affairs of the city of Hamilton. Sir, I have the honor to represent that city, and proud I am of the honor; and I have to say that the only new thing that has been said on the other side in this debate was the astounding statement put forward by the hon. member for Bothwell with reference to the city of Hamilton. The hon. gentleman said—and I read from the report of his speech in *Hansard*:

"The Hamilton *Speciator* is the organ of the Tory party. It is a paper friendly to the Administration; it advocates the doctrine of protection, and it describes the condition of the manufactures in Hamilton at that time. It says: 'The Empire foundry of Copp & Co. had been enormously increased in capacity, and its business has increased.' It mentions the fact that the Wanzer Sewing Machine Co. had greatly extended their business, and were employing a much larger number of hands than before. It mentions that the Gurney Co. had also greatly increased the capacity of their factory, and were giving employment to a greater number of men than before. It also describes the manufacturing establishments of Sawyer & Co. and of Burrows, Stewart & Milne. It describes several other establishments in Hamilton that had enlarged their capacity, and employed an increased number of hands. And, Sir, it is well known that the progress of manufactures in Hamilton was greater between 1873 and 1878, notwithstanding there was a depression existing, than it has been between 1879 and the present hour."

It is that astounding statement, Sir, that has been the cause of calling me to my feet; and it is on account of that that I have to ask the indulgence of the House in order that I may give it a flat and blunt contradiction. I say the facts do not warrant the assertion, and I submit that it is an extraordinary thing for any member of the House, occupying the position that the hon. gentleman presumes to occupy, to make such a statement in the broad face of day. Sir, it is true, that Hamilton was a flourishing city in 1873 and 1874. There is no doubt of it. Hamilton has always been, comparatively speaking, a flourishing city. Its people are energetic, enterprising and enlightened, and desirous of making their city what it should be, a great manufacturing centre. They are engaged chiefly in manufacturing industries, and have that spirit of enterprise which all good citizens should have, and which I am happy and proud to say, abounds in the city of Hamilton. No doubt, for some years, up to 1873, 1874 and 1875, Hamilton wonderfully increased its manufacturing establishments. This House understands that Hamilton has long been looked upon as the seat of the National Policy. The people have long been in favor of a policy which would foster and protect the native industries of the country; the people had but one opinion on that point, and the hon. gentlemen who represented Hamilton before my colleague and myself had the honor of seats in this House, were elected on the express promise and pledge that they would give their utmost support to a protective policy. Had they not given that pledge, they could not have been returned, and they said to the people: "You had better by far return us, who are supporters of the Government, than to return our opponents, who would be in Opposition, and could do nothing." Well, the people believed them. These gentlemen were returned in 1874 by a majority

of something over 500, and the electors believed firmly that a policy of protection would be introduced by the Mackenzie Government. Their representatives told them that such a policy would be introduced, that although the Mackenzie Government were free traders, yet they could see what was for the interest of the country, and that they, as representatives of Hamilton, would have sufficient influence with the Government to induce it to concede the point. More than that, up to 1878, at every bye-election, the Government were being defeated, and the people of Hamilton thought that, as a matter of course, the Ministers would have sense and prescience enough, and were of sufficient ability as statesmen, to see what the demands and requirements of the country were, and that when the Session of 1878 came round the Finance Minister would, as a matter of course, come down with such a scheme for the readjustment of the tariff as would give the people what they so much required. They waited in vain; but, in the hope that their wishes and expectations would be gratified, they did, in some cases, enlarge their premises, and this was noted at the time in the public press. The Session of 1878 came and went. When the members of the Conservative party would meet members of the Liberal party and draw their attention to the fact that the country was going to the dogs for want of that policy which Hamilton had been so instrumental in propounding to the country, they were always met with the assertion: "Have faith in the Minister of Finance; he is the greatest Finance Minister that ever graced the treasury benches; he is no ordinary man." In fact, in comparing him with other financiers, they spoke of him as a "mountain" compared to "a mole hill." They considered him the great "mountain of finance," as a man whose ability was so great that he could only be compared for a moment with any of his predecessors! Well, the time came; the "mountain" was in labor and it was expected to bring forth something more than a mouse, but it did not bring forth even "a mouse;" it was a "fly on the wheel." Of course there was great depression then. The people saw that nothing could induce the Government of the day to grant that great panacea which they all desired so much. Shops and manufacturing establishments were either shut up entirely, or were working on half time, or at half their capacity; mechanics who should have been earning \$2 or \$2.50 a day, were turned out into the streets, and those who could not afford to leave the country and go to the United States or elsewhere, for the purpose of earning a livelihood, were obliged to remain in Canada and work for the corporation at 75 cents per day. Are there any such scenes witnessed to-day in Canada? Or anything approaching them? Yet the hon. gentleman has the hardihood to say that "the progress of manufacturing industry was greater from 1873 to 1878 than from 1878 to the present." Hamilton is, as I have said, almost entirely a manufacturing city, and, except so far as manufacturing industries are concerned, her commercial importance is not so great. If, therefore, what the hon. gentleman has said were true, the population of the city would have decreased, and the value of property would also have decreased. But what do we find? I have it from the best authority, and although I would be very loath to quote any paper from the opposite side of politics in corroboration, yet one can go sometimes with profit into the enemy's camp for the purpose of obtaining evidence in support of his statement. In 1874, the population of Hamilton was 31,957; in 1879 it was 34,268, or an increase in five years of 2,311, making an increase of 462 per year. In 1883 the population had increased to 38,196, an increase of 3,928 in five years or 786 per year. In 1884, the population had increased to 39,216, an increase in one year of 1,020. Since 1881 the increase has been more than double as rapid as from 1874 to 1879. In support of the progress of the city, as regards population, I refer hon. members

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton).

to the Hamilton *Times* of the 18th March instant. A question of representation in the Local Legislature of Ontario is up before that House. I will not trespass on the good nature of the House by alluding to that in any other way than merely to mention that the hon. member (Mr. Gibson) who represents Hamilton in the Local House, is desirous that there should be two members to represent Hamilton, as he claims that city is entitled to two members instead of one; so Mr. Gibson has given notice of his intention to move that Hamilton shall be given an additional member. The *Times* newspaper goes on to say:

"His argument is that the population of Hamilton is now about 40,000 and that the population of the city increases more rapidly than the population of the Province at large, so that in ten years hence there will be 50,000 or 60,000 within the limits, and that is quite true."

I think I have proved that part of my statement, at all events, by the facts as I have given them to you, as they have been taken each year by the assessors as they go from door to door, and subsequently by the assertion of the organ of the party, which the hon. gentleman opposite certainly will not say a word against, that "it is all true." Now, let us look at the assessed value of property within those periods. I think those things go to show whether a country or a city is progressing or is going to decay. In 1874, the assessed value was \$13,850,040; in 1879, it had increased to \$15,163,210, being an increase in the five years of \$1,313,170, or a little more than \$260,000 per annum; in 1883, it had reached \$17,713,150, an increase of \$2,544,940 in five years, or rather more than \$500,000 per annum; in 1884, the year just expired, it has increased to \$18,818,330, showing an increase in one year of \$1,105,180, or more than four times the rate of increase between 1874 and 1879. Yet the hon. gentleman says that "it is well known that the manufacturing industries of Hamilton have not prospered so well between 1878 and the present hour as between 1873 and 1878." Now, there is no doubt that, as between 1882 and 1884, there is a difference in favor of 1882. We all know that 1881 and 1882 were years of wonderful activity in trade and business. That every manufacturing interest was then driven to its utmost capacity. We know that there was not an establishment—and I am speaking now from a local point of view—in the city of Hamilton but was working over hours and could not even then fill the orders fast enough. The time did come when there was a slacking up. The great excitement that extended to the North-West began to die away, and the manufacturing interest began to flag, and therefore, of course, business is not so brisk in 1884 as it was in 1882. But, nevertheless, there are more men now employed in the aggregate and higher wages are paid than at any former period in the city's history. Why, at this day, although you hear people complain about the want of work, and the impossibility of getting work for the laborers to do, you cannot employ a man in the city of Hamilton for less than \$1.25 a day, and many of them ask \$1.50. But then we must take into account that this is the winter season, and hundreds of laborers can only find employment when the snow is off the ground, and the weather is more seasonable. There is never so much work going on in a city or in a country, if I might so speak, in the winter season, as there is in the other parts of the year. But we have no mechanics, unless brick-layers and stone-masons, out of employment. We have no man who is able to earn \$2.50 a day coming to the offices of the city hall and begging the mayor to give him work at 75 cents a day as a digger, or scraper on the streets. We have no such characters as these. They are all employed one way or another, or, if they are not employed, they have the money lying by in the savings bank which they can draw on for the purpose of keeping the wolf from the door, a thing they could not do in 1878. Now, a good deal has been said about the report of the

manufacturing interests which has been laid before this House by the Finance Minister, and it has been derided and spoken about in a way anything but complimentary. I am free to say that that report does not give a full and particular account of all the industries of the Dominion. It never was intended that it should. It would be quite impossible for any one man or any half dozen men to go from one end of this Dominion to the other and give a full and particular account of its industries and make comparative statements between 1878 and 1884. It does not pretend to do that, and with reference to the city of Hamilton alone it leaves out a great number of most important institutions. My colleague and myself, of our own knowledge, here in the House, have been able to go over that statement and show that at least 50, if not more, important establishments have been left out. I suppose the report meets the purpose for which it was intended. It gives a certain number of institutions that were in vogue in 1878, and a certain number that have been established since that time, and they draw a comparison and show that of these 62—we take the city of Hamilton—40 of them were erected before 1878, and 22 since, showing the comparison, the increase of capital invested, the amount of wages paid out weekly, and the amount of products that have been turned out. I might mention that in that report so important a concern as George E. Tuckett & Sons' tobacco factory, one known all over the world, is omitted. R. M. Wanzer & Co.'s great sewing machine establishment is left out; R. M. Wanzer & Co.'s great screw factory is left out. Now these are very important establishments, and the hon. gentleman had the audacity to say that "Wanzer & Co.'s establishment was not employing one-third the number of men this year that it was in 1878." Well, all I can say to the hon. gentlemen is this, Mr. Speaker, that R. M. Wanzer & Co. have added to their capacity for turning out work within the last year, buildings and machinery which have cost them \$100,000; so I think that is something which goes to prove a state of affairs contrary to that asserted as existing by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills). Then, Sir, we have another establishment in Hamilton, which was built immediately after the National Policy was introduced—an extensive coffin factory erected, as was jocularly said at the time, for the purpose of burying the clear Grit party. We have also got a very large baby carriage factory, which is evidence of a great increase in population. So you see that putting one against the other the rising generation being protectionists, those who are being buried are free traders—the result is inevitable! I will not take up time by enumerating the other establishments erected since 1879, because it is unnecessary to do so; but they are large, numerous and extensive, all of which goes to show that the city of Hamilton, which the hon. gentleman endeavored to belittle and detract from, is one of the most flourishing in the Dominion of Canada. So much for the city of Hamilton. I must now, with leave of the House, notice some of the figures the hon. gentleman gave us by way of proving that the duty does not keep articles out of the market. The hon. gentleman said in his speech:

"High taxes have been imposed, and for what? Why, hon. gentlemen opposite say, for the purpose of keeping away the foreign products, and making Canada a close preserve for the manufacturers of Canada. We want to have Canada for the Canadians. But has that been the result of the policy? Take the case of the importations. The following table shows the importations in 1879 and 1883 of a number of leading articles."

Then he enumerates carriages, boots and shoes, blankets, furniture, and that sort of thing, and gives the importations, some of them very insignificant—stoves, for instance, \$34,212; whips, a good article—some gentlemen ought to have them applied to them—\$3,383. He goes down into these small articles for the purpose of proving that the duty

does not keep the articles out of the country. I did not understand that it was ever supposed that the tariff would create a close market, that it would prevent other countries from exporting into Canada, or prevent the inhabitants of this country from importing from other countries. It was intended to secure the markets of this country for such articles as we could produce, while such articles as this country could not manufacture, or could not manufacture a sufficiency of—of course the people must have them, and they would get them from abroad. But I submit that the hon. gentleman, like other hon. gentlemen who have followed him on that side, has not given us a fair, candid and upright statement with reference to the very articles he has mentioned. If he wanted to show to the House and to the country the real state of affairs that exist to-day with reference to the National Policy, and to compare it with the state of affairs which existed before that policy was introduced, he should have taken the year 1878 and compared it with the year 1884. And so I propose to do with not a few of the articles the hon. gentleman has mentioned. I do not intend going over the whole of them, because there would be no profit in that, and we have already lost time enough over this subject. The hon. gentleman mentions blankets, for instance, and he says that there were \$201,070 worth imported in 1879, and in 1883, \$265,956 worth. But according to the returns the importation in 1878, before the National Policy was introduced, show a very different figure. In that year there were \$226,946 worth, and in 1884 they come down to \$122,178, being less than one half of what they were in 1883. Then take furniture. The hon. gentleman shows that in 1879 there were \$247,970 imported, and in 1883 \$264,360. Now, what was it in 1878? In 1878 there were imported into this country \$399,330; in 1884, only \$206,436 worth; showing a very great decrease. The hon. gentleman did not want to show these figures; he did not draw the attention of the House to them. He evidently must have compared the Trade Returns of 1883 and 1884, and he chose to take those of 1883 and 1879 and compare them and leave out those which would give the real and true test of what this country is doing at the present time as compared with 1878, when a different tariff was in force. The hon. gentleman also refers to pianos. He says that the importation of pianos in 1879 amounted to \$289,631, and they increased in 1883 \$328,774. Well, what do we find? In 1878 the importations were \$353,466 worth; in 1884 they were only \$288,855, showing a very great decrease. And we have to take into consideration this fact, that the most expensive pianos are not made in this country; they are chiefly made in the United States, and the importation of this class of pianos mount up in value very much more speedily than the ordinary article manufactured in this country. I do not mean to say, Mr. Speaker, when I allude to pianos in that way, that there are not splendid instruments manufactured in this country, some very excellent ones, indeed; but we do know this, that musicians have their fancies and their pets in pianos; they will have a particular make and no other, and that fact militates a good deal against the Canadian piano, although in many cases Canadian pianos are quite as good as the very best that are imported into this country. But I notice that the hon. gentleman cunningly left out of his list one of the most important musical instruments, the one that tells the story best as to what the National Policy is doing for this country—certainly with reference to musical instruments. We all know that the manufacture of organs is a very important industry in this country; we all know that the great mass of the people have them; nearly every well-to-do farmer possesses an organ, or a melodeon, or a piano. But this item of organs shows what the country requires and is able to pay for in the way of musical instruments. We find that in 1878 we imported organs to the tune of \$121,525

worth; in 1879, after the National Policy came into force, that sum was reduced down to \$95,786; in 1883, down to \$71,842; and in 1884 down to \$51,317. Why did the hon. gentleman leave out that item unless it was for the purpose of detracting from the condition of prosperity which this country is enjoying? Well, now, I find he has mentioned another insignificant item in respect to importation, and that is the item of stoves. In 1878 the importations amounted to \$59,319 worth, in 1879 to \$34,212, and in 1879 the importations had fallen to \$47,428, but stoves always had a fair protection and have not been so much influenced by the National Policy as other great industries. Is it supposed for a moment that the National Policy was intended to keep out every article that could possibly be manufactured in this country? You cannot secure such a result. It was never contended that it would have such an effect. The people will have their fancy about one article and another article; and although they may generally like and be pleased with what we manufacture here, yet they go over to the other side and they find something which pleases their taste and they import it and use it instead of the Canadian product. The article of sewing machines has been referred to also. No doubt there is a very large importation of these goods into this country, notwithstanding the duty placed upon them. But the fact is the sewing machine industry of the United States has attained such enormous dimensions, and the surplus stock on hand for the last two or three years has been so wonderfully great, that manufacturers, in spite of the duty, are able to send their goods in here to the injury of the manufacturing interests of the Dominion. That, instead of being an argument against the National Policy, is an argument in favor of it; and if the duty on sewing machines is not sufficiently high, it should be increased. But, I submit, even in this respect the hon. gentleman has not given a fair and candid statement, because although in 1883 we imported sewing machines to the value of \$323,197, the value imported in 1884 was only \$226,232. Another very important item which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) referred to, was agricultural implements. He told the House nothing, however, as to how many of them had been imported in 1884. What do we find? In 1879, we imported to the value of \$240,566, and in 1883 the amount was \$583,065. That is true. But the hon. member does not take into account the great rush of settlement that was going on in the North-West at that time, and that American agricultural implement makers were rushing every machine they could possibly turn out into the North-West. The proof of that is, that we find by referring to the tables with respect to Manitoba alone that the value imported there, in 1879, was only \$74,174; in 1883 it had increased to the enormous value of \$363,769, only \$200,000 less than the whole value of agricultural implements imported into Canada. The hon. gentleman, moreover, did not take into account that notice was given at the time the amended tariff was introduced that it would not come into force until the 10th of May. Thus three weeks were allowed Americans to send in agricultural implements, and the value was run up to the large sum of \$363,769. The duty was increased from 25 to 35 per cent. We find there is now no complaints in the North-West of implements being too dear. We know from the reports which come to us that there are thousands of machines lying there waiting to be sold. They are brought down to the lowest price. What is the consequence? In 1884 the total amount imported was of the value of only \$189,966, showing conclusively quite the contrary, I submit, to the hon. gentleman's statement "that the duty does not prevent articles coming into this country." I do not propose to occupy any more time, but I want to refer to one or two items in a general way in order to show how the farming community has benefited in one item of their produc-

Mr. ROBERTSON (Hamilton).

tion since the National Policy has come into force. I refer to cheese. Canada has now attained in England a pre-eminent position for her cheese, and she is outbidding the world not only for quality but for quantity. In 1879 the Canadian cheese product was of the value of \$3,790,300; in 1884, five years afterwards, it had increased to \$7,251,989. I find that the value of cheese in 1878 was nearly half as much as the value of our barley, beans, oats peas and rye, exported from the country. But in 1884 while those coarse grains increased in value to \$8,273,994, yet cheese came up and reached their united value within \$207,131. I will conclude my remarks. I felt it was my duty to take upon myself to contradict the hon. member for Bothwell, who, I regret again, although he knew I was going to answer him, has not thought proper to make his appearance in the House. I will close my remarks by giving hon. gentlemen opposite a piece of advice, which I am quite sure they will act upon, and that is to go on disparaging the country as long as they please, because hon. members in this House understand them and understand what they are driving at, and they may rest assured that the people of the country, outside this House, also understand them. There are very few men who are so unpatriotic as not to know when you set to work to create grievances, or to make small troubles appear great and not give the country credit for that progress it has indisputably made since 1878, and is still making, that those who pursue such a course have a sinister motive, and you may rest assured that when the time comes round and this House is dissolved, and we are all sent back to our constituents to give an account of our stewardship, then hon. gentlemen will meet with the same reward they did in 1878 and 1882 and be returned here again only to enjoy the cold shades of a sunless opposition.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have listened with considerable interest to the address which has just been delivered by the hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Robertson). He attempted in his introductory remarks to show that the policy of my esteemed and hon. friend in front of me (Mr. Mackenzie) had the effect of ruining the country. He went on to say that the Finance Minister of that day was a fly on the wheel; that he could not accomplish anything in the country's interest, and that it was only when a change of Government took place that the country began to prosper. Now, I would like to know what is the matter just now. We have not the same prosperity in this country that we had in 1882. We have places now that are complaining seriously of the stringency of money, and people who are complaining seriously of the scarcity of work. We know that there are general complaints of these matters throughout the country. How is this? How is it that hon. gentlemen have not, in accordance with their declared policy, looked after the interests of the country and seen that matters of this kind do not exist? I would like to enquire with regard to the engine works at Kingston. Why is it that under the operation of the benign influence of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite these works are not in full blast, and that people have not got employment in them? Why have they had to leave our soil and go across to the other side to earn money to support their families, which they left behind them in Canada? Why has the National Policy permitted things of this kind to take place? I think the hon. gentleman should have explained why hon. gentlemen opposite have been so far neglectful of their duties, so far recreant to their duty as great financiers and promoters of prosperity, as to allow matters of this kind to exist at the present moment. The hon. gentleman admits that Hamilton did increase in population under the Government of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie). He does not deny that, but he claims there is a larger increase under the Government which now exists. Why, Sir, Hamilton did a very respectable manufacturing business before there was a

National Policy. Indeed, I believe, and have good reason to believe, that there are men there to-day who were better off, and made more money, and were in more comfortable circumstances financially, under the operation of the tariff of the Mackenzie Administration than they are to-day under the tariff of the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury Benches. I am satisfied they had greater prosperity. You may have a few more factories, but what is the fact? If the National Policy tends to do anything at all it tends to build up and then break down—to encourage more factories than are necessary. The Finance Minister extends his liberty and kindness in the direction of protecting those who are disposed to enter into manufacturing business, and the result is that more factories are erected than can find consumers for their produce and the end is that there comes disaster. Well, Sir, it does not matter what particular state of things exists hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to clap their hands. When the manufacturers are now in deep water they say, "Did not we tell you what would come; did not we tell you that when new factories were erected competition would arise and the people would get their goods far cheaper. To-day there are hundreds of factories in financial difficulties. I know of factories which were in existence and did a creditable and lucrative business before the introduction of the National Policy, and to-day, I am sorry to say, they are closed—they are not able to turn out a single implement, simply because the production in the particular line in which they were engaged has been far more than the country required. The great evil has been that they did not get consumers for the goods they produced. The Government has cast around us a protective policy and we have not the people to take the article manufactured under that policy, and the result is that in many cases they have a larger production than is necessary, and the consequence is stagnation and ruin. The hon. gentleman also said that the price does not keep the goods out of the country; that notwithstanding the National Policy we have still a large influx of goods. That is true; and I ask the House to notice that we are paying an increased price on all those articles we are bringing into the country, in order to satisfy and encourage the owners of those factories in their erection and operation. People have imported goods and paid the increased duties imposed on them in order to encourage the erection of factories to manufacture these goods. Notwithstanding that fact they have not reduced the price, because in some cases they have not produced a sufficient quantity, and the people are driven to foreign markets to supply themselves, and the result is that they are paying an extra price for their goods. Now, Sir, I was surprised at the remarks which dropped from the hon. gentleman with regard to cheese. He said before he sat down he wished to draw the attention of the House to one particular thing, and that thing was cheese, and if there was anything in the world to show the benefits and the advantages of the National Policy it was the article of cheese. Well, Sir, I cannot understand how he draws the conclusion that the National Policy has been the means of establishing so many cheese factories in this country. Does he pretend to say that this country would be flooded with cheese from the United States if we had not a protective policy? Does he mean to say that our people would not have gone into the manufacture of cheese, or that cheese would not have been manufactured in this country, if we had not had the National Policy? Why, Sir, the National Policy has no more to do with the increase in the manufacture of cheese, or with fixing the price of cheese, than it has with arranging the hour when the sun rises or sets each day.

An hon. MEMBER. The duty is just the same as it was.

Mr. McMULLEN. Yes, the duty now is just what it was, so that the National Policy has nothing to do with it. But the hon. gentleman appears to be convinced that the National Policy really has done wonders for cheese. Well, Sir, I do not know, but my impression is that if he went to the country and addressed a rural audience, and told them they should thank with all their heart and soul the goodness and kindness of the present Government in so encouraging the manufacture of cheese by the introduction of the National Policy, I should think if there was any snow around he would be snowballed, for the people would not stand such nonsense; they know better. We are face to face with two policies. In the first place the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is a policy of protection. Their policy is to protect our factories first, and never mind whether the tariff levied on the people is sufficient to raise a sum necessary to meet the demands of the treasury or not; that is a secondary consideration. We claim that our policy is this: Tax the people to the extent necessary to meet the demands on the Dominion Treasury, and no more. If those who want to manufacture goods within the Dominion are able to manufacture within those limits, we say to them with all our hearts, God speed. But we say on the other hand, if we have in the first place to sacrifice the rights of every consumer in this country, if we have to impose on him a duty which he should not be asked to pay, if we have to extract from his pocket annually a certain sum in order to encourage a certain individual to manufacture a certain thing—we say then, in justice to the country, in justice to the individual, it is wrong. It is wrong that any country should base its annual levy for the purpose of meeting the demands on the Treasury, from any such point of view. I say that a revenue tariff, properly and honestly administered, is amply sufficient for the purpose of encouraging the manufacture of any goods within this Dominion that can be successfully manufactured here. Now, Sir, the difference between a revenue tariff and a protective tariff I think I have fully explained; and I hold that if those who are disposed to manufacture were permitted to import the raw material free, and were granted the privilege and the protection our tariff would necessarily give them, it is all the protection they should ask, and all they should receive. Now, I made a special note of the remark of the Finance Minister on the cotton trade. He took the opportunity of comparing the prices of cotton on the American side with those now manufactured in Canada. He mentioned certain brands manufactured in the United States and certain brands manufactured in Canada, and he said the prices are about the same. Now, Sir, he should have told us something along with that. He should have told us that in the United States at this moment not a single bale of cotton leaves a factory that is not sold under a combination. There is not a single mill in the United States at this moment that has not entered into an arrangement whereby every bale it turns out is placed under the control of and sold by one man. I know that. Now, in the face of that fact, what is our position to-day when the Finance Minister tells us that we are now paying a price for cotton equal to the price paid under a combination in the United States? What is going to be the price here when we have a combination? What does the hon. gentleman say? He says to us: I have no hesitation in saying that there is not a member in this House, there is not at least a supporter of the National Policy, who is not prepared to say that he would be glad to see such an arrangement made as would secure to the investors in this country a fair return for the money they have invested, as well as a fair return for the article produced. That is his statement. Well, what will be the result of that? The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that we have more cotton mills in the country at present than can find

consumers, and yet he is telling them: Gentlemen put your heads together, and tell us what you want; put on your prices; we will be glad to see you get a good return for the money you have invested, and for the cotton you have produced. The result will be that these cotton mills will combine, and on every dollar in their stock they will pay an annual dividend; money will be forthcoming to pay the interest on their investments, for the cotton the mills will produce will be offered to the public at a price that will pay a dividend on the entire investments in mills as well as the cost of material and working expenses. That will be the result when that arrangement is perfected, as I have no doubt it will. We know that protection leads to combination, combination leads to trade union, and trade union leads to monopolies; one thing follows another just as day follows night. There is one point in this connection to which I wish to call the attention of the House. We think to-day that we are manufacturing cotton in Canada very cheaply. We think we have accomplished a great deal in producing the articles we now produce. Now, I have noticed in the report for 1882 of the Chamber of Commerce of Manchester, the centre of the cotton district of England, that the price realised for the entire out-put of cotton of all kinds and grades, was threepence a yard; that is, from the best and most expensive goods manufactured out of cotton down to the lowest, from the most expensive produced down to the cheapest produced. What was the price realised in 1870, twelve years before? The price realised then was sevenpence a yard. I should like to know how the Canadian manufacturer, with a limited population of four and a half millions, with no other country to look to to provide an outlet for the surplus products, is going to compete with the outside manufacturer, and put on all the new and expensive improvements in machinery necessary to keep pace with the times—how he is going to produce an article at a sufficiently low price, if in the cotton district of England there has been an actual reduction in twelve years of 133½ per cent. in the cost of the article he is turning out. I wish to know how our manufacturers are going to compete under these circumstances. I was sorry to hear the hon. gentleman announce his intention to put a duty on winceys, and I am glad that he has decided to take part of that duty off. I am sorry, for the great struggling masses of this country, that it became necessary to put a duty on that article that so largely enters into the clothing of the poorer classes, though I congratulate him on the reduction he proposes to make. He says he put on the duty to encourage the manufacture of that article in this country. It seems curious that he is not aware that winceys have been made in this country for several years. I can give the names of several places where factories have been established.

Mr. BOWELL. Where?

Mr. McMULLEN. I will endeavor to give the hon. gentleman the information. I am sorry that it is necessary for him to ask the question, because he ought to be posted. Now, the hon. gentleman proposes to fix the duty on winceys at 22½ per cent. I would like to know under what calculation, or under what amount of information, he has come to the conclusion that it is necessary to give the manufacturers of this country a protection of 22½ per cent. on winceys in order to induce them to manufacture. Why, Sir, in order for the Finance Minister of this country to be able to judge intelligently between the consumers and the manufacturers, he would need to be a mechanic, thoroughly posted with regard to the cost of these articles, the cost of raw material, and the cost of manufacturing; and we have the evidence that simply because he is not posted he has made very serious blunders. We know that at the commencement he gave the cotton manufacturers too much protec-

Mr. McMULLEN.

tion. The result was that we have a large number of mills; we have now more than we need. We have good reason to know that had the cotton mills been left alone and the additional number not built they would have been able to pay 40 per cent. dividend; but now there is over competition, there is financial disaster, and they are producing more cotton than is wanted. Under a protective tariff it is utterly impossible for any Finance Minister to so balance matters between the producer and the consumers as to do justice to the producer and at the same time to place an article in the hands of the consumer at a price at which he is fairly entitled to have it. He cannot be possessed of that information, and in order to conduct a National Policy such as the Government have inaugurated and are now trying to run—and they are trying their best not to run it into the ditch—but I am afraid they will, in order to run it intelligently, require to have the assistance of a number of men thoroughly posted as to the different manufactures, so that they would place their products in the hands of consumers at the lowest possible price. The Finance Minister is not in a position to do that. What does he know with regard to the manufacture of cotton, or of winceys, or of a sulkey rake, or of a gang plough? He is entirely at the mercy of those men who come to press for an increased duty. They come and put on a poor mouth, and say: Mr. Finance Minister, we want you to give us a little further protection; if you do, we will establish certain things in this country. And he gives them what they want, and as the result of all that, the people of this country are suffering, and are paying more than it is absolutely necessary for them to pay, simply because he does not know how to fix the duty in order to do justice to the consumer as well as the producer. Now, Sir, I was amused with the comparisons the Finance Minister made between agricultural implements in our North-West and those on the other side of the line; and I was glad to find the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) let out the secret when he said a very large amount of manufactured implements had been sent to the North-West which were now lying scattered about the country, and were selling as cheap as possibly could be expected. That is true. When the Minister of Finance quoted the different prices at Winnipeg, Brandon and other places along the line with the prices on the American side of the line, he omitted to mention the fact that our North-West is over-stocked with Canadian implements. I know of a manufacturing concern in Ontario that has thousands of dollars worth of implements in Manitoba which they cannot sell, and for which they would take 50 cents on the dollar if they could get it to-morrow. Other institutions tell a similar story; it appears there are as many agricultural implements in that country as can be used for two years to come, and thus the manufacturers are at a severe loss. A leading partner in a large manufactory told me that in this Dominion his firm had \$125,000 worth of agricultural implements scattered up and down, between the east and west, and their entire capital stock is \$100,000. They cannot sell their goods. That is the case in a great many instances. I say that the wealthy manufacturing institutions are wiping out the smaller ones; the manufacture of these things is being centralised; institutions throughout this country, which rendered very admirable service to the people are, one by one, being wiped out of existence, those who work in them are suffering, and the manufacturers themselves are losing the little means they possessed. It is only a question of financial strength as to how long the smaller institutions can stand against their wealthy rivals. I was also amused with a remark that fell from the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Tupper). He said that the volume of farm produce, that the volume of our exports of farm produce, had largely increased, and that this was one of the cases in which the National Policy was doing a great

deal of good. How he can possibly reason that the National Policy has been the means of making the crops grow or of inducing the farmers to sow more grain or produce more largely, is beyond my comprehension. It may be the means in this way, that the farmers, finding their resources decreasing, and in order to provide themselves with the necessaries of life, are bound to work harder and produce more; but unless he can show me that the National Policy manures the ground, he cannot prove to me that it is the means of producing more grain. Judging from such wild assertions as these from hon. gentlemen opposite, I have no doubt there are some gentlemen so blind to the operation of the National Policy, as regards the farming interest, that they would actually declare and insist upon it that the National Policy did manure the ground, for they are prepared to insist upon anything; they support the National Policy and will swear by it, you would think they are prepared even to die by it, and I hope they will, politically. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Tupper) then admitted that we could not control the market; he admitted that the foreign markets were beyond our control. This is altogether a departure from the statements made at the inauguration of the National Policy, when its advocates claimed we could control the market; they then claimed that the National Policy would bring in a large number of manufactories into operation and bring in a large number of operatives into the country who would consume everything we could produce, and that consequently our farmers and gardeners would have a market at their own doors where they could have remunerative prices for everything they had to sell; that they would, in fact, be independent of the foreign market altogether. The hon. member for Pictou now admits that the National Policy cannot do that. He admits that the predictions of its advocates at the inception of the National Policy some years ago, when they declared Canada would be independent in the matter of markets, that we would be able to adjust this question among ourselves, that our farmers would get glorious prices for what they had to sell, no matter what went on outside, no matter whether there was war or peace or whether things went up or down, these promises have not been realised. We were to have Canada for the Canadians, but all this beautiful prospect has now passed away. I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Montreal advocate the National Policy very strongly, and then admit that after all there was depression in Montreal, that things were not just as nice as they had been in the past. It was rather singular he should have gone so far as to admit that; and with regard to the deputation of which he spoke that was supposed to wait upon Sir John Macdonald in Montreal when a grand banquet was to be given him, denied that there was any such deputation. However, I notice, he could not give any very credible witnesses; and in order to back his statement that there was an abortive effort made by political friends of ours to thwart the glorious entertainment they were going to give the First Minister, he brought a man from the dead to testify that what he said was true. I have a few words to say with regard to the milling interest. I know that there is a strong feeling among Canadian millers that they should have protection, and as far as I am concerned I must say that if the millers amongst others are going to benefit by anything of that kind they are as well entitled to it as other manufactures. If in the interest of the coal producers of the Maritime Provinces, the millers are asked to pay a large amount on the coal they use in their steam mills, they have a right to get back that money in the shape of protection to their flour. I am satisfied it is impossible to do anything in the interest of millers unless a very decided increase of duty is put on flour coming from the United States. The milling interest has suffered in the past and is suffering seriously to-day, and the great diffi-

culty—a difficulty I do not attribute so much to the National Policy—under which they suffer is this. The manufacture of flour in the Western States is very extensive and the rates of freight from St. Paul and Minneapolis to Liverpool are about as cheap as they are from the city of Toronto, so that it is impossible while this state of things exists for the millers of this country to successfully compete with the American producers of flour. I know a very extensive miller in Ontario who has himself told me that if it were not for the substantial character of his plant he would, in his own interests financially, be compelled to pull up stakes and go to a point in the west where he could get his wheat cheaper and the rate of freight to the selling point as cheap as from any point in this Dominion. The only remedy to this would be, in my opinion, if once we became rich enough, to turn our canals into ship canals so that sailing vessels could load at any point on Lake Huron or Lake Superior or any of the lakes and go right through to the Liverpool market. By that means alone we might be able to reduce the rates of freight to our millers that they would be able to compete with the American millers, and until that is done I cannot see how our milling interest can be promoted further than simply to give them a command of our local markets with which they must content themselves since they cannot compete outside.

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

After Recess.

Mr. CURRAN. I rise to a question of privilege. The hon. gentleman who has the floor made the following statement in his speech to-day:—

"I was rather amused to hear the hon. member for Montreal advocate the National Policy very strongly and then admit that after all there was depression in Montreal, that things were not just as nice as they had been in the past. It was rather singular he should have gone so far as to admit that; and with regard to the deputation of which he spoke that was supposed to wait on Sir John A. Macdonald in Montreal, when a grand banquet was to be given him, he denied there was any such deputation. However, I notice he could not give any very credible witnesses, and in order to back his statement that there was any abortive effort made by political friends of ours to thwart the glorious dinner they were going to give the First Minister, he brought a man from the dead to testify that what he said was true."

I consider that this was an attack upon my veracity and honor as a gentleman and a member of this House, and it is only on that account that I take the liberty of reading an extract from a private letter which I received yesterday from one of the oldest citizens of Montreal, a friend of the late Mr. Cramp, who is alluded to here, and a friend of his family. It is dated Montreal, 20th March, 1885, and contains the following statement:—

"Mrs. Cramp requests me to offer you her very sincere thanks for the very handsome manner you alluded in your address in the House of Commons to her departed husband, and to add that the expressions quoted by you and ascribed to him she had heard him repeat in his own house."

I regret having had to read this statement, but, as my veracity was impugned, I have been obliged to do so. I also regret having had in this way to refer to Mr. Cramp, who, though not a political friend of mine, was a personal friend all his life time.

Mr. McMULLEN. I have no objection whatever to the hon. gentleman making the allusion he has just done to the remarks I dropped in regard to what he said as to the operations of the National Policy in Montreal. He has not gone so far as to deny that the manufacturing institutions of Montreal are not in a flourishing condition and that the stringency which he stated in his former speech existed does exist. I will now proceed to make some remarks with regard to what fell from the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster)—I am sorry he is not in his place. In the introductory portion of his address he referred to some

statements that had been made by the hon. the ex-Finance Minister with regard to the dissatisfaction, the absence of that contentment and cordial feeling that existed in this country some twelve years ago, and he characterised the statement of the ex-Finance Minister as untrue and unwise. I have to say that I believe the feeling to-day in this Dominion is not by any means so cordial as it was twelve years ago. I believe, from the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite have from time to time and from Parliament to Parliament attempted to interfere with and thwart and annoy the Provinces of this Dominion by interfering with matters that they had a right to legislate on themselves, that they are responsible for a very great portion of the discontent that now exists; but the hon. member for King's was a party to that action. On every single measure that was brought forward to interfere with the rights and the privileges of the Provinces he was prepared to cast his vote with hon. gentlemen on that side in favor of that interference. Last year, when a question came up with respect to matters of the most vital importance to the Province of Ontario, he recorded his vote in favor of the rights of the Province of Quebec, but on the other hand he recorded his vote against the rights and privileges of the people of the Province of Ontario. Action of that kind from year to year on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite has caused a great deal of the feeling and a great deal of the dissatisfaction that now exists in the breasts of the people of this Dominion. The hon. gentleman from King's went into a very elaborate and extensive argument to show, if he possibly could, that the debt of Canada was not equal to that of the United States. He took to task the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) as well as the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson), and went into an extensive shower bath of figures to show us that the debt of the United States was in excess of the indebtedness of this country, and the taxes collected there were in excess of the taxes collected here. I have taken the opportunity of looking over and comparing the figures he submitted to the House, and I am prepared to say that the entire debt of the United States, according to the last returns which we have in our possession, is \$1,832,500,000. Taking their population at 56,000,000, that is \$32.68 per head. The net national debt of Canada, taken at \$200,000,000—and I am sure that it is a great deal more than that, I am satisfied there is no gentleman even on that side of the House who will dare to question a statement putting the net national debt of this Dominion at that figure at this moment—with a population of 4,500,000, gives a net debt of \$44.44 per head. I know that the hon. gentleman, in presenting the figures to the House which he did on that occasion, deducted from the gross debt of the Dominion the amount that stood charged against the several Provinces at the time that Confederation was inaugurated, he said: These are provincial debts, we have no right to take these into account in counting up the debt of this Dominion, we have a right to place those where they were before Confederation. I look upon that as a fallacious way of going to work to calculate the present indebtedness of the Dominion. The erection of these buildings which we occupy was part of the then debt of the Provinces. Will the hon. gentleman from King's dare to say that the amount of money spent in the construction of these buildings should not be counted as part of the Dominion debt? But still, when he proceeded with the calculation and found that, unless he made a deduction of that kind, he could not bring out the figures to suit his idea, he fell back into that as a means of doing it, that being the only way he possibly could bring out the calculation in anything like a favorable light to this country. The net debt of this country, then, is \$11.76 greater than that of the United States. The entire debt of the United States at present, national, state and municipal, is \$2,887,113,069.57,

Mr. McMULLEN.

or *per capita* for 56,000,000, \$51.52. The entire debt of Canada, Dominion, provincial and municipal, is \$257,600,000, or \$52.79 per head, or \$1.27 a head more than the entire debt of the United States. I contend that that is a very serious state of affairs in the interests of this country. I contend that, when we have got to compare our present financial position with the country that unfortunately had an internal war that doubled and trebled its debt, and that we never had, and consider that to-day, with a limited population and an extensive territory and many developments to make in the interests of our country, we stand \$1.27 a head in debt more than the United States, it is a very serious consideration. But there is a more important consideration which we have not touched upon. There is a point which every member of this House and every man in the country should seriously consider, and that is that the United States, since 1878, the period at which hon. gentlemen opposite took office in this Dominion, have reduced their indebtedness \$425,676,968.96, while the Government opposite has increased the debt of this country to \$80,384,030.14, while the debt of the United States is going down from year to year the debt of Canada is yearly increasing. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will refer to the question of cities. The hon. member for King's, New Brunswick (Mr. Foster) labored very hard to show his friends in St. John that it was no use in their going to the United States for the purpose of getting rid of municipal indebtedness and heavy taxation. He told them that if they went from St. John to Bangor they would leave a city that only had \$36 of municipal debt per head and go to one that had \$157 and some odd cents per head of municipal indebtedness. Well, Sir, I took occasion to look over the statistics of the United States, and I find that in the year 1880 there were in the United States 268 cities with a total population of 11,327,648, and a gross debt of \$580,516,140, or a *per capita* debt of \$51.54. Now I believe the *per capita* debt of Toronto is something like \$64 per head. We have not very accurate data upon which to base a calculation as to the exact municipal indebtedness of our towns and cities; I am sorry to say our census does not give us the data upon which to make a correct calculation. But as I said before, the hon. member, when his friend left St. John, wanted to send him to Bangor. Why send him to Bangor? Because, Bangor was heavily taxed. He had evidently searched the statistics of the United States to find a heavily taxed city, and so the hon. member sends his friend to Bangor instead of to any other city with a less indebtedness. I find, Sir, that there are 63 cities in the United States with a *per capita* debt under \$10; there are 108 cities with a *per capita* debt under \$20; there are 47 cities with a *per capita* over \$60, and 22 with a *per capita* debt of over \$40. But the hon. gentleman does not send his friend from St. John to any of those places. Oh no, he sends him to Bangor, and Bangor is one of the heaviest taxed cities in the United States. There is only one other city the municipal debt of which per head exceeds that of Bangor. Well, I suppose he thought he would send him to the worst place. He did like the evil spirit in the "Pilgrim's Progress;" he made up his mind that he would keep his friend as long as he could in the city of St. John, and when his friend was determined to go he sent him the wrong road, in the very opposite direction that he wanted to go. Now, Sir, I will give you the municipal indebtedness of some of the cities of the United States:

	Population.	Rate per capita.
Amsterdam, N.Y.	\$ 95
Akron, Ohio	1 07
Bloomington, Ill.	17,000	12 89
Burlington, Iowa	20,000	6 58
Baltimore, Ind.	332,000	2 57
Bradford, Penn.	10,000	0 00
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	10,000	4 04
Newport, R.I.	15,000	7 42
Quincy, Mass.	10,500	6 24

	Population.	Rate.
San Francisco	233,959	13 08
Lockport, N.Y.	15,000	8 09
Kansas City, Mo.	55,785	24 00

Now, Sir, I want to give you some of the more heavily taxed cities, and we will commence with the favored city of my hon. friend, Bangor. And let me remark in this connection that the hon. gentleman said in his speech: Now, I want you to understand that I want to be fair; I want you to understand that I have tried to be fair in these comparisons. Now, Sir, we will see how fair he was. He takes Bangor with 16,856 of a population, and a municipal indebtedness of \$157.87 *per capita*. Then Elizabeth, New Jersey, has a population of 28,229, and a debt of \$195.28 *per capita*. Jersey City, N.Y., has a population of 120,722, and a *per capita* debt of \$127.49. Memphis has a population of 33,000, and a *per capita* municipal indebtedness of \$135.59. Middletown has a municipal indebtedness of \$119.97 *per capita*. I may say that there are eight cities of the United States with a *per capita* municipal indebtedness of over \$100, and one of these is Bangor; Bangor stands at the head of the list except one. Now this is the fair comparison the hon. member for King's would lead us to understand he was disposed to make in dealing with the debt of the cities of the United States. I was rather amused when he came to deal with the municipal taxes of the Dominion, that he should have gone to Ontario. He appeared to be glad to take the figures as set down in the Province of Ontario, notwithstanding the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite have lost no opportunity in criticising in very severe terms the manner in which the affairs of the Province of Ontario have been managed. They have tried to show that its money has been squandered, that its business has been badly managed by the very able and efficient gentlemen who have been at the head of that Government for so many years. But after all, when they want to make a comparison in this Dominion they have to go to Ontario, of all the Provinces, to find the most favorable standard. This is a confession on their part that its affairs are very well handled. I cannot find out, for the life of me, how he came to make out the entire municipal taxation of the Dominion to be \$4 per head. He appears to have borrowed that opinion from some quarter—I do not know where. I cannot tell on what data he proceeded, because I say, Mr. Speaker, that if there is anything at all surrounded with difficulty it is the endeavour to ascertain exactly the municipal taxation of this Dominion, that is, the amount collected in each municipality for municipal and school purposes. However, he gives it to the House at \$4. He says with a flourish of eloquence: I present these figures to the House and to the country. I think, he says, they will stand investigation. Well, Sir, that reminds me of a story I once heard of an Irishman who came to this country. He landed at New York, and engaged to an American. After the American had had him some time in his employ he thought he would have a little fun out of him, so he said to him one fine evening: "Pat, go out doors and count the stars for me." Pat went out, and after a while he came in and said there were 9,876,000 or some big figure of that kind. "Oh," says the American, "you must be mistaken; how can you be so sure of the number?" "Well, sir," said Pat, "I am quite certain that I am right, and if you do not believe me you can go outside and count them yourself." Well, Sir, the hon. gentleman has presented these figures; wherever he got them I do not know. But he says: I present them to the House, I present them to the country, and I am prepared to say that I believe that I am correct. Well, Sir, I do not believe that he is at all near correct. I believe when he took that amount as the municipal taxation of the Province, he made up his mind that he would take an amount that would come within the limit so as to show that we have a less municipal taxation than that the United States in.

I do not think we can get such evidence as will enable us to come to a correct conclusion on a question of this kind. I believe the only possible way to make a comparison is to take the entire debt of the United States, the state, federal and municipal debts, and putting them together compare the gross amount with the Dominion debt, the provincial debt and the municipal debt combined. We have done that, and I am sorry to have to admit that our debt exceeds that of the United States by \$1.27 per head. I took considerable trouble to read over the hon. gentleman's speech. Last year in addressing the House he said he had read over the speech of the leader of the Opposition three times. He said he found nothing in that speech worthy of notice unless it was the "may be," "may be," "may be," which occurred several times. I read over the hon. gentleman's speech recently delivered once, then I read it again, and part of it a third time, and the only thing that attracted my attention was the word *metropoli*. I do not know where the hon. gentleman got the word; but all great men, Mr. Speaker, in this world are known either by having invented something or being the author of a book or the author of a word. The late Lord Brougham was known to the after generations of his day as the inventor of a carriage, and one of the Dukes of Wellington is remembered as the inventor of a pair of boots. The hon. member for King's (Mr. Foster) will no doubt be known by future generations as the author of a word, *metropoli*. I was quite amused with the very determined manner in which the hon. gentleman assailed three of the prominent members of this side of the House, the ex-Finance Minister, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) and the hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson). He made an effort to overthrow the whole of them. I began to think that possibly the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) would feel that his position was in some danger when the hon. member for King's made such a very elaborate statement and went so largely into figures and, as he thought, into facts, but I am sorry to say were largely fiction; I began to think I say that the hon. member for Cardwell would begin to think that he should try and secure a position on the Treasury Benches immediately, because when the hon. member for King's took his seat he was quite satisfied that he had performed the duties that devolved upon him with the greatest amount of ability. I do not know how long that hon. gentleman may be asked to remain on the back benches, but in his own estimation he should be advanced to a front seat before very long. There is one question I wish to bring before the House, and it is this: It is not very often we get admissions from hon. gentlemen opposite that are of use to us as going to show the fallacy and injustice of the policy which they advocate and uphold. The Finance Minister in delivering his Budget Speech made some admissions that struck me forcibly when he made them, and I then thought that if I had the privilege or pleasure of offering some remarks during the debate I would undoubtedly allude to them. He stated that the ex-Government, during the time they had been in power from 1st July, 1874, to 1st July, 1879, five years, had under the then tariff extracted from the people's pockets \$98,295,770.34; while from July 1st, 1879, to July 1st, 1884, it appears that under the operation of their policy they have extracted from the people \$124,723,689.84, or \$26,426,899.50 more than the previous Government took from the people. It is not often we get such an admission. We have often met hon. gentlemen opposite on the political stump, and they have always declared—and I will not be surprised if some of them still persist in declaring it—that under the National Policy the people pay no more taxes. Then where has the money come from? Where did the Finance Minister get his extra \$26,000,000, which he declares he got? The hon. gentleman has extracted \$5.88 per head during five years more than was extracted under the administration of

of the late Government during the same time. I hope, therefore, we shall not hear any more as regards the National Policy not making the people pay more money into the Treasury. It is quite plain from the admission of the Finance Minister himself that they do pay more taxes. He will not surely rise and attempt to show that the money was got in some secret way. He tells how the money was got. He says it was by excise duties and stamps, and that the late Government got the money from the same sources; and we have, under the operation of our tariff of increased duties imposed in connection with our protective policy, succeeded in making the people pay \$26,427,899.50 more than they would have paid under the operation of the policy of the preceding Government. That is the hon. gentleman's admission. There is another question to which I desire to call the attention of the House. From the inception of the scheme of the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway down to the present time we have heard public declarations made by hon. gentlemen opposite that the people of this country would never be asked to pay one dollar to the construction of that railway. Now what is the fact? Over \$12,000,000 of the people's money, out of the surplus collected under the operations of his tariff, has gone directly into the construction of the road within the last five years. I believe I am stating the amount at something less than what I should state it; I believe over that amount I have named has gone into that railway. I should like to ask the Finance Minister, or any hon. gentleman whether one dollar will ever go back to the pockets of the people from whom it was extracted. I answer, no. No portion of that money will ever be refunded. You may say that the country will get a certain amount of money out of the sale of lands. Will it go back into the pockets of the people? Not one dollar. Yet we find hon. gentlemen prepared to assert that the tax payers of the Dominion will never be asked to pay one cent towards that work. I hold that the most important question in connection with handling the affairs of this Dominion is the increase of our population. I believe that the immigration policy of hon. gentlemen opposite has been a mistake. A very large amount of money has been positively squandered and lost, and in many cases the people who have been brought out to this country have proved utterly useless. If there is any particular class of settlers that would prove beneficial to the Dominion it is the class of men possessed of some means and able to take up homes and work out their own course of life. During the last year this country has not obtained the proper stamp of immigrants; many of the men brought here were literally useless. They were worthless to us. I therefore hold that a very large amount of money has been lost owing to the manner in which the immigration policy has been treated. I hold that the next thing we should do, Mr. Speaker, is to cut off all monopolies. I believe myself that the policy adopted in the North-West in regard to the creation of these monopolies in land, with regard to the restricted manner in which lands were offered to those who went in there in search of homes, with regard to the manner in which railway land corporations and other lands were surrounded by restrictions imposed by those who held these lands, has been a drawback to the settlement of this country. The proper course would have been to leave all the lands absolutely for those who are prepared to take up homes and live upon them, and if that policy had been adopted I believe, Sir, we would have had more settlers there to-day than we have; and I believe, owing to the course of hon. gentlemen opposite, there have gone from that country many letters of disappointment from settlers to friends in the old country, telling them that the representations made to them and the offers by which they were induced to cast their lot in with the future of that country,

Mr. McMULLEN.

were highly overdrawn, and that they did not realise in full the promises made to them. I believe they found that in place of getting land wherever they liked to settle, in many cases they had to take it in out of the way places or else it was subject to restrictions which they could not carry out. And if there is anything at all which the people of the old country detest it is a system of landlordism, such as they have been struggling with in the old country, and they do not want to be subjected to that kind of thing here. If all the land had been given to them at a fixed rate, so that they would have been induced to make their homes there, it would have been the true policy of settling that country and getting that influx of population into it that we would all be so glad to see. Now, Sir, in connection with the immigration policy of the Government I may say that I had the privilege a short time ago of examining a book known as "The National Policy"—a book of which I believe some 5,000 have been issued at a cost of \$5,000 by hon. gentlemen opposite and circulated in the old country. That book I am prepared to admit is the most ingenious invention in the interest of immigration. I must say that it possesses peculiar and attractive qualities as a production, such as could not possibly emanate from any men except the most ingenious thinking lot of men you could come across. I notice that the first page of the book has a photograph of the First Minister in it, the second page has a photograph of five of his colleagues, and the third page has a photograph of five more of them. I think that is an admirable way of presenting to the people of the old country the attractions of this country. Any man looking at the pleasant kindly countenances of those eight or nine men, who would not come to the conclusion that this is a paradise, if there is one on earth, must be a fool or an idiot. I would caution hon. gentlemen opposite to be careful how they use that book. Why, Sir, if too many of the people of the old world should get the privilege of seeing that particular book, we might find ourselves face to face with a famine, for we might not be able to feed the people that would rush to this country, or give them the necessary accommodation. I notice that this year the Government have asked a smaller appropriation than last year for immigration, and I do not wonder, because I do not believe if that book is judiciously handled they will require any money at all, for it will take the place of any expenditure in that way. While I am on the point of expenditure I would refer to some matters which I think are worth looking into. There is a certain amount of expenditure in this Dominion which is quite under the control of hon. gentlemen opposite in this House. I admit that there is a certain amount of expenditure which is perhaps not fully under their control. At the same time, Sir, I hold that where we find that even under statutory regulations we are spending more money than is necessary should be spent it is our duty to retrench and curtail and cut down the amount, and amend our laws so that the expenditure shall not be in excess of the ability of the people to pay. While we were talking about the United States I was looking over what was paid there to their State Governors. I find, Sir, that in the United States they have 47 State Governors. I find that they pay these 47 men \$168,900 on the whole, or an average of \$3,600 apiece. The House will remember that those Governors have to seek their election at the hands of the people; they have to go to the polls and pass the ordeal of seeking votes, and incur all the necessary expenses connected with the election, and they hold their offices for four years. I find that we have in Canada 9 Provincial Governors and Governors of Territories, and that we pay the whole of them \$68,000, or an average of \$7,550 apiece. Therefore we pay our Lieutenant Governors in this country virtually twice as much as they pay in the United States for their State Governors. Now I hold that the State of New York, which pays its Governor \$10,000 a

year, is perhaps in point of actual value worth about as much as the entire Dominion. I have no doubt they could afford as well to pay as large a salary for their Governor as the Dominion could to ours. They pay him \$10,000 a year, while Ontario pays our Lieutenant Governor, appointed by the Crown—for he is not required to seek the popular vote, he is not required to cultivate popularity—he gets the appointment from the Crown and draws \$10,000, along with perquisites and other expenses connected with his position. I find that in the Province of Quebec the same amount is paid to their Lieutenant-Governor. Now, Sir, I believe it is only by the reduction of those amounts that we can possibly hope to bring the amount of taxation levied on the people of this Dominion within proper limits. I say that it is time that we should commence seriously to consider several items of expenditure, from the largest to the smallest, cut them down in every single instance and bring them within the means of the people of this Dominion. We have been going on in an extravagant way year after year, and every year the amount is increasing. The incidental expenses are annually increasing. I find that in the several Departments in this city, for the convenience of hon. gentlemen and their attendants and clerks in these Departments, there is no less a sum paid, according to the Auditor General's Report of last year, \$9,660.25 for newspapers and periodicals, not for advertising, or for any work done, but actually for periodicals and newspapers supplied to the Departments. I find in looking over the items of incidental expenses connected with the several Departments presided over by hon. gentlemen opposite, that they have spent in the matter of incidental expenses, \$177,945.56. Out of this there has been paid \$22,346.79 for expenses connected with His Excellency the Governor General and members of the Government—travelling expenses of the Governor General and suite, and members of the Government. Included in that amount I find that members of the Government, for their own personal expenses and cab hire in the city of Ottawa, have actually drawn from the Treasury \$6,280.18, that they have actually drawn from the treasury \$6,280.18, over and above their salaries of \$7,000 or \$9,000 a year, their annual sessional allowance of \$1,000 a year, and also their allowance for mileage, if they come from a distance to attend to their duties here. I think, when the people of this country come to understand these expenditures, they will not endorse them. I think, when they come to understand that money is thrown away in this kind of style, that they will rise in their might, and will pledge every man who comes to Parliament not to support any Government, Reform or Conservative, that spends the public money in this way. I say it is time we had an end to this sort of thing; it has gone too far; and I hope the day is not far distant when men will be sent here to watch the public accounts and criticise every item, in the interests of their constituents, and see that the public money, is not squandered and frittered away in this kind of style. Now, I have no doubt that any hon. gentleman who follows me will rise up and say that we are still decrying our country. Well, all I have got to say is this: Hon. gentlemen opposite place us in the position that we must tell the truth; and if they like to take the alternative of telling the opposite, and not decrying the country, we are willing that they should assume that responsibility. It is our duty to criticise the policy of the Government, every item of expenditure, and every matter of interest to our country, and in doing that, if we should expose some matters which are not perhaps too creditable to us, it is only because we feel it to be our duty, in the interest of our country, in the interest of the people who have sent us here, to tell the truth and the whole truth, and to expose those things that should be exposed. There was another matter that I should have referred to, in connection with the items of expenditure. A

few evenings ago we had a considerable discussion with regard to extra fees paid to clerks engaged in the several Departments here. On looking over the accounts, I find that there is one continuous systematic effort to fleece the public chest by every man engaged in the Departments here. Every man engaged in any of the Departments, if he does an extra hour's, or half hour's work, makes a demand for extra pay, and the members of the Government are apparently only too willing to allow it. In connection with the Savings Bank Branch of the Post Office Department I find that \$1,927.67 was allowed for counting interest on deposits—paid extra to men who receive a salary, year by year, for doing work of this kind; men who receive full and ample allowance for the work they perform; men who only put in a few hours a day, and have the balance for themselves; simply because it becomes necessary for them to make these little calculations, they make a demand and are paid this amount in excess of the sums they receive for their ordinary employment. Now, I say it is wrong that these things should be permitted, and it is the duty of every man in this House to expose them; and if his remonstrances are not listened to by the Government, it is his duty to carry these things to the constituencies and press upon the people the necessity of pledging those who are sent here to see that the annual expenditure is cut down to the limit of the people's means, and to the point that will enable the people to live easily. Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have been always willing and anxious to criticise us as free traders. Well, I have only to say that however anxious any man on this side of the House might be to see a system of free trade introduced, hon. gentlemen opposite have placed it out of the power of the most ardent free trader in this country to realise free trade in the present generation. The way our annual debt is rolling up places an insuperable barrier in the way of free trade. It is quite evident that we must have either a revenue or a protective tariff. Hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed, for the time being, to insist on a protective tariff—first, in the interests of the manufacturing institutions, and secondly, in order to meet the demands on the Treasury. We on this side claim that a revenue tariff is the true basis of taxation. We claim that people should not be called on to contribute more than the necessities of the public expenditure require. We say that any more is unfair, and unjust, and unwise. Now, I have endeavored to put my remarks in as concise a form as possible. I thank this House for listening to me in my rambling remarks, and I hope that by these discussions and criticisms of the public affairs of this country, we shall be guided in coming to conclusions that will be for the best interests of the people of this country, and will tend to build it up and make it what we should be glad to see it become a great and prosperous nation.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, in rising for the first time to address this hon. House, and at so late a stage of this important debate, the main subjects of which have already been so fully and ably discussed by hon. members, I am impressed, Sir, with the necessity of soliciting at the hands of hon. members, all the consideration usually accorded to new members. And, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, I have the proud satisfaction of being justified in congratulating the right hon. leader of the Government, his colleagues and the House, on the very satisfactory exhibit, concerning the great general interests of our country, that the eminent Finance Minister has placed before the House and the country, in his masterly and exhaustive Budget Speech, and upon his general conclusions in respect to the present actual position, and the well-grounded future prospects of this great Dominion of ours; all of which, Sir, are fully justified by the facts of the case. In reference to expression of opinion that I shall take the liberty to make, in regard to the fiscal policy of our

country, I may say that they have not been acquired yesterday or the day before, but far anterior to the year 1878, 1876, or even 1875, at a time when the matter was taken up so ably, and when the celebrated resolution upon which the National Policy was founded was brought down to this House by the right hon. Premier, then sitting at your left, apparently in a hopeless position of Opposition, having merely the corporal's guard at his back, and taking a step that, so far as I have been able to read or understand the history of constitutional government, has not had a parallel—when the head of a great political party, though, at the moment, in opposition and in small numbers, propounded on the opposition benches a policy which, though strongly opposed by the Ministry of the day, was subsequently heartily endorsed, and later on reendorsed, by the great majority of the people of this Dominion. My own conclusions on such subjects are not arrived at by the perusal of theories. It has been my lot to be compelled, as it were, to study far more the pages of my own personal experience, in reference to the effect of our present fiscal policy on this country; and in arriving at conclusions, when I found the generally accepted trade theories, however scientifically laid out, either in books or in speeches of public men, were contradicted by the facts, I decided that it was so much the worse for the theories. The leader of the Opposition, however, and those who support him, appear to act on entirely the opposite principle, that where facts contradict theories, they concluded apparently so the worse for the facts. I shall not, at this late stage of the debate, trespass upon the time of the House any longer than will be absolutely necessary to elucidate some of the points in reference to the working of our fiscal policy, and to refute, as I think I will be able to do, some of the futile attempts of hon. gentlemen opposite to establish that our policy is not in the best interests of the country. I think it is not difficult for any unprejudiced, impartial mind, to establish that the policy of the present Government is eminently in the best interests of our country. With the permission of the House, I will take the liberty of making some quotations from the Finance Minister's Budget Speech, to show why I consider and why I believe the people consider, the country is to be congratulated on the results of his policy. The first point in which the general ratepayers of our country are particularly interested is, that the taxation under the Administration from 1874 to 1879, under the *regime* of hon. gentlemen opposite, was \$4.88 per head, while from 1879 to 1884, under the present Government, it was 10 cents less per head, notwithstanding an increased expenditure in the active development of the country, of \$750,000 per year. For 1883-84 our tax per head of the population was actually \$1.35 less than that of the United States, although the ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) has asserted that ours is nearly double that of the United States. This is the gist of the result of the Administration of last year, and in which the people are especially interested. I shall next take the liberty of referring to the statement made by the member for South Huron (Sir Richard Cartwright) who, I regret, is not in his place at the moment, for in it is explained the extraordinary fallacious position which that hon gentleman has attempted to maintain before this House and the country for years past. The statement to which I refer is this:

"We find that our debt in six years apparently has increased about 60 per cent.; we find that our taxes are increased at the rate of 150 per cent., the average amount to-day of taxes being 150 per cent. greater than they were six years ago.

"He then goes on to explain why he comes to that conclusion; from about 17½ per cent. the hon. gentleman has made them very considerably over 35 per cent., taking them all round."

Now, according to his own position, according to the basis he lays down himself, upon which he makes his calculation and estimate the actual taxation paid by the people, he

Mr. DICKINSON.

exaggerates only 50 per cent., but this may be considered very moderate for that hon. gentleman. By this exaggeration he exposes the falsity of the basis upon which he founds his estimate of the taxation per head paid by the people of this country. Now, the practical fact is that all rates named under the tariff are not necessarily taxation, except on such articles as are necessities and cannot be produced in the country, or unless such as are produced under the paternal influence of the National Policy are thereby rendered more expensive to general consumers than formerly, whereas the contrary are the facts, as has been most conclusively shown during this debate by several hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. If the contention of the hon. member for South Huron in this connection be correct, an article stated in the tariff at 100 per cent. would cost the consumer of the country where that tariff is imposed double what it would otherwise, a contention so ridiculous and absurd that it is hardly worth referring to further. Now I take the liberty of asserting that a basis such as the hon. gentleman has laid down for statements of any kind being false, insecure and a fallacy, the structure of argument which he raises on such a basis must be equally fallacious. Again, that hon. gentleman says:

"For the last six years this unhappy country has had a protective tariff, administered by a Government of practical politicians, presided over by a philanthropic Minister of Finance, who desires to increase the greatest happiness of the greatest number."

I am able to congratulate the hon. gentleman for having expressed the precise words that would be used by the great majority in this country in reference to the present Government, although ironical on his part. He goes on further to say:

"By giving to a few hundred persons, influential political partisans, who had access to him, unlimited right to tax the millions of consumers who were not equally fortunate."

The hon. gentleman has for once, as I said, expressed the facts of the case, but he states in one breath that the manufacturers, from the effects of the tariff, had been highly benefitted at the expense of the consumer, while, in the next breath, he attributes what he terms their present ruinous condition to the effects of the National Policy, overlooking the fact that, if that is true, and it is not true, the great mass of our community must be getting the benefit from lowness of prices arising from over-production. The hon. member for South Huron says further:

"A very sharp check will be needed. In these six years our position has altered very materially for the worse, and not only materially but morally."

Because, forsooth, the great majority of the people of this country have emphatically affirmed and re-affirmed that the hon. gentleman is not the heaven-born financier that he imagines himself, and will have none of him. He has been tried and found wanting, as also have the political party with which he is allied. Hence that hon. gentleman hesitates not from his place in this House to cast this insult in the face of one and all who differ from him, and to charge the great majority of the people of this country with having deteriorated, not only materially but morally. Again we have his gratuitously implied insult to the great body of the agriculturists of our country, who are a mainstay of this Dominion more important than any other interest—that exists in this Dominion. I refer to his recent statements made in his efforts to attack the correctness of the census or to attack the hon. the Minister of Agriculture. On that occasion he did not hesitate to make a variety of statements, of which, with the permission of the House, I will give a few specimen bricks. He said:

"Now, Sir, in order that the House may know that I am warranted in saying that the census, as at present taken, abounds with a great many details which can by no possibility be accurate, I will just call the attention to certain items in the census of 1881. I find there that nearly twenty pages, and something like fifteen distinct entries required to be made up all over the Dominion, are devoted to items like these: Total

number of pounds of home-made butter, pounds of home-made cheese, pounds of grapes, bushels of other fruits, pounds of maple sugar, pounds of hops, and a variety of items of the same kind. Now, if accurate information on these points could have been obtained, the hon. Minister might have been justified in asking for it, and in loading down the census tables with all these details; but I put it to the common sense of every hon. gentleman in this House whether one farmer in a hundred, or in five hundred, is able to give the census enumerators the number of pounds of home-made butter or cheese he has produced, much less the number of pounds of grapes or of maple sugar. Any one who has paid any attention to the way in which such information is obtained knows that farmers scarcely ever dream of keeping accurate accounts of these various matters. The fact is, that all these details are simply guesses, and nothing more; not one of them can be depended on. They are approximations, more or less accurate, generally less accurate than more. I dare say the information would be valuable if it could be relied on; but the hon. Minister, who is a man of practical experience, knows that very few farmers keep accurate accounts, even of the quantity of grain they raise, much less of these details with which the census is encumbered."

In contrast with this implied depreciation of the intelligence of the farmers of our country, the hon. the Minister of Agriculture responded in this wise:

"He says these people are guessing. It is he who is guessing. He says the quantity cannot be obtained. Why, there is not a man who makes sugar who does not know almost to the very pound how much he makes. Is there a man who raises hops who cannot tell how many pounds he sells? Is it not ridiculous for the hon. gentleman to say that this information cannot be got directly? It is the very information you can get directly."

And further:

"It shows what an impracticable man the hon. gentleman is. Let the hon. gentleman condescend once in a while to dine with a farmer, or go to a farmer's house and look at him, and the farmer will tell him at once that what the hon. gentleman has said is perfectly ridiculous."

I am informed that that hon. gentleman's constituents are in a very large degree farmers. I simply ask the question—I will not answer it—whether, according to his estimate of the intelligence of that portion of his constituents, that does not account for the presence of the hon. gentleman here in Parliament. I am reminded that his predecessor was a farmer, but arrangements were made by which the farmers of his county should not be represented here. Now, Mr. Speaker, with the further indulgence of the House, I will refer to some of the statements made by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), whom I am sorry to see is not in his place. That hon. gentleman, during this debate, said:

"Sir, the hon. gentleman has reduced the price of every bushel of wheat the Canadian farmer has to sell, of every bushel of farm produce he has to sell—he has reduced it by the operation of this policy, which has placed us at variance with our natural customers, and driven from the markets of Canada the people who are the consumers of our surplus food products."

Now, is it reasonable, or is it in accordance with common sense, to make those remarks about a country whose exports of agricultural products in 1884 were \$619,269,449, and of manufactures, \$111,330,242. The hon. gentleman went on further to say:

"This has been the operation of the National Policy, a policy which has not only imposed direct taxes on the people of this country in the shape of Customs"—

It is something new, probably, to this House, to hear that Customs duties are direct taxation—

"but has imposed indirect duties, in the shape of an enhanced cost of the ordinary articles of consumption of the people of this country, and impose this additional taxation in the shape of a reduction in the price of farm produce. Not for one hundred years has wheat been lower in England than it is to-day, because she has reached countries where that article can be produced cheaply. Not for many years has the price of wheat been lower than it is in Canada to-day, notwithstanding the vaunts and boasts of hon. gentlemen, that they would afford agricultural protection to the farmers of Canada. They offered them benefits and blessings. They have conferred on them curses instead."

I will now point out the contradictions, and these are very evident. Here is another palpable self-contradiction, but that is not unusual with the hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House. He says, first, that the National Policy

has lowered the prices for the farmer. Second—and that is (heir stock argument—he says it is well known that England regulate the prices. Next, he says that for 100 years wheat has not been lower in England than it is to-day. Therefore, his argument is contradictory, for it opposes his own contention that prices are reduced by the effect of the National Policy, whereas by his own showing low prices are produced by a fall in the English market. Then that hon. gentleman went on to say:

"Sir, we cannot conceal our position from the United States or from any other intelligent men. It is not necessary to tell them; they know it. But we can inform ourselves, and it is necessary that the people of Canada should know the truth. It is necessary that the people of Canada should know the affairs of this country, and it is nothing short of criminal to conceal from the people of Canada the actual condition of the public affairs of this Dominion. I do not intend to conceal them. And gentlemen may prate about unpatriotic conduct and injuring the country if they choose. We have heard enough of that stuff."

An hon. gentleman who, with the responsibility resting upon him as a representative of the people and a member of this House, stigmatises any pretension to patriotic conduct that he does not agree with, as "stuff," I think, Mr. Speaker, will hardly be appreciated by this House or the country. Has that hon. gentleman come to his conclusion on the same principle that a certain nameless personage who has a perpetual contempt for and sneers at the existence of virtue of any kind? Next, we have a choice specimen of his asserted truth-telling, where he refers to the present position of the sawed lumber interest in this Ottawa section. Now, Mr. Speaker, I must solicit the indulgence of the House whilst I refer to the following statements of the hon. gentleman, and I cannot imagine where or from what source he obtained the information that he gave to the House and to the country, when he stated in his place:

"I may remind the people of the country that they are growing poorer every year through the reduction in value of the various properties. Farms can be bought in any part of Ontario cheaper than they could be purchased six years ago."

Now, whatever the experience in this respect may be of the members from the western part of Ontario, the contrary, I can assure this House and the country, is the experience of the representatives from the Ottawa valley and central Canada. There is a difference of opinion even among the hon. gentlemen opposite on that point. I will read an extract from a speech of the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), who said:

"The hon. member for Montreal Centre (Mr. Curran), who spoke the other day, quoted the statistics of the Ontario Bureau of Industries to show that the price of farm land had gone up in Ontario. I believe he quoted them correctly, and I believe, from my knowledge of the gentleman who collects those statistics, that they are as correct as they can be made. I believe that the value of farm property in Ontario has gone up."

But the most astounding and incorrect statement made by the hon. member for North Norfolk is in respect to the present condition of the sawed lumber interest in this section particularly:

"What is the state of the lumber interest? Are the lumbermen of Ottawa and of the West, and of the East working double time, making sales far ahead? There is a vast accumulation of lumber in the yards at Ottawa, and none of it is sold. Gloom and despondency prevail in the lumber markets; the shipping interest is low, not a single prediction made by the hon. gentleman in regard to any industry in the country has been realised."

Now, I deny that the sawed lumber interest of the Ottawa valley is in a deplorable condition, but to the contrary, is in a most satisfactory state. Allow me to state, Mr. Speaker, that a very carefully compiled statistical account appeared in the *Citizen* last November, of the season's cut on the Ottawa, and it gives an approximate estimate of the amount of lumber cut in the different mills during the season of 1884. The gross amount is 495,500,000 feet. That amount, taken with what is cut up the river, makes the gross cut for the Ottawa Valley 625,000,000 feet, or

about an average season's cut. This represents a cash value of \$7,500,000 to this section of Canada. The report continues :

"Now that the Presidential contest is over in the States, we can look to a good trade for next season, and with cheap labor, flour and pork, next year bids fair to be a most profitable one for our lumber kings."

That statement is corroborated by a lengthy article in the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite in this city. It is dated 20th March. I will read merely the heading: "Work in the Woods. A Hopeful Lumbering Outlook for Next Season's Trade." I have here a statement of the position of the lumber that is now piled here, the remains of last year's cut. The source of my information is such that I take the responsibility of saying that I am prepared to challenge any satisfactory contradiction from any quarter in any important particular. The statement is this :

"Of the 495,000,000 feet cut last season between Ottawa and Grenville all is sold and shipped except about 190,000,000 feet remaining in mill yards and docks, of which about 150,000,000 has been sold since close of navigation and is now held in second hand. The balance, about 40,000,000 principally coarse box, suited only for local purposes and Montreal market; and within the past week most, if not all, mill culls about Ottawa mills have been sold to Montreal buyers at about same price as last year, and the buyers proceeded to mills below this, as far as Grenville, with the view of securing from them any amount of this quality they can obtain. As to next year's cut a much larger percentage is sold in advance than is usual at this season of the year, and at higher prices, (from \$2 to \$5 per thousand feet) over last year's prices, particularly in the upper grades. The advance on these will much more than compensate for any reduction, if any there be, on the coarse box. As to pine deals for Quebec, every deal now on hand in this section, and at all other points heard from, and the entire cut during season of 1873, are now sold in advance, at prices varying from \$2 to \$10, 1st, 2nd and 3rds per hundred standard, over prices obtained last season, which were considerably more than those obtained in 1883.

"Estimate of deal to be cut on the Ottawa during 1885, is as follows : Booth, Ottawa, 15,000,000 to 20,000,000 feet; Eddy, Hull, 25,000,000 to 30,000,000 feet; Gilmour & Co., Chelsea, 18,000,000 to 20,000,000 feet; Edwards & Co., Rockland, 8,000,000 to 10,000,000 feet; Jas. McLaren, Buckingham, 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 feet; Pattee & Perley, Ottawa, 15,000,000 to 16,000,000 feet; Hamilton Bros., Hawkesbury, 15,000,000 to 18,000,000—say 115,000,000 feet board measure."

An important sale of timber limits, which affords an index to the condition of the lumber trade, occurred on Saturday at the Russell House, in this city, the Hall limits on the Gatineau river realising \$247,000, one-third cash, balance at eight and twelve months. The hon. gentleman to whom I have referred has been egregiously mistaken, and I think, as a public man, he should be more careful in making statements that may seriously affect an important industry. With the further indulgence of the House, I desire to bring under its attention the position of the two political parties in regard to the tariff, so far as actual taxes on the food supplies of the people are concerned. Hon. gentlemen opposite on all occasions, inside this House and outside of it, pose as the friends of the working men, and as the party who are in sympathy with the masses. Let us see whether their actions correspond with their professions in this respect :

"The Customs duties on tea and coffee for the undermentioned years were as follows:—

	From '74 to 20th Feb., '77.	From 20th Feb., '77, to 15th March, '79.	From 15th March, '79, to 24th Feb., '82.	From 24th Feb., '82.
Coffee, green.....	2c. per lb.	2s. per lb.	2c. per lb.	Free.
" roasted or ground.....	3c. "	3c. "	3c. "	3s. per lb.
Tea, green.....	4c. "	6c. "	{ 3c. " & 10 p. c. ad val.	Free.
" black.....	3c. "	5c. "	{ 2c. per lb. & 10 p. c. ad val.	

An additional duty, which is still in force of 10 per cent. *ad valorem*, was imposed on all tea and coffee from the United States."

Thereby encouraging especially to the shipping of our ports. I will now proceed, with the permission of the House, to show the aggregate reduction which has taken

Mr. DICKINSON.

place—the reduction of the real taxes, because it was a reduction upon the necessities of life principally, or at least what had become the necessities of life, so far as tea and coffee are concerned. The amount of Customs duties collected on tea, under the old tariff, in excess of the duties which would have been collected had the previous Conservative tariff remained in operation, was \$304,639. The amount of duties which would have been collected on tea and coffee under the tariff of 1879, since those articles were made free, has been reduced by an aggregate, for the years 1882, 1883 and 1884, of \$1,869,996. The aggregate further loss to the revenue, by reductions in the tariff on promiscuous items, from 1880 to 1884 inclusive, would be \$2,736,931. The abolition of bill stamps since the 4th of March, 1882, has decreased the revenue by about a yearly average of \$100,000, or say, to date, \$400,000; and the loss to revenue from the abolition of postage on newspapers since the 1st of June, 1882, say about four years, an annual average of \$60,000, or a total of \$240,000, making a grand total of \$5,551,566 saved to the people of our country by the operation of the National Policy in respect to the above items alone. The result of all changes under this paternal policy, as conclusively shown by the Finance Minister, is an average decrease of taxation of at least 9½ cents per head of our population, from 1879 to 1884 inclusive, as compared with Grit rule from 1874 to 1879, notwithstanding the enormous expenditures during the former years by the present Government on the Canadian Pacific Railway, now on the eve of completion, and general railroad extensions. There have also been spent millions upon improvements of our rivers and canals, and various public buildings throughout the Dominion, all of which will, directly or indirectly, become revenue-producing, including a large extension of postal service throughout the entire Dominion. In dealing with the general results of the policy adopted by this Government and the manner in which it dealt with the necessities of life—lifting the burden of taxation from the poorer and equalising it in such a manner as to make the rich pay for their luxuries in proportion to their wealth and habits—the fact should not be lost sight of, that the Dominion is to-day paying interest on millions of dollars, the result of reckless extravagance during times of gloom and depression upon the part of the preceding administration. For all time to come the millions wasted in an absurd purchase of steel rails, in useless North-West telegraph failures, in Fort Francis lock construction, in the Welland canal enlargement—where the Government commenced at the wrong end, and left capital lying there for years. These must be paid by the people, in consequence of their having believed in and trusted Reform leaders and Reform professions. I think it will not be unprofitable to this House and to the country to have their attention drawn to the difference of results in regard to our general position, as affecting the credit of our country, with respect to deficits as compared with surpluses. Under the rule of the hon. ex-Minister of Finance, the deficits were as follows:—

1875-76.....	\$1,900,785
1876-77.....	1,480,026
1877-78.....	1,128,147
1878-79.....	1,937,999
	<hr/>
1879-80, disputed.....	\$6,426,957
	1,543,228
	<hr/>
Total.....	\$7,970,185

So that, leaving entirely out of account the amount as to which there is a dispute, the total deficits for that period amount to \$6,426,957, although I have no doubt that the fact could be established that the larger amount is nearer the actual deficit. The surpluses under the present Government are as follows:—

1880-81.....	\$4,132,743	
From Dominion lands.....		\$ 131,124
1881-82	6,313,357	
Dominion lands		1,744,456
1882-83	7,064,491	
Dominion lands		1,009,019
1883-84	754,255	
Dominion lands		951,636
	\$18,264,846	\$3,836,235

Or, a grand total, including Dominion lands, of \$22,101,081, as compared with the total deficits of hon. gentlemen opposite of \$7,970,188; while at the same time the Government have relieved the people of this country, by an actual reduction of taxation, during the same term, amounting to \$5,551,566. In addition, the credit of the country has so improved that the Finance Minister has been able to place a loan at an excess of price over that obtained by the member for South Huron. The difference in interest charge would, in fifty years, wipe out the loan altogether. Hon. gentlemen opposite claim before the country that the people of Canada would be very much improved were they to again grant them their support. Now, I desire to bring under the notice of the House and the country the qualifications that they possess, so far as we can judge from their past administration and sayings, for governing this country in the future. I will trouble the House with a short extract from the Budget Speech of the hon. ex-Finance Minister (Sir Richard Cartwright) in 1878. After referring to the financial position of the country, he said:

"Now, under the circumstances, it may not naturally be asked by some members of this House, whether it would not be advisable, in view of the fact that we have now had, for two years, considerable deficits, to adopt such precautions as would render the existence of another deficit impossible. Well, Sir, I would say at once that if we possessed in Canada any tax equivalent to the income tax now in use in England, probably I would not hesitate to advise the House to have recourse to that means of increasing the revenue."

Take this statement in connection with the utterance made in 1876 by the same hon. gentleman, that no legislation could directly benefit the interest of the country. With these two statements before them, I hardly think that the majority of the people of this country will be in a very great hurry to again repose their confidence in the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. In reference to the general argument brought forward invariably in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, in regard to the merits and demerits of the National Policy, we find these hon. gentlemen having their annual wrestling match, as it were, not only with the Government of the day, but with the great majority of the people of this country. I make this statement, Sir, and I think I am justified, because it has been shown that the great majority of the people of this country are enthusiastic supporters of the National Policy. Then, Sir, there is a natural result of the National Policy which I do not recollect ever having heard referred to, and that is its effect on the national spirit of our inhabitants, the cultivation of which is as necessary to the growth and prosperity of a country as its financial policy. Again, what position do hon. gentlemen opposite occupy on the question of the application of the true principles and intention of responsible government? We find them, year after year, arguing with the same determination against the avowed will of the people as when the National Policy was first adopted, ignoring, according to my humble judgment, the characteristics of responsible government, which is acknowledged to be a great boon, and is often boasted of as such by hon. gentlemen opposite. In fact, I think they claim a large share of the credit of having that great boon conferred on this country. As I understand the principles of responsible government, it is the duty of the Administration of the day to carry out the well-understood and defined wishes of the people. On minor subjects the opinion of the majority of the people is not always clear; but in reference to this National Policy

there has been no uncertain sound on the part of the great majority of the people of this country. It was adopted in 1878 and re-affirmed and endorsed in 1882, and there is no evidence in the country, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and no constitutional indication, that in any degree have the wishes and desires of the great majority of the people of this country changed. Thanking you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, for the kind indulgence you have extended to me, I would simply close by asserting, as my individual opinion, warranted by the present position of the National Policy, that it is the sheet anchor of the future prosperity of this Dominion. And, Sir, notwithstanding what hon. gentlemen opposite may continue to reiterate, as a matter of fact and a matter of judgment I am satisfied that it is now so embedded in the very soil of this country that no political party, coming boldly before the country and asserting that any material change will be made, so long as the Dominion remains in its existing circumstances in relation to other nations, will ever be supported by the majority of the people of this country. And it should be and is a source of congratulation, that the great project which is to complete Confederation, the Canadian Pacific Railway, is so near its completion; and as the National Policy is the sheet anchor of the development and progress and prosperity of this Dominion, so the completion of that grand work is the key stone, as it were, of the arch of Confederation.

Mr. SPROULE. In continuing this debate, I shall endeavor to confine myself as closely as possible to the subject, so as to make my remarks as short as is consistent with a fair presentation of the case to the House and the country. But before entering on the general discussion of the Budget, which was so ably presented to this House several days ago, I may be permitted to draw the attention of the House to some remarks that fell from the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). The Government had told the country, he said, that although they were building that great national highway, the Canadian Pacific Railway, not one dollar would be added to the expense of the people, and that the work would be accomplished without increasing the burdens of the country. He then went on to state that there had been \$12,000,000 expended in that work, and he asked when he might expect to see a dollar of it returned to the people. I can only say that if there has been \$12,000,000 expended by the Government in that work, they have a very creditable showing to make to the people, in the construction of from 12,000 to 15,000 miles of railway; and when a comparison is made between that expense and the expense of \$13,000,000 made by the late Government, the comparison is strongly in favor of the present Administration. What was the condition of the road under the late Government? It was that, although \$13,000,000 had been expended on it, only 113 miles had been built at one end into the wilderness and 117 miles at the other end, and between them there was left a link, that could not be used for a great many years, so that the money was virtually expended without any special benefit arising to the country from that vast expense for years, had not the present Government pushed it to completion the way they did. In referring to the Finance Minister's Budget Speech, the hon. gentleman was pleased to say that the Finance Minister had treated this House to a shower-bath of words, for the purpose of convincing the people that their taxes had not been raised and that they were in a better condition than formerly; and the hon. gentleman said that in his opinion the Finance Minister had failed to make good his assertion. All I can say in reply is, that the hon. gentleman himself has been treating this House to a diarrhoea of words and sentences, resulting in a lamentable failure to establish the arguments he advanced. The hon.

gentleman travelled over the whole continent of America, from end to end, for the purpose of picking up arguments to prove to the people of this country that they are worse off to-day than they were five years ago; but with all his industry he lamentably failed in the endeavor. Referring to the speech of the hon. member for King's, N.B. (Mr. Foster)—a speech which, to my mind, was a very eloquent effort, containing close reasoning and strong arguments—he said he had perused that long speech twice over and a part of it for the third time, and could find nothing in the whole speech to attract his attention, but the word *metropoli*. In that he reminded me of the story of the boy who was presented with a very fine book, but although that book contained some of the finest essays of Bacon, and some of the most admirable selections from the works of Socrates, and some of the finest efforts of the most eminent men of the day, a book which was one of the best contributions to the literature of the country, but who, on being asked what he thought of it, answered that he could not see anything in it but the picture of a kite on one of the fly leaves. The explanation of this was that the boy had been attending to his boyish amusement of flying his kite and could see nothing else. So the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) saw nothing in that speech but the word *metropoli*, because he was flying his kite all over the cities of this continent, to see if he could catch any arguments to be urged against the National Policy. He was dealing with millions, travelling from Bangor to Boston, from Boston to Illinois, and back, flying his kite from one great metropolis to the other, and therefore he could think of nothing else. With reference to the reduction in the price of cotton in England, the hon. gentleman said that during a period of twelve years in the history of England, where there was no National Policy, the price of cotton had not increased but had been reduced some 7 pence per yard; but he omitted to tell the House that the period was one beginning with the close of the American war, when cotton was perhaps at its highest point. I may tell the hon. gentleman that the price has been reduced in the United States, even more in proportion in the same interval; and that it has been reduced to a still greater extent during the short time that the National Policy has been in operation in this country. At the outset of his speech the hon. gentleman said that the country was not so prosperous as in 1882. Well, I admit that in some respects it is not; but can that falling off be attributed to the National Policy, or to the administration of this Government? I believe not; I believe it is mainly explained by the fact, as shown by the Ontario Bureau of Statistics, that there was a falling of \$26,000,000 in the crop of Ontario, for the year 1883, as compared with 1882. That is the reason why we experienced a temporary lull and an apparent want of prosperity in the country. True, we have had, the past year, a better crop, but a great deal of that has had to be used to pay the indebtedness of the previous two years; and, therefore, it is reasonable to suppose we cannot enjoy the prosperity we otherwise would have had. What is the line of arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite? Each one seems to take his own view of the question, and to present to the House and the country his view from his own standpoint; and, strange to say, their views are as diametrically opposed to each other as day is to night. One endeavors to prove one thing, the other to prove the reverse. They remind me of the defence adopted by a celebrated barrister in the case of a client who was charged with stealing a kettle. In the first place, said he, we did not steal the kettle; in the next place, if we did steal it, it was our own; and in the third place, there was no kettle to steal. So, in the first place, hon. gentlemen opposite say the country is no better off than it was in 1878, on account of the present policy of the present Government; second, if the country is better off, and we admit it is

Mr. SPOULE.

better off, it is due neither to the National Policy nor to the railway policy of the Government; and third, they say that the present Government has no policy at all; that it is only proceeding by haphazard to suit the exigencies of any special class who may happen to wait on the Ministry from time to time, in order to advance their own individual or collective interest. I think we may reasonably ask, Is the country better off to-day than it was five years ago? Some hon. gentlemen opposite have used a large share of their time in the endeavor to prove that the country is no better off. The hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton) said expressly that the country is worse off to-day; that there is a reduction in the value of the lands; that the people are undergoing greater hardships to-day than they were previous to 1878. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) in the early part of his speech, introduced and endeavored to support the same grounds; but he went on after a while to say: We admit the country is better off, that there is a showing that the people are better employed and are receiving perhaps larger wages, but what is it attributable to? It is not attributable to the policy of the Government at all, but to causes over which the Government or the policy could have no control. And he cited to the House the fact that it was due to the increased export of the agriculturists, that it was due to the increased amount of money taken out of the woods and forests of the country, that it was due to the increased amount of money taken out of the seas and lakes of our country in the fisheries, and he gave this as an evidence that, although, as he admitted, the country was better off, it was better off by virtue of the large production in these various lines, and not by virtue of any improvement brought about by the National Policy. We may ask for a few minutes: Is the country any better off to-day? If it is, we may expect to find the people individually better off. What does represent prosperity in a country? Is it not wealth? Is it not employment for the people? Is it not the earning of sufficient wages to supply themselves with the necessaries and comforts of life? If these things are not an evidence of prosperity, then I do not know what is. If we look at the condition of the country, and we are asked: Is it any better off to-day; is there any increased value in the land of the country? I need only take up the return made to the Bureau of Statistics in Ontario, and deal with that part of the country with which I am best acquainted; and I may say, in passing, that I was surprised to find that most of the hon. gentlemen from Ontario travelled all the way down to the Maritime Provinces for the purpose of using arguments to prove to the people of Ontario that the people in the Maritime Provinces were worse off, but they left untouched the very arguments that were patent and apparent to every member in his own constituency at home, and left members from the Maritime Provinces to deal with them. That was, to my mind, a very unfair way of dealing with the subject. In reference to these statistics, an hon. gentleman has endeavored to discredit them, and goes on to show that they are not reliable. I can give him the opinion of the farmers of this country, as expressed through their Grange, a short time ago, and it will enable him to understand what value they attach to those statistics, and what they were believed to have proved. At the Provincial Grange meeting, held in Toronto a short time ago, the president, in addressing the association, said this:

"He rapidly referred to the centennial anniversary of the settlement of Ontario, and consequently the centenary of the birth of agriculture in the same; to the recent abundant harvest, and the low price of produce; to the increase in the number of live stock kept on farms and the improvement in the class of animals; to the improvement in farms and buildings noticeable throughout the Province; to the increase in value of farm property of over \$50,000,000 in a year; and to the efficiency of the Ontario Bureau of Industries, whose statements are so valuable."

They found that these statistics were valuable because they contained data and information that gave them an insight

into the growing prosperity of the country, and yet hon. gentlemen in this House, although these statistics are carefully culled and collected by their own friends in Ontario, are inclined to discredit them and say they are not reliable. What do these statistics tell us as to the increased value of the property in the country? The hon. member for North Norfolk said he defied any man to show that the value of property, especially in Ontario, had increased during the last few years. I have these statistics before me, and I find in them, where there has been a careful investigation of the subject, that during the year 1883 there was an increase over 1882 in the value of farm property amounting to \$22,450,525, in the Province of Ontario. I find that there was an increase in the value of buildings to the extent of \$31,319,100. I find that there was an increase in the value of implements that farmers used to carry on their operations amounting to \$6,492,715, and I find there was an increase in the value of the live stock of \$18,341,645—or, in these lines, buildings, implements and live stock, a total increase in the Province of Ontario, for 1883 over 1882, of 78,603,985—and that, too, notwithstanding the fact that there was a falling off in the value of crops that year of over \$26,000,000. What better evidence can hon. gentlemen in this House want to satisfy them that the country is prospering, and that the people are growing in wealth and becoming more comfortable? I can only say, in referring to the statement of the hon. member for North Norfolk, that in looking over these statistics very carefully, I find there are only two or three counties in the Province of Ontario that show any decrease in the value of lands or the prosperity of the people; and, strange to say, those very counties are the counties represented by hon. gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House. There is the county of Norfolk, represented by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), and by the hon. member who endeavored the other night to prove that the man who sent goods out of the country paid the duty, and the man who brought goods into the country paid the duty—that the farmers paid the duties both ways (Mr. Jackson). These are the men who represent that county, and I do not wonder that there is some decrease in the wealth or some shrinkage in the value of land in counties where they are subjected to the speeches of these hon. gentlemen from year to year and from month to month. I come nearer home, and deal with this question in reference to my own county. The hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen), who spoke to-night, travelled all over the continent of America to press into his service arguments suitable to the occasion, but he forgot the facts patent to his eyes in his own county, which give the strongest evidence of prosperity. In the constituency he represents I find there is an increase in every line. In the value of the lands there is an increase of \$2,120,820 during the last year; there is an increase in the value of the stock amounting to \$1,154,000, and in the value of the implements of \$238,460, or a total increase in the wealth of his own county, during the last year, amounting to \$4,146,890; and yet he says the country is worse off to-day. What I would like to ask the House and country is, what importance they can attach to the statements and arguments of hon. gentlemen in this House, when they endeavor to prove such allegations as they are endeavoring to prove here, when the people see these facts before them every day in the year. In my own county we had three men who went through the county to value it for the purpose of equalising the assessment five years ago, and while they did their duty admirably and were men of very good judgment, and devoted themselves assiduously to the task, the return was that the value of the county was a little over \$12,000,000. A little more than a year ago three more men went through the county, and in the past five years the value of the same county, the value of

the land in that county, the improvements the people had made in the land, and the wealth of the people as represented by their assessment, taken by men of equal ability and taken with the same care that the others had shown, before them, had about doubled. It was at the last valuation \$25,000,000. And yet we are told that this country is going to the dogs, that the National Policy established by the present Government is tending to make the people poorer instead of richer. Now, I can only say that if the hon. gentlemen who are using these arguments, collected from Maritime Provinces, would only come to the farmers of their own counties and examine the improvements that are taking place there, they would endeavor to present the case in a fairer light to their constituents, or else they would show no disposition to do what is fair in this question. Now, in reference to the wealth of the country, as represented by the accumulation of money in the country, what do we find? I have before me a statement showing the increase in the amounts that have been from year to year deposited in the savings banks of our country during the last ten years, and in the chartered banks. I find that during the years 1876-77-78 the amounts deposited in the post office savings banks, in round figures, were about \$2,000,000 each year; and in the chartered banks they averaged \$58,000,000. But after the present Government came into power do we find them increasing or decreasing? If there was any correctness in the allegations of the hon. gentlemen who attempt to prove that the country is retrograding, we would expect to find a decrease; but, instead, there is an increase in every line, as appears from the following figures:—

Year	Post Office Banks.
1875.....	\$2,926,000
1876.....	2,741,000
1877.....	2,640,000
1878.....	2,754,000
1879.....	3,105,000
1880.....	3,948,000
1881.....	6,208,000
1882.....	9,474,000
1883.....	11,976,000
1884.....	13,245,000

I claim that these figures show that there has been a constant accumulation of wealth among the poorer classes of the people since the present Government has had control of the affairs of this country. In the chartered banks the deposits increased from \$58,946,000, in 1878, to \$87,341,000, in 1884. Now I think this is the very plainest evidence we can have that the country is growing wealthier. If the land is increasing in value; if the buildings of the people are becoming more valuable; if they are becoming possessed of better facilities for carrying on their agricultural operations; and if, in addition to that, the people are accumulating capital, then I cannot understand how it is that the country is going backward. The hon. gentleman from Queen's, P. E. I. (Mr. Davies) said that this showing was no argument at all; that it did not prove that the wealth of the country was increasing; that it only showed, to his mind, that there were not avenues or openings in which the money could be invested and give a reasonable return, and consequently those who had capital locked it up in the savings banks. Now, I think that hon. gentleman either did not examine this subject carefully, or else he was most unfair in presenting this view of the question to the House. I have ascertained the amount of deposits in the savings banks for a number of years. Mr. Stewart, who has charge of the post office savings bank, has furnished the following figures, classifying the deposits. There were 141,000 depositors amongst the farmers of the country, and they deposited \$1,724,000. And how much was the average that each man deposited? Only \$337.28. There were 7,850 mechanics, who deposited \$1,422,000. How much was the average that

these mechanics put in? The average was \$181.14 each. I take the trust accounts—young children—and I find there were 5,500 depositors, whose deposits amounted to \$170,000, or an average of \$30.50 to each depositor. These deposits were made by men who could not find avenues of trade in which to invest their money that would ensure a reasonable return, and therefore they were obliged to lock it up. I take the laborers of the country. There were 4,270 depositors, depositing \$724,000, or an average of \$169.49 per man. I find that, taking the total of these depositors, there were 66,682, and their deposits amounted to over \$13,000,000. What clearer evidence can be asked than this to prove that this sum represents the savings of the industrial class of the country? It indicates, also, that these people are able to supply themselves with the necessaries and comforts of life, and over and above that, from the products of their labor, they are able to put these amounts in the savings banks. Although they appear to be small individually, in the aggregate they represent a large sum, and they show also that the industrial classes of the country are improving their condition, and that they have been growing in wealth from 1878 up to the present time. I take again the returns as represented by the number of miles of railway in the country. In 1878 we had 6,143 miles of railway in operation, and in 1884 we have very close on 10,000 miles, an increase of almost 4,000 miles of railway within the five years. Now, does that represent wealth or does it represent poverty? If our country, in order to carry on its increasing trade, is compelled to build these railways, and if we have been enabled, through the successful operation of the policy of the present Government, to build this 4,000 miles of railway, then it shows that the result of the policy of the present Administration, which they inaugurated five years ago, has been beneficial to the country, and I say it is the very strongest evidence that the country is growing wealthier all the time. I might ask hon. gentlemen what further evidence they need that the country is getting better off? I will take the loaning companies of the country, and what do they tell us? Now, the hon. gentleman from North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), who had, I may say, the audacity to stand up in the House and say that the value of the property in this country was decreasing, evidently could not have consulted either the speeches of the presidents of these companies or their financial statements. I have before me a return of the Canada Permanent Loan and Savings Company. It tells us that in the year 1884, in the Province of Ontario, there is a less amount of land held in default, a less amount held for sale, than has been held for many years. The president says: "The obligations of the mortgagees for interest accruing and due were generally met with punctuality." I have before me the returns of the British Canadian Loan and Savings Company. They tell us that out of all their loans the amount received from borrowers during the year, principal and interest, was \$218,945. The amount overdue and in default was only \$13,770 on the whole operations. The number of mortgages upon which compulsory proceedings had to be taken during the year were only six, and the amount represented by these mortgages was only \$5,950. And yet hon. gentlemen will tell us that the people of the country are growing poorer. If they were growing poorer how could they pay their way, as they have done, and how could these companies make so splendid a showing, when out of a business representing \$114,902,000 only \$5,150 were in default on the year's operations? I can only say, in regard to my own experience in the county I represent, a few years ago, before the present Government came into power, we had private individuals lending money to loaning companies in large amounts. This was a profitable business and yielded large returns. What has been

Mr. SPROULE.

the change that has occurred during the last few years? The change has been such that they have been compelled to give up the business, because they could not loan any considerable amounts of money, and therefore the business was not a profitable one. Farmers are paying off their mortgages rapidly to-day, they are improving their buildings, increasing their stock and the value of their implements, and in every part of the country we have the very strongest evidences of prosperity. Can any hon. gentleman who has walked through Toronto or looked over Montreal or Hamilton, London, Oshawa, and other of our Canadian cities and towns, have failed to see that in every direction they are rapidly growing. In Toronto land, which was only fields a few years ago, has been taken into the city and is being covered with some of the finest structures to be found in the country. In Montreal wealth and extensive building operations are apparent in every direction. In London the same condition prevails, and in Hamilton the showing presented to-night by one of its members is the best guarantee that that city is prospering. I think I need say little in connection with this subject, beyond directing the attention of the House for a short time to the condition of the people. If the country is better off we naturally expect to find the people better off. How can they become rich? Only by being steadily employed and earning sufficient wages for their labor to enable them to supply themselves with the comforts of life and save something each year. Do we find, on looking over the newspapers, that any considerable number of the people are out of employment? Do we find there is any great demand on the charitable institutions in the large cities and towns, by persons unable to supply themselves with the necessaries of life? Do we find the laborers are not employed? I take up the statements of the same Bureau of Statistics I used a few minutes ago, and what does the report say? I find in it returns given by 590 laborers in the cities of Toronto, Hamilton, London and Oshawa, and they are said to be correct returns, because the parties themselves made them. We find that out of 590 employed in those cities only twenty-eight were earning less than what was necessary to support themselves and families. The average earnings of each man was \$414.85 for the year. Out of that number the average amount over and above that required to procure the necessaries of life was \$41.63 during the year. Is this evidence that the people are worse off? There is another tale to be told. Those people said they were not employed the whole year; that they lost fifty-one days in the year, and yet they were enabled to support themselves and their families and put away, as savings, \$43.63 each year. Is that evidence that the laboring classes are worse off than formerly? Need we wonder, however, at this result, when we look at the statistics of the manufacturing industries of the country? Do we wonder, when we find such a large increase in the number employed and the capital invested, that in every line there has been a gradual increase in the wages of the people during the last year and the previous year. The year before last I went to Toronto to engage some mechanics and a plasterer. After trying a number of contractors I found I could not get one of them to send me a plasterer for less than \$2.75 a day, I paying the railway journey both ways and boarding the man. If men can earn that sum in wages can they be in a state of poverty? It is impossible. Look for a moment over the wage-earning class of the community. If you take the farm laborers, their wages have been increased from 1878 to the present time. While they received in 1878 from \$10 to \$15 per month with board, they now obtain from \$20 to \$25. That is the very best evidence that they are doing better, and that the country is better off. The hon. member for Brant (Mr. Paterson) went on to say that

although there had been an increase in the manufactured products, that fact was no evidence that the people were better off. He said :

"Where are those millions of money that were to be invested in the country if the National Policy was passed. I want to know where the millions are. Will the member for Cardwell tell me? We have paid some hundreds of dollars—I do not know whether it will not run into thousands—for commissioners to go through the country to find evidences of prosperity. They have not found these men; they have not found these millions."

That hon. gentleman was most unfair, because if he had wished to be fair, he would not have overlooked the fact that the report of the commissioners who went through the country examining the condition of our manufacturing industries stated, in language as plain as language could be made, that there had been brought into this country a capital of \$79,560,000, or, at all events, that that much additional capital had been invested in addition to what was invested in these industries in 1878. Yet the hon. member asks where are those millions, for he has been unable to find them. It has been said before, and I think it will apply with equal force now, that no one is so blind as a man who will not see. The hon. gentleman asked where are the thousand of men who were to be employed; where are the large quantity of products which was to be turned out if this policy was adopted? He overlooks the fact that products to the value of \$59,966,000 was produced as the result of that policy in 1884 over 1878, and there were employed 51,528 men. I should like to ask this House and the country whether it is reasonable to suppose that employers could employ that large number of men and expend that large sum of money and turn out that large amount of product without, at the same time, producing an improvement in the condition of the people. It is most unreasonable, and it cannot be successfully established by any hon. gentleman, either here or elsewhere. Then he went on to speak about the woollen manufacture. He says that although we have three millions of woollen goods manufactured in 1884 over 1878, yet, because there is no evidence of any importation of the raw material, it is impossible that that was the result. The hon. gentleman did not look at the figures showing the large amount of wool we have in the country; showing that we have been for years accumulating wool in the country; showing that it had been raised in large quantities, and that the National Policy was accomplishing what was claimed by the Finance Minister when the tariff was introduced, namely: That it would give us at least the privilege of using up what we raised at home, and manufacturing it for the people, and thereby converting it into a source of wealth. Now, I may ask again, in reference to the railway policy of the Government, is it reasonable that we should build 4,000 miles of railway inside of five years, expending, as has been expended, \$92,000,000, largely brought in from other countries, without it doing any good to the country? Is it reasonable to suppose that we could expend, not only on railways, but on canals and post offices and Custom houses throughout the country, large sums of money, and that the people should be no better off? Is it reasonable that we could employ the 51,828 people who are shown to have been employed in 1884 over 1878, in the factories of the Dominion, and yet to say that the country is no better off? Is it reasonable to suppose that we could employ the 20,000 who have been employed in building the Canadian Pacific Railway in the last few years, and yet that it is no good to the country? I think that logic which would satisfy any man that that is the case is the strangest I ever heard of. Hon. gentlemen from the western part of Ontario, in dealing with this question, have always steered clear of the evidence which was plainly before their eyes, and they have gone to the Maritime Provinces to hunt up arguments. Take for a moment the additional market that is given to our farmers and producers generally, by the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

I have before me a small cutting from a paper, showing the amount of stuff that was shipped from the port of Owen Sound, to supply some of these hands on the Canadian Pacific Railway during the last year. This is only one port, and in addition to Owen Sound we have Meaford, Collingwood, Southampton, Kincardine, Midland and Penetanguishene, and if you take these and collect the aggregate returns from these different ports, showing the total amount of the local produce of our country that finds a good market there—a better market than in the East—it will enable us to understand what the improvement has been in that part of the country, from the policy of the present Government. We shipped from Owen Sound last year no less than 8,460 head of cattle, and these were largely taken from the counties of Grey and Wellington—from the county represented by my hon. friend, which I have shown has increased so largely in wealth during the last few years, and from my own county. Still, hon. gentlemen say that the policy has done no good to our country, and has given us no increased market. We had in the port of Owen Sound during the last year—

Mr. COCKBURN. How much will you ship next year?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know, but it will be a great deal more. We had in Owen Sound 1,064 steamers, representing a tonnage of 463,366 tons. And I say that every one of these steamers was kept busily employed carrying on the trade between that port and the upper lakes, supplying the men employed on the Canadian Pacific Railway, thereby giving us an increased market, and an increase in the wealth of the people of that country from that source. These steamers employed no less a number than 15,881 men. Is that no benefit to the country? That is evidence from only one port; and when you remember there are a number of ports on Lake Huron and Georgian Bay that are sending stuff in the same direction and in equally large proportions, it is an evidence that we are receiving a great benefit from the building of that railway. With reference to the second proposition of hon. gentlemen, that I spoke of at the outset, they state, in the first place, that the country is no better off since the introduction of the National Policy, and in the next place that, if the country is better off, as some of them admitted it was, it is not due to the National Policy or the railway policy. What is it due to? What is this large expenditure of \$91,000,000 on the Canadian Pacific Railway by the company, in addition to what the Government spent, due to? Is it not due to the Government's policy of building the railway? Is it not due to the system of building the railway, and that is only a policy? Can hon. gentlemen safely say that the Government had no policy at all, and that no benefit is accruing from that policy? What is the large showing given to us of the increased number of factories in this country due to? Is it not due to the National Policy? We found these factories waning and dying out, and the number of hands employed previous to 1878 decreasing, but since that time they have been growing rapidly year by year. I would call their attention for a short time to the sugar refineries that have been started, to the cotton mills that have been built up in the country, and to the various manufacturing establishments which have grown up in every part of the country since the present Government came into power. And I would ask, do the people of the country appreciate the great benefits they receive? We have the strongest reasons for believing that they do, for although from 1878 to 1882 the Opposition were endeavoring to prove that they were being injured by the policy of the Government, that it was their duty to turn the Government out of power and put others in their places, strange to say they failed to convince the people of the country of that fact, and the result was that the Government came back as strong in 1882 as they were in 1878. We have

reason to believe that there has been no material change in the opinion of the people of the country since; and the results of bye-elections which have taken place from 1882 to the present hour are, I think, strong proof of it. I can only tell hon. gentlemen that if they desire to remain for a long time in the cold shades of opposition, they have only to take the same line of argument that they have been adopting in this House during the last five years, and they will be successful in keeping themselves there. If they endeavor to stultify the intelligence of the people, by showing that the country was deluded, that the people of the country were deluded, I say it is an insult to the intelligence of the people of the country. I can tell hon. gentlemen that the people understand what is to their advantage just as well as hon. gentlemen do, and they view it from an unbiased standpoint, because they have no object but their own welfare. These gentlemen have in view the coveted seats of office which they are craving for, and it is a strong inducement, it compels them to lay before the country those garbled statements that are from day to day produced in this House, and those disingenuous arguments which they endeavored to use for the purposes of convincing the country that they are not fairly dealt with. Now, I think I need say very little more in reference to this question. I may only for a moment refer to a statement made by an hon. member—I think for one of the Ontarios—who I understand is a lumberman. He states that the people of this country did not sell any more of their coarse grains, on account of the National Policy; that the farmers did not want the National Policy for that purpose. He did not say the farmers; He said, "We (speaking as a lumberman) do not want it." We were aware of the fact in 1878, that the lumbermen did not want it, because they got their supplies of oats and pork and other articles from the western States, and they left the products of the farm at home to be sent to other markets, deducting from the products of those farmers the amount it cost to take them to foreign markets and sell them there. They say that we do not want to keep corn and corn meal out of the country, but I can only tell hon. gentlemen that the farmers want the National Policy as much to-day as they did in 1878, and they appreciate the good done to them by the Government as much to-day and as strongly as they did in 1878. It is said by the same hon. gentleman that this policy has done the farmers no good. Now, I can only say, in reply to that, that if there is any one class in the country more than another that it has benefited, it is the farmers. It has given them an increased market for their products, at least to the extent of the consumption of 71,000 people, employed in the factories and on the railways of the country; and it has reduced the cost of agricultural implements by the competition brought about by the additional number of people engaged in their manufacture. What is the story told to-day by men selling machinery? They say that it has been reduced, during the last four or five years, in value, from 20 to 25 per cent.; and the hon. gentleman to-night said that he knew manufacturers who had a million dollars in machinery that they would sell for 50 cents in the dollar. If this is so, the farmer must be able to buy cheaper. This policy has also reduced the cost of living to the farmer. Hon. gentlemen opposite have endeavored to prove that if the cost of living to the people has been reduced by the National Policy, it cannot have done the farmer any good; but it has reduced the cost to the farmer of those lines which he cannot supply himself. It has reduced the cost of the necessaries of life. It has made tea and coffee free of duty, so that they can be got at the lowest possible price. What are the prices of the necessaries of life to-day, compared with their prices in 1878? I am giving the figures that were collected by the hon. Postmaster-General last fall, because I have verified them by the prices

MR. SPROULE.

given me by commercial men in my own part of the country, and I find them to be strictly correct:

	1878.	1884.
Sugar, retailed per pound.....	\$0 09	\$0 05
" " " " " " " " " " " "	0 10	0 06
" white " " " " " " " " " "	0 11	0 07
Syrup for table use, per gallon.....	1 00	0 60
" ordinary " " " " " " " " " "	0 80	0 50
Tea, per pound.....	1 00	0 60
" " " " " " " " " " " "	0 75	0 50
" " " " " " " " " " " "	0 50	0 30
Coffee, per pound.....	0 30	0 20
	1880.	1884.
Suits of Canadian tweeds.....	\$10 00	\$ 8 00
" " " " " " " " " " " "	12 50	10 00
" " " " " " " " " " " "	17 00	12 50
Men's wool undershirts and drawers	1 00	0 75
" Union " " " " " " " " " "	0 50 to 0 75	30 to 50
Canadian tweeds for men's and boys's suits.....	0 75 to 1 00	50 to 0 75
Canadian blankets, per pound.	0 65 to 0 75	0 45

This reduction in the price of blankets is due to the competition, and yet, though securing the home markets to these manufacturers, they have been enabled to reduce the price and still have as good a profit to-day as they had in 1878:

	1880.	1884.
Grey flannel, per yard... 35c., 37½c., 45c.	25c., 30c., 35c.	
Check " " " " " " " " " " " "	37c. to 40c.	25c.

In cotton goods there is an equal reduction. In fact, in every line representing the necessaries of life there has been a large reduction in the price, compared with the price in 1878. Now, if these figures do not show that the National Policy has benefited the farmer and the laboring man, then I do not know what is a benefit. I think we may safely assume that the farmers have been benefited by the enlarged market they have obtained, by the reduction of the price of agricultural implements, by the increased amount of money expended during the last five years, by the increased value of their products and the decreased value of the necessaries of life that they have been compelled to buy, and by the rapid settlement of the North-West country and the consequently increasing demand for the products of the agriculturists, especially of the Province of Ontario. I think I have shown clearly that it has reduced the cost of living, and consequently it must have benefited the laboring man as well as the farmer. I think, too, the mercantile class of the country are better off than they were in 1878, because if you take the last five years, and compare them with the previous five years, you will find that the number of people in mercantile business who failed in this country was only 5,040, compared with 9,185, during the five years previous. Why are fewer people failing to-day? Because they are in better circumstances and are better able to pay their way. The amount of money represented by the failures in the last five years was \$57,467,724, against \$133,128,724 in the five years previous. Now, I claim that this improved condition of affairs is plainly attributable to the improved condition of the people and their greater ability to pay their way to-day than was the case five years ago—to their increased purchasing power, and to the improved condition of the country in every particular. Now, although this question has been debated at great length in this House, I think the time has not been badly spent, for we have two parties laying their views before the country—one party, in my opinion, endeavoring strangely to mislead the country, and the other endeavoring to place facts and figures plainly before the people, to enable them intelligently to judge of their condition to-day compared with what it was a few years ago. I say, while we have a class of people in this House who are endeavoring to mislead the country, and to prove that the people are worse off, that a great injustice has been done to them by the policy of the present Government, and that it

would be to the interest of the country to make a change in the Government, I think it is our duty to defend the position we occupy and to endeavor to lay facts and figures fairly before the people, to show them that they are receiving great benefit by the legislation introduced by the present Government. I can only say that if the facts and figures before us to-day, and the observations we can make from time to time, are any evidence of what the people want and intend to continue, they prove to my mind conclusively that the people believe that they are much better off than they were in 1878, that the present Government are legislating in the interest of the people of the country, and that it is the desire and intention of the people to continue in power the same class of men who have accomplished these great results in the past. I can only say, in reference to the Opposition in this House that if they continue the same line of argument and attack which they have taken during the last five years, I predict that they will remain a long time in the cold shades of Opposition, and that their hair will have grown very grey before they will be called on to enjoy the pleasure of holding office in the Government of this country.

Mr. BECHARD. I do not lose sight of the fact that the House is getting tired of this protracted debate, and is desirous of seeing it brought to an end, but I assure hon. members that I do not intend to solicit their attention for any considerable length of time. I will endeavor to make my remarks in the English language, though I speak it with great difficulty, but I will do so out of a sense of courtesy to the vast majority of this House. Before the National Policy was instituted our ears rang with the flattering promises of its advocates and promoters, and since it has been inaugurated we have heard the same gentlemen at every Session speaking in boastful language of its success. According to them, all the prosperity that this country has been enjoying for the few years past has been due to the influence of that policy. My hon. friend, the member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), whom I do not see in its place, in the eloquent speech which he pronounced on Friday last, spoke in glowing terms of the National Policy; and as an evidence of how it is appreciated by the people, said that after being adopted in 1878, it has since been re-affirmed in 1882. It is true that the people, after having adopted the National Policy, re-affirmed it, but my hon. friend should not forget that the people sometimes change their minds respecting questions of public policy, and surely he has not remained blind to what has taken place in England, for instance, during the last twenty years, where both political parties, Liberals and Conservatives, have held power alternately and for comparatively short terms. Did we not see, last fall, in the neighboring Republic, the Republican party defeated, after having held power for a period of twenty-four years. That which has occurred in other countries has already occurred and will occur in Canada, and it is my sincere belief that the day is not very far distant when the Canadian people will modify their opinion respecting the National Policy. Some hon. gentlemen, in the course of this debate, with a view of showing the prosperous condition of the country, pointed to the increase in our exports of some classes of products, such as fish, lumber and farm produce. No doubt the exports of a nation can be considered as an element of prosperity; the more we export, the more we have produced; but the question here is, whether those exports are the results of the National Policy. If our fishermen had an abundant catch, if our lumbermen exported largely the products of our forests, if our farmers were blest with abundant crops, which they sold at fair prices in foreign markets, I would like to know what the National Policy had to do with this. Surely no man believes that we can regulate here, by legislation, the prices which we may receive in foreign markets for our exports; surely no

man in the full possession of his senses will believe such a position to be a sound one. But, Sir, those hon. gentlemen who spoke in such laudable terms of the increase in our exports had not much to say about the increase in our imports. It is not to be forgotten, however, that not very long ago the excess of our imports over our exports was regarded by hon. gentlemen opposite as a public misfortune and evil. At least, it was so regarded when my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) was at the head of affairs. Those hon. gentlemen pretended that the balance of trade was constantly against us; that as the difference had to be paid in gold, our gold was drawn off from the country, and that the system was ruinous, because it placed us in the condition of a man who consumed more than he produced; but the National Policy, they said, was going to cure that evil. Has it cured it? The official returns tell us that since the National Policy has been instituted, with the exception of one year, our imports have continued to exceed our exports; and mind you, that excess has been in an ascending proportion within the last two or three years. Being in this position, if the theory of the balance of trade, such as interpreted by hon. gentlemen opposite, be correct, this country instead of being prosperous ought to be on its way to ruin; but if, on the contrary, this country is prosperous, the consequence is that the theory of hon. gentlemen opposite is erroneous and unsound. Is not this one of those public questions about which men sometimes change their opinion? And if the hon. gentlemen opposite have modified their opinion on this question, why should we not, on this side, be entitled to believe that the people of Canada will also change their mind in respect to the National Policy? The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), during a portion of his speech, referred to the good results of the National Policy, with respect to the interests of our manufacturers, and as an evidence of those good results, he pointed to the fact that some classes of goods which he mentioned are cheaper to-day than they were before. On this last point I do not differ with my hon. friend. There are goods indeed which are very cheap to-day, and that cheapness is the result of the National Policy; but the question is, whether that cheapness is in accordance with the interest of the manufacturer. The National Policy was established, in so far as the manufacturer was concerned, to promote his interest by protecting him against foreign competition. I have no doubt that our manufacturers received a certain amount of protection from this tariff during the first few years that it was in operation, but we are now beginning to see the other side of the question. Capitalists have invested too much capital in some branches of industry, and the result has been an over-production. Hence the suspension of operations in a large number of our manufactories, and the fact that a certain number of men are to-day without work; and there is the danger that threatens too rapid a development of manufacturing industries stimulated by artificial means. My hon. friend has also alluded to the good results of the policy with regard to the interest of agriculture. Our agriculture, no doubt, has been very prosperous for the past few years, although it is not so prosperous to-day as it has been; but I deny that this prosperity is due to the influence of the National Policy. We had the National Policy in March, 1879, and it is remembered by all that during that whole year the depression continued with more intensity than ever. Never before had more banks failed, more bankruptcies occurred; never had farm produce been sold cheaper in any one year than it was during the year 1879, and the first part of 1880. But, in the second part of 1880, a revival of business having taken place in some other countries with which we have extensive commercial relations, that revival of business was also felt here. In the succeeding year we were blessed with abundant crops, whilst crops failed in some

European states. The consequence was, that there was an increase in the demand for farm products in those foreign countries, and we had the good fortune to sell them the surplus of our abundance. Our farmers made a great deal of money; those of them who were indebted paid their debts, and a considerable number of them remained with money in hand to loan. This is one of the reasons for the diminution in the rate of interest which took place then, and which was alluded to by the hon. member for Ottawa. It was said by the promoters of the National Policy that it would secure the home market for our farmers. I hold that the home market was secured to our farmers before the National Policy was in existence. It is secured to our farmers by the large surpluses of farm produce which we are bound to export every year to foreign markets, in order to make it profitable to us. When our home market is overcrowded with our natural products, it ought to be obvious to everyone that it cannot be advantageous for the sale of similar products imported from foreign countries. But there is one protection that this Government could, perhaps, give to our farmers—the opening up of new markets by commercial treaties with foreign nations. Depend upon it, this is the best and the only efficient protection that could be given to the farmers of Canada. While I am on this subject I am just reminded that some gentleman in the course of this debate referred to the possibility of negotiating a commercial treaty with the United States. It has been always considered or admitted by all parties in Canada that the treaty of 1854 was beneficial to both countries, and we know that the Canadian Government could never succeed in negotiating a treaty with the United States so long as the Republican party was in power. But that party have just been driven from power and been replaced by a Democratic Administration. It is permitted to hope that, with a Democratic Administration at Washington, the Canadian Government, whether it be composed of Conservatives or Liberals, might be more successful in the negotiation of such a treaty; for it is well known that it is in the traditions of the Democratic party in the United States to extend, as much as possible, their commerce, and to restrain the restrictions upon their foreign trade as much as is compatible with the necessities of the revenue. We must not forget that the treaty of 1854 was negotiated on the part of the United States by a Democratic Administration—the Administration of General Pierce—and that the same treaty was denounced by the Republican party as soon as they assumed the reins of power. My hon. friend from Ottawa, who spoke on several subjects in his able speech, to some of which I have already alluded and to some of which I shall have to allude briefly, forgot to say anything of the results of the National Policy regarding emigration. We remember that, according to the promoters of the National Policy, one of its results would be not only to check the emigration of our countrymen to the United States, but even to bring back to our country those of them who had previously emigrated. I am sure that it would be interesting for every member of this House to see in this respect the statistics of the hon. the Minister of Agriculture, and to compare the number of those who have returned with the number of those who have gone to the United States since the National Policy was inaugurated. Those who returned are farmers who, after having rented their farms, go to the United States for a few years to earn money. Those generally return to our country; but those who are not land owners as a general rule do not return, but stay on the other side of the line, and if some of them, from time to time, make their appearance in Canada, it is not for a long time. I represent a constituency which is essentially agricultural. It has no large city where is generally to be found a floating population that is disposed to emigrate. Yet I find, referring to the late census, that within the last decade the

Mr. BECHARD.

population of my constituency has diminished, and that reduction has taken place notwithstanding the permanent fact of reproduction; and in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I hold that we are as well endowed as any other people. But, notwithstanding our natural advantages, I find the population of my district has decreased by about 1,000 souls. This is a deplorable state of things, and I am sure that everybody in the country and in this House is sorry for it. It is possible that the flood of emigration has not been so large from other counties as it is from mine; but, Sir, it is well known that all over the Province people are constantly leaving and going to the United States. We were told that the National Policy would check that emigration, but to-day we are compelled to say that it has failed to fulfil the promises and expectations of those who inaugurated it. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Tassé), in describing the state of the country under the Administration of my hon. friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie), has referred to the deficits which occurred for a few years and blamed him for not having resorted to what he termed a vigorous policy. But I think the hon. member would have been more fair towards my hon. friend from East York if he had stated that these deficits were not occasioned by an extravagant expenditure, but that they were caused by a diminution of the revenue. The public accounts show that the revenue which amounted in 1874-5 to \$24,648,715, had fallen in 1876-7 to \$22,059,274—a decrease of \$2,589,441 which would have been more than sufficient to cover the deficit of each year. Now, Sir, it would have been very easy for my hon. friend from East York to resort to that vigorous policy referred to by the member for Ottawa, and which we know meant nothing else but an increase of taxation; but he thought it would be more humane on his part, in the difficult circumstances in which the country was placed, to allow a few deficits to accumulate, knowing well that they would disappear, and be followed by surpluses as soon as a revival of business took place, than to increase the burden of taxation which would weigh more heavily upon the shoulders of a suffering people. But this patriotic conduct of my hon. friend was not appreciated as it ought to have been. His opponents began a terrible campaign against him. They charged him with being responsible for the depression that then prevailed in the country. It was in vain that he and his friends answered that the depression was beyond the control of the Government, and that as a commercial crisis was prevailing in other countries with which we had extensive commercial relations, it was only natural that the same crisis should be felt here. But this reasoning was of no avail; it served the purpose of hon. gentlemen opposite to hold him responsible. If bankruptcies occurred, if trade was in a state of stagnation, if manufactures were closed, if farmers suffered a succession of bad crops, or had to sell at low prices, all these evils were attributed to the Administration of my hon. friend. Sir, unfortunately, the people were convinced by the hon. gentlemen opposite, and in the fall of 1878 my hon. friend left power. He came down from the exalted position to which he, a self-made man, not having had the advantage of a classical education, had attained solely by his great talents, his industry and his indomitable energy. He fell from the proud position which he occupied, but he fell like an honest man and a man of honor, preserving his principles and an unstained reputation. My hon. friend from Ottawa referred, Sir, to the fact that some distinguished members of the Liberal party had committed themselves in years past, either by speeches or by writing, to the policy of protection; and he seemed to find fault with the Liberal party in Quebec for not having adopted the same policy. I am quite sure, Sir, that the hon. gentlemen to whom he referred are well able

to defend their position. However, I may tell the hon. gentleman that whenever a man, however distinguished he may be, expresses his own individual opinions on any public question, that opinion remains his alone, so long as the party has not adopted it—at least, so long as the leaders of the party have not adopted the doctrine as that of the party. But the hon. gentleman says that the Liberals of Quebec have repudiated their principles and their leaders. Sir, I am at a loss to know when such repudiation took place. It is well known that their leaders, during a great many years, were the hon. Mr. Dorion, who is now Chief Justice of the Province of Quebec, and the lamented and deeply regretted Mr. Holton; and, Sir, I do not know when those two great leaders ever were repudiated by their friends, who never had any reason to be ashamed of them. Political parties sometimes find it opportune to modify their opinions regarding some public questions, in order to render them more adapted to actual circumstances; and suppose the Liberals had in some regards adopted such a course, they would not occupy a worse position than the Conservatives occupy to-day, who, after having upheld during forty years the principle of a revenue tariff, repudiated it and adopted the principle of protection. When the hon. gentleman feels the want of speaking of repudiation of principles he need not lose his time in searching out of the ranks of his own party, the subject matter, proper to satisfy his wishes. The hon. member showed some curiosity in the course of his remarks. He said he would like to know what is the programme of the Liberals. I do not feel authorised to tell the hon. gentleman what is or ought to be any special programme of the Liberal party. But I will tell him this: When in Opposition the Liberals find it to be their programme to watch the conduct of the Conservatives, to criticise their actions when they deserve to be criticised, and to warn the people of their faults; and when in power the Liberals find it to be their programme to administer public affairs with honesty and in accordance with the best interests of the country. I dare say my hon. friend, if he was in his seat, would find this a fair and patriotic programme. The hon. gentleman alluded, in one of the most eloquent parts of his speech, to a disturbed period of the history of France, and quoted a few sentences from a great speech pronounced on the occasion referred to, by the powerful and overwhelming Mirabeau, who made the best of his oratorical genius, to carry a certain measure proposing a heavy taxation. The hon. gentleman thought there was a great similarity between the position of those who opposed that measure and that of the Liberals in this House, as well as in the position of those who favoured the measure, and that of the Conservatives of to-day; but we did not want that comparison made by the hon. member, to know that the party of increased taxation in the country is represented in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite. I was sorry that the hon. member attempted to slur the Liberals of Quebec. In speaking of the duty on petroleum, he found it pleasant to say that the Liberals of Quebec, he did not know why, had a love of petroleum, although he would not say that they had any affinity with the Liberals of France, who had exhibited such a love for petroleum, that they had been called *pétroleux*. He would not say that they had any affinity with the Liberals of France, but he insinuated as much. Sir, there is a charge here, and although it is disguised under the veil of insinuation, that circumstance only gives it a character more bitter and perfidious. I know the class of men whom the hon. gentleman called the Liberals of France, and I understand how he meant to characterise them in saying they were called *pétroleux*. But the insinuation that there can be any analogy between the Liberals of the Province of Quebec and those contemptible demagogues, the dregs of the French population, who, at the termination of the Franco-Prussian war,

attempted to burn the city of Paris, and succeeded in burning down some of its finest monuments, I say the insinuation that there can be any possible community of opinion and feeling between those lawless men and the honest, respectable citizens, the law-abiding men who compose the Liberal party of Quebec, is an outrageous slander whichever may be the mouth that utters it, and whenever such a charge is made within my hearing, I feel in duty bound to repel it with scorn and indignation. But it is not the first time that charges of this character have been made against the Liberals of Quebec. For a long series of years they have been repeated over and over again by the Conservative press and by a portion of the Conservative party of the Province; I do not say by all the Conservatives, because I know there are numerous and notable exceptions. Those charges have been made continuously against the Liberal party, not only by insinuation but in plain and emphatic language. We have been represented before the people as a body of men in sympathy with the Radicals and *revolutionnaires* of France, as having community of feeling with them, as being imbued with their principles and, like them, hostile to the clergy and the church. And although the highest authorities of the church years ago pronounced upon this matter, and declared that there was no reason why the Liberals of Quebec should not be considered as being orthodox as the Conservatives, yet we find to-day a portion of the Conservative press and a portion of the Conservative party continuing this same system of misrepresentations against the Liberals, and affecting to be standing in defence of the church against the supposed perversity of Liberal principles. It is fashionable to-day, for a certain press, as it has been formerly, to couple the Liberals of Quebec with the revolutionists of France; it is fashionable to-day, in speaking of the Liberals of Quebec, to associate them in feelings and opinions with the Republicans of France. This is done to-day by a certain portion of the press in Quebec and by a portion of the Conservative party. It is fashionable for that press and a portion of the Conservative party to deprecate, on all occasions, the Republicans of France, and even the French Government. I hold that whatever may be the form of Government that France chooses to adopt, it is none of our business in Quebec; and it is idle for us to comment in public newspapers on that Government, which has nothing to do with the interests of our population. But there is good reason to believe that while a portion of the Conservative press and the Conservative party denounce the Republican Government of France on all occasions, there are others in that party who do not seem to be so horrified as are some of their political associates. We know, Sir, that some of them who stand amongst the most distinguished in that party are proud to carry on their breasts decorations which they received at the hands of that Government, as we know also that some of them did not hesitate to be counted amongst the guests at a banquet which was given at the city of Montreal, in the summer of 1883, in honor of a distinguished Frenchman, a member of the Chamber of Deputies of France, M. Vermond, who was reported at the time by a certain press to be one of the disciples and followers of M. Gambetta. Would you conclude from this last remark that the conduct of these Conservatives I have referred to is liable to blame, for having been present at that banquet, or for having received decorations from the Republican Government of France? On the contrary, in my humble opinion in acting as they have done on those occasions they have shown themselves as being men of good sense and who, whatever might be their political associations, would not let their actions be controlled by the stupid fancies and fanatical notions of a part of their political friends. But let me tell the hon. member for Ottawa that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones at others."

Mr. HESSON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 109) respecting real property in the North-West Territories.—(from the Senate).—(Sir Hector Langevin.)

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, 26th March, 1885.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRAYERS.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 110) to incorporate the Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Railway Company.—(Mr. McDougald.)

CONSOLIDATED RAILWAY ACT, 1879.

Mr. MULOCK moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 111) to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879. He said: The general object of the Bill is to provide certain safeguards in the matter of railway rates, safeguards which I think will be found to be reasonable and necessary in the public interest, and at the same time will not operate unjustly against any railway corporation. There are several minor features in the Bill which I will not trouble the House with referring to now, but will take the principal ones. The first provision is one dealing with the question of obtaining the sanction of the Governor in Council to a proposed schedule of rates. As the House is aware, the general Railway Act provides that railway companies shall not collect tolls until their schedule of rates has been approved of by the Governor in Council. Well, I am informed it has now become so much a matter of course to approve of whatever schedule of rates is sent down by a railway company, the views of the company alone being represented to the Ministers, that practically the rates are fixed by the railway company without due consideration of the public interest. It is therefore proposed in this Bill that in future, before any rates are sanctioned by the Governor in Council, due public notice shall be given of the application of the railway company for approval of its rates, and that the public shall be enabled to procure copies of the proposed rates, and, if they feel it in their interest to make recommendations in regard to them, they shall be at liberty to present their case to the Governor in Council. Another section provides for certain penalties to be imposed on railway companies in case they should make rates not sanctioned by law. With regard to this section, I may say that some railways which have been carrying on business for many years have never submitted their tariff; one, at least, of which I have official information, has never submitted its tariff of rates to the Governor in Council for approval, yet it has been carrying on business and collecting whatever rates it chooses to impose, and the public have to submit to these or do without the advantage of the railway altogether. Another provision is to the effect that a railway company shall not charge more for hauling for a short distance than for a long distance where the long distance embraces the

Mr. BECHARD.

shorter distance. By way of illustrating these two sections and showing that some necessity exists for legislating in this direction, I may refer to a case of which I have received notice. Take the case of the Northern Railway system, a system composed of the Northern Railway, the main line from Toronto to Collingwood, connecting the two great waters, Lake Ontario on the south and the Georgian Bay on the north. That railway has effected a certain arrangement with the Hamilton and North-Western Railway, and has also acquired certain leased lines. Now, the Hamilton and North-Western Railway has never yet submitted its tariff to the Governor in Council for approval. Nevertheless, it has collected rates that are, I am reliably informed, unjust, unfair, oppressive. It does that because the public cannot resist. The public must either not use the railway, or must submit to this imposition. In illustration of the fact that there is a grievance, I may mention some cases. Take the town of Cookstown, on the line of the Hamilton and North-Western, a railway which is collecting rates not sanctioned by law. That point is distant from the city of Toronto, by the Toronto, Grey and Bruce Railway, 62 miles, but by going northerly to Allandale to strike the main line of the Northern, it is distant 79 miles. The Northern Railway system, including the Hamilton and North-Western, charges 11 cents per 100 pounds for grain by the carload from Cookstown to Toronto. It charges for drawing the grain to Allandale till it strikes the Northern Railway, and then for drawing it down the Northern Railway to Toronto. I cannot conceive that it is any advantage to the shipper to have his grain hauled round-about, and be charged extra for it. Take the town of Collingwood, the northern terminus, a most important point, that with proper railway management could be built up to be a large town on our lakes, one of the termini to receive the trade from the North-West. The local grain from that point is hauled over this Northern Railway a distance of 98 miles, if you are fortunate enough to be able to get a rate for it, at less than 6 cents per 100 lbs., and yet, if one is unfortunate enough to live 50 miles nearer to Toronto than Collingwood, instead of getting a rate at all events equal to his neighbor at a point further away, one has to pay—as for instance from Bradford, which is 42 miles from Toronto—8 cents per 100 lbs. The Bill proposes that, in such a case as that, no more shall be charged for hauling the short distance than the long distance under the same conditions. The necessity for that must be clear. At present, the railway companies are enabled by this system to destroy property, to destroy towns, to build up other towns. That is a power that I think the Legislature should not allow to be exercised by any corporations. Another clause in the Bill provides for a mode of enquiring into charges of unjust discrimination. We frequently hear it stated that railway companies discriminate, contrary to the provisions of the law, and yet there is no mode of enquiry. Persons feel they are aggrieved. They think their more fortunate neighbors are getting better rates. Perhaps they are; perhaps they are not. If it were necessary for me to prove that there is a grievance in this respect and that legislation in this direction is necessary, I should be able to prove it, I am well informed by shippers, by referring to the practice in force at the present time over the very railway system from which I have been taking other illustrations. Another clause in the Bill is to the effect that money owing to employes, clerks, servants and others in the service of a railway, also money owing for supplies and stores and consumable articles necessary for the running of a railway, shall together form a first charge upon the earnings of the railway. At present the mortgage bondholders have the first charge and lien on all the assets, real and personal, of the railway. Under our law a mortgage bondholder cannot foreclose a railway. He cannot sell it as an ordinary mortgagee

would sell a piece of property mortgaged to him. It is only useful to him as a going concern. It is necessary that it should be kept going in order that it may be of any value to him, and therefore it appears to me that the labor and the materials that are absolutely necessary to keep the concern going in order that it should earn anything at all should be a first charge upon the earnings of the concern. There are some other minor provisions in the Bill. I think these are the principal ones.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Of course, I will not discuss the Bill now, but I wish to know from the hon. gentleman if the last clause he speaks of is to have a retroactive effect; whether this clause would apply to the railways that have now a bonded debt.

Mr. MULOCK. The clause is not limited in its effect.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. GIGAULT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 112) further to amend the Canada Temperance Act, 1878. He said: My object in moving this Bill, is to amend the Scott Act, so that electors may vote for or against prohibition or for partial prohibition. Partial prohibition shall mean the prohibition of all alcoholic liquors other than cider, beer and wine. For the sale of wine, it shall be necessary to obtain a license and to pay the duty imposed by the Provincial Legislatures. The number of licenses shall be limited according to population. There will be one hotel license for every 500 souls. The council shall have the right to reduce the number of licenses to a less number. The form of the ballot paper shall be changed so that the first space shall be marked for the petition, the second against the petition, and the third for partial prohibition. What is considered now as the third part of the Scott Act shall become the fourth part, and whenever partial prohibition shall be adopted, the Governor General in Council shall publish an order declaring that the third part of the Scott Act shall be in force in the electoral district where the election has been held. The Scott Act was enacted in order to consult the public with respect to the traffic in intoxicating liquors. Some electors believe that total prohibition promotes the cause of temperance, others are in favor of the license system, while many electors believe that it is unwise and unjust to prohibit the sale of beer and wine. By means of the amendment which I propose, every elector will have an opportunity of supporting by his vote a measure in accordance with his views.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION AT QUEBEC.

Mr. AMYOT asked, Whether it is the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to vote a sum of \$1,000 for the maintenance of a school of navigation at Quebec, and, if not, what sum do they purpose asking for in that behalf?

Mr. McLELAN. It is not the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to vote a sum for a school of navigation, there being other arrangements at present by which all requiring instruction receive it from the examiner appointed there.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to increase the length of the Esquimalt Graving Dock; if so, to what extent, and will it necessitate a cessation of work by present contractors?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Arrangements have been made to lengthen the dock a distance of fifty feet, and doing so will not necessitate any cessation of the work. The dock will be lengthened from 380 to 430 feet. I may take this opportunity of saying that in view of the future extension of the dock it was at first intended to have an entrance at the end, and that would take about 50 feet. We thought, however, that as such extension might not be necessary for 50 or 60 years it would be better at once to add that distance to the dock itself and leave the question of new docks for a future generation.

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK—CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) asked, Is it the intention of the Government to substitute granite for sandstone, in the Esquimalt Graving Dock; and if so, by how much will the cost be increased?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. No change has been made in substituting granite for sandstone.

TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Mr. BAKER (Victoria) asked, What was the total revenue from all sources of telegraph and signal service in British Columbia, for the year ending 31st December, 1884, as also total expenditure on said service for same period?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. There will be due from the 1st of January to the 30th June, 1884, \$40,372.12; and from 1st July, to 31st December, 1884, \$18,707.05, making a total revenue of \$33,139.17. The expenditure from 1st January to 30th June, 1884, was \$21,093.64; and from 1st July to 31st December, \$18,469.84, making a total expenditure of \$39,543.48, or an excess of \$5,500 of expenditure over revenue.

GOVERNMENT LOANS IN CANADA.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Whether the Government have borrowed any further sums of money from any banks or persons, in Canada or elsewhere, in addition to sums borrowed prior to 1st of March?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The Government have. That answers the hon. gentleman's question, and perhaps he has no objection to have a little more information. The Government have, since the last return, borrowed \$250,000 from the City and District Savings Bank, making the total amount of debt from those sources of \$12,462,855 at the time.

LOUIS RIEL.

Mr. CASEY asked, Has Louis Riel been in the employ of the Government in any capacity at any time during the past year, or is he now in their employ? If so, in what capacity has he been or is he employed, and what amount has been or is to be paid to him?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. Louis Riel has not been in the employ of the Government in any capacity at any rate during the past year, nor is he now in the employ of the Government.

H. R. PRINGLE.

Mr. CASEY asked, Has H. R. Pringle, of Cobourg, been at any time since the general election of 1882, or is he now in the employ of the Government in any capacity? If so, what capacity, for what period and what pay or allowance has he received or is he to receive?

Mr. POPE. Mr. Pringle has been employed by the Government as agent for collecting exhibits for the Antwerp Exhibition, for a very short time past, and for a very limited time. When he is at work his pay is \$5 a day, with \$3 for expenses.

Mr. CASEY. For how long?

Mr. POPE. I cannot say, but for a very short time, and not continually.

Mr. MACKENZIE. Does he collect electoral exhibits?

Mr. POPE. Of course, I am bound to answer the hon. gentleman's question. If he does, they will be consulted.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CONSTRUCTION TO INDIAN TOWN.

Mr. WELDON asked, What amount has been paid on account of construction of the Intercolonial Railway to Indian Town? What was the cost of survey, and does such cost include costs of surveys prior to 1884?

Mr. POPE. The hon. gentleman will have to make a motion for the papers.

IMPORTATION OF BEET-ROOT SUGAR.

Mr. VAIL asked, Has an Order in Council been passed recently permitting the importation of beet-root sugar from Europe on payment of duty on cost less the drawback, and how much is the drawback per hundred pounds?

Mr. BOWELL. Such an order as that referred to has been passed so far as it affects raw sugar. The hon. gentleman has not asked from what country the drawback is paid, and, of course, it is impossible for me to tell him.

Mr. VAIL. From Europe?

Mr. BOWELL. Europe is a very large area, and the question is too indefinite; if the hon. gentleman means Germany, the drawback is a fraction over 2 cents per pound.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—TANGENTS AND CURVES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What is the number and what the aggregate length,—(1) Of the tangents of the Canadian Pacific Railway? (2) Of the curves with the average curvature?

Mr. POPE. The number of tangents is 4,739, with an aggregate length of 1,620 miles. The number of curves is 4,945, with an aggregate length of 900 miles. The hon. gentleman will see that they do not agree with each other, and the difference is owing to the fact that there are two separate compound curves.

Mr. BLAKE. What is the average curvature?

Mr. POPE. Four degrees. I may say to the hon. gentleman that I will bring him down the rest of the information to-morrow.

Mr. BLAKE. Let the question stand.

THE DUTY ON FLOUR.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT asked, Is it the intention of the Government to increase the duty on flour this Session?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It has been the custom of the Government not to make known their policy with reference to changes in the tariff until they submit them by resolution to Parliament, and they see no reason to change their course on this occasion.

Mr. CASEY.

MR. J. W. TRUTCH.

Mr. LANDERKIN asked, Is Mr. J. W. Trutch the Government's confidential agent in British Columbia? If so, how long has he acted in that capacity and what is his yearly allowance as such? Is he employed as inspector of the Canadian Pacific Railway on behalf of the Government? If so, how long and what is his yearly salary for such service? Does he receive a yearly amount from having once formed part of the Government of British Columbia? If so, what amount? What amount does he receive from Government for travelling expenses for himself and also for the parties who accompany him in his travels?

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. I am afraid I must ask the hon. gentleman to give notice of this matter. It is such a long question that I think it would require a long return.

Mr. LANDERKIN. This is the second notice I have given of it.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN. This is a question. I think the hon. gentleman will have to give a notice of motion.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES.

Mr. BLAKE asked, What were the earnings and working expenses of the Intercolonial Railway for February last?

Mr. POPE. The earnings of the road were \$147,294; the working expenses \$159,000. The accounts were not fully and finally adjusted at the time these figures were prepared; but I have given the amount as nearly as I could obtain them.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—POSTAL DELAYS.

Mr. WELDON. I desire to call the attention of the Acting Minister of Railways to the great delay that has occurred on the Intercolonial Railway. We had no mail for some days until last evening, when we received four mails. The mail due to-day has not however arrived.

Mr. POPE. I am informed that a mail came in this morning.

Mr. WELDON. That mail brought the mails for Thursday, Friday, Saturday and Monday; but to-day's mail is not on hand.

Mr. POPE. We have had very severe storms indeed on the road. Every possible exertion has been made to have the mails carried through promptly, and no time has been lost.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—LAND GRANT.

Mr. BLAKE. I desire to renew the following question: How many acres of their land grant have been finally accepted and taken over by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company within the Canadian Pacific Railway belt,—1. Between the first and second principal meridians; 2. Between the second and third; 3. Between the third and fourth; 4. Between the fourth and fifth; and also 5. In southern Manitoba outside the railway belt; and 6. Elsewhere outside the railway belt?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I asked that a return be prepared. I have been told that I will receive it to-day; and if so I will lay it on the Table.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Government Notices of Motion are called, I wish to ask the Government to give the House

some further information with respect to the state of affairs at Prince Albert and the North-West generally, and with respect to the action of the Government. I feel that full information is due to the House with respect to the causes of this affair, and as to what the Government have done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The situation stands very nearly as it did before. There is no information as yet, and there cannot be very well until to-morrow, of a junction between the body commanded by Commissioner Colonel Irvine, and the body at Carlton under Superintendent Crozier. When those bodies are united they will have a force of 250 men. There are 100 men of the 90th Regiment now at Qu'Appelle ready, if necessary, to proceed from there in the direction of the South Saskatchewan. They will be followed by the remainder of the regiment, 200 men, and half a battery of artillery. Lieutenant-Governor Dewdney telegraphs me to-day that he has seen the principal men of the Indians on the reserve near Broad View. Some reports have been circulated about those Indians being excited. They were exceedingly indignant at such charges being brought against them, and demanded that they be brought face to face with their accusers. We have received messages both from Battleford and Edmonton, and everything is quiet there. I had a telegram from the Rev. Father Lacombe to-day, and he vouches for the loyalty of all the Blackfoot Indians at Carlton and the west. We are quite unaware of the approximate cause of the half-breed rising under Riel. Riel came into the country, invited by them, some time ago. I believe he came in for the purpose of attempting to extract money from the public purse, and during this last summer occasionally there were hints—and more than hints, intimations—that if we gave him a sum of money—and a particular sum of five thousand dollars was mentioned—he would depart in peace. Of course that could not be entertained for a moment, and he has remained there, inciting the half-breeds, and attempting to arouse the Indians by stating to them that the country all belonged to them, and that the whites had no rights whatever. As I stated when I last was asked the question about the state of affairs there, it has been alleged that Riel is exceedingly indignant at being told that he was an outlaw—that he was not a British subject—and had no rights there; but such an intimation, so far as I can discover, was never made to him in any way by anybody. He has a great influence over the half-breeds and some over the Indians. From former occurrences in the North-West he is considered a sort of martyr in the cause—a sort of half-breed Mahdi—and they look up to him with a sort of superstitious regard, and from that feeling he is able to act upon these poor people. I do not believe there is the slightest danger from the half-breeds unless they should be joined by the Indians. If the Indians were brought once into the field no one could foresee what the consequence might be, but I am exceedingly glad to state to the House that our information goes to show that the Indians are quite quiet, and there is no danger their joining with the half-breeds. There are one or two Indians, whom we know pretty well by name, who are troublesome men; I had better not mention names, because all these things go over the wires—but there is one who has always been troublesome for years. The hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) would know his name if I mentioned it. I asked about him and the answer was, "It is all bluster and tobacco." The most influential Indian in the North-West is Chief Crowfoot, head of the Blackfoot tribe, a remarkable and very able man, and for his fidelity and loyalty I believe there is every guarantee. I am quite sure that to a great extent if he were permitted—which of course we could not permit—he would show by action on his own part how loyal he is.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman has spoken with reference to the proximate causes; will he say what are the remote causes of this rising?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The causes of the rising are what I have expressed. The half-breeds have had a great many claims, some of them, as I have stated, reasonable enough, but some of them are not reasonable. The House knows that at the time the arrangement was made for the settlement of land titles in Manitoba, on the creation of that Province, a large number of Indians settled on the Assiniboine and Red River who had got places, localities, little properties, in possession under the direct sanction, though perhaps not by any other title, of the Hudson Bay Company. Those claims were recognised and a certain quantity of land was appropriated for their satisfaction. Land scrip was issued to those Indians to the value of their holdings. The half-breeds scattered over the plains had no such rights from the Hudson Bay Company or any one, but as they heard that the half-breeds had received certain moneys, or money's worth, within the Red River settlement, they claimed that they all had the same rights. Among those half-breeds that are at Prince Albert and along both banks of the Saskatchewan, there are a number who received their land scrip for their land on the Red River, who have left Manitoba and are on the plains beyond the bounds of Manitoba. They made their claims and they pressed them, thinking they would not be recognised again. They pressed their claims again; they said they were half-breeds, and they tried to enforce a double claim on their behalf. A great many of these have been identified and have been refused. As a whole the half-breeds have been told that if they desire to be considered as Indians there are most liberal reserves that they could go with the others; but that if they desired to be considered white men they would get 160 acres of land as homesteads. But they are not satisfied with that; they want to get land scrip of equal quantity—I think upwards of 200 acres—and then get as a matter of course their homesteads as well. Then there was some difficulty about the plots on which these half-breeds had settled along the Saskatchewan. No man has been disturbed in his settlement, and he has been told that he would not be disturbed. Sometimes the half-breeds quarrel amongst themselves, because in the bends of the rivers one man's claim overlaps another. These claims have been very difficult to settle. There have been several reports from different officials for several years, and a great many of these have been settled, but some remain unsettled. Finally there is a commission which we hope will proceed in the spring, or as soon as possible, to settle the few claims that remain unadjusted.

Mr. BLAKE. When was the commission appointed?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. The commissioners were selected some time ago, but one of the commissioners was unable to go and resigned, and we have appointed another only the other day.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman state what proportion of the volunteer forces, and how many of the mounted police are there, or on their way to the scene of action? I could not well make out from what the hon. gentleman stated.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. There are 100 men at Carlton.

Mr. BLAKE. Mounted police?

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Yes. From the last information we have received there are also 40 volunteers from Prince Albert. There are also upwards of 90 of Irvine's

men, who are supposed to have effected a junction yesterday morning with Crozier at Carlton. They have two or three guns with them. There are besides at Qu'Appelle 50 mounted police under Superintendent Herchmer, who will go by the Touchwood Hills on the route which is towards the north, keeping communications open if any attempt is made to obstruct them. There were this morning or last night 100 men of the 90th, and they will be joined by 200 men and a half battery of artillery.

Mr. BLAKE. I just wish to say that I think this subject calls for further explanation and fuller information, more particularly as it has been going on for some time past, than the hon. gentleman has given us, and I think Parliament ought to be informed of the intentions of the Government with reference to calling out the volunteers. I shall take an opportunity in the course of the day of communicating my views to the House on that subject in a more formal manner.

TRANSLATION OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. MASSUE. (Translation.) Before the Order of the Day is called, I desire to call the attention of the Government and of the Debates Committee to the fact that the French translation of the *Debates* is not distributed with all possible promptness. Nevertheless, if I am well informed, there are over 200 pages of copy which have been delivered to the printers but which have not yet been published.

Mr. BÉCHARD. (Translation.) As a member of the Committee on the *Debates*, I may tell the hon. member that if the distribution of the French copy is not made to his satisfaction, the delay must not be ascribed to the French Translators, for I have been informed within a few days that the translation keeps about on a par with the publication of the *Debates* of the House, and from the information I have received, it appears that the translation remains for a long time in the hands of the printer, which is the cause of the delay complained of by the hon. member.

Mr. MASSUE. (Translation.) The hon. member is only corroborating my statement, but I should like to have further particulars on the subject.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). What the hon. gentleman has said is quite true, that the cause of the delay in the French copy of the *Hansard* is in no way due to the translators. I believe Parliament has no officers more efficient, or more active and zealous in the performance of their work, than the staff of French translators as at present constituted, and especially the chief of that body, who seems to devote himself zealously to the work he has in hand. As evidence of that, I may say that the report of last Monday's debate is already translated. But unfortunately the printers have been terribly behind this Session. There are 240 pages of matter in connection with the *Hansard* at present in the hands of the printers untouched; and besides the *Hansard*, I believe I am right in saying that a Bill, which was in the hands of the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Cameron), was translated and sent to the printers on the 6th of February, and was not touched by them for nearly a month afterwards, the opportunity of proceeding with the Bill was thus delayed. Under the contract, the printers are liable to a penalty for delays of this kind, and I suppose that when the Committee meet they will take up the matter in the light of that contract, and perhaps make a recommendation to the House to enforce the penalty.

THE CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY PROPOSALS.

Mr. BLAKE. Before the Orders are called, I would invite the attention of the Government to the condition of things with reference to the Canadian Pacific Railway Com-

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

pany's proposals. I had a question on the paper, which was answered last Monday by the hon. leader of the Government to the effect that on the Thursday preceding the Canadian Pacific Railway Company had made certain proposals to the Government, and that they had been on Saturday considered and not accepted by the Government. I had asked in my enquiry whether the papers could be laid on the Table. The hon. gentleman said they would, but that there might be another application. Now, I do not know whether there will be another application or not; we do know that this matter has been in the air since before the beginning of the Session, that the company has made application to the Government, Parliament being in full Session, for assistance, and that the Government has not acceded. My idea is that Parliament ought to have that proposal, with the answer of the Government to it; there is no reason for delay; if there is another, we can get it when it comes; but we should have this one without delay. We know that there are various rumors in connection with it; the Ministerial organs give different accounts of what it is; but, in some way, either through the Government, the company, or the officials, I cannot tell how, vague, inaccurate accounts get out as to what the proposal of the company is. It is of deep interest for Parliament and the country to know what this is, and therefore the hon. gentleman should at once lay on the Table the proposal of the company with the answer of the Administration.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I differ altogether from the hon. gentleman. The Government are charged with the administration of affairs in the confidence of Parliament and select their own time and their own way of submitting matters to Parliament. The other day when the hon. gentleman asked if there had been applications made, I said there had been on Thursday, and that they had been considered on Saturday, and had not been accepted. The hon. gentleman asked if papers would be brought down; I said yes, but there might be other applications. When I stated that the application had not been accepted, I did not say it had been rejected. I may say here that some portions of the application were worthy of consideration and are now under consideration, and until the full consideration of the matter is given, I think it is highly expedient in the public interest to bring down an imperfect correspondence.

ENQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BLAKE. Amongst some returns which have been ordered by resolution of the House in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway are the profiles of the line; and they were to be ready, I think, on the 15th day after the commencement of the Session. The only profiles brought down are the profiles of a small section in British Columbia. The other profiles have not been brought down this year as yet. It is of great consequence that we should have them, and I trust they will not be further delayed. I am sorry to say that when they do come down they come in a very imperfect condition. They are copied on tracing paper or linen, and the scale or the ruled lines to enable one to judge of the work done in the intervening period are not given, so that one can only approximate. There appear to be other defects in the profiles brought down; but, defective as they are, we ought to have them, and I hope they will be brought down at once. I may also say that several motions have been made for tables of the grades and curves of the railway. We have not received any of these tables yet. The hon. gentleman will find that, as far back as 1878, in the report of Mr. Marcus Smith of the proposed route of the Canadian Pacific Railway through British Columbia, there were tables of gradients which gave the gradients of different characters and the ruling gradients and the average grades of each description, so that we could get an intelligible

understanding of what the road really was. I moved for those for years; they have been ordered for years, but not one as yet has come down. I have been this Session under great difficulties endeavoring to extract from the profiles, which are imperfect, that information which ought to have been given to us, and which, during my hon. friend's (Mr. Mackenzie) Administration, was submitted to Parliament even in advance of construction. The line I am now speaking of is a line actually located and which has been almost entirely constructed.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. I will see the Minister of Railways about it at once and endeavor to obtain the papers.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE TARIFF.

House resumed adjourned debate on motion of Sir Leonard Tilley to go again into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HESSON. If hon. gentlemen on this side have to crave the indulgence of the House while they take into consideration the question now before us and the debate on the tariff is thus prolonged, the responsibility rests with hon. gentlemen opposite; because, so far as the case of the Government is concerned, it might fairly have been allowed to rest on the excellent speech of the Finance Minister. That his statements should have been attacked continuously, as they have been, is not only a surprise to this House, but a surprise to the intelligence of every elector. I would not crave the indulgence of the House for a few moments did I not feel it necessary, were not the duty forced on me, as it is on other hon. members on this side, to answer the unfair statements in many cases, and the unfair manner in which the question before us is discussed by hon. gentlemen opposite. I have had the pleasure of listening to several Budget speeches from the Finance Minister, and I must honestly say, considering all the circumstances of the country, considering the state of affairs that exist the world over, in Europe, in the United States, and in this country, every Canadian ought to feel satisfied that the hon. gentleman was able to present to this House a case so strong and so satisfactory as the one he presented. Hon. gentlemen opposite are not disposed to accept the verdict of the people on the question; they have to be convinced over and over again; and it falls to the lot of hon. gentlemen on this side to reassert, to re-affirm, to re-hash, if I may use the term, what has been said over and over again on every hustings, in every newspaper in Canada, since the introduction of the National Policy down to the present time. That we are still obliged to repeat what has been said so often does not show great intelligence on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite. They are unwilling to accept the verdict of the people; there is not an elector in Canada who has not expressed his opinion on the policy of the Government, and if the majority is to rule in this country what have hon. gentlemen opposite to say? What has been the answer of the electors to hon. gentlemen opposite? Not only did the electors give a decided answer in 1878 against the policy of the late Government, but even during the period when the late Government was in power, the people took every opportunity of showing their want of confidence in the policy of that Administration. Not a constituency was opened but was wrested from them. Every constituency, I might almost say, was taken from them, year by year, as they were opened and the people had an opportunity of expressing their opinion. What was the fate of the late Government from the day they took office to the day they fell, 17th September, 1878? It was one continuous series of disasters, as constituency after constituency was thrown open. From the day my hon. friend, the Premier, and the little party then in Opposition propounded the policy which has since received the unanimous endorse-

tion of the people—a policy which hon. gentlemen opposite did not dare to propound—the people have shown on every occasion their approval of my hon. friend's course. What was his policy? He was prepared to nail his colors to the mast and to stand or fall by the policy of protection to Canadian industries. His policy was Canada for the Canadians, and when we went to the country in 1878 the response which the people gave was a glorious victory for my right hon. friend, and a most crushing defeat to hon. gentlemen opposite. Since then, day by day, and year by year, the answer of the people has been continuous and strong in favor of the National Policy, an answer so unmistakable that it requires no effort on our part to show what is the real sentiment of the people on this great question. To-day the Government are as strong in the hearts of the people as they were when returned to office in 1878. This is shown by the fact that, as each opportunity has arisen, the people have shown their continued support of the present Government. Hon. gentlemen opposite claimed that the Government had obtained a snap verdict, and contended that if opportunity were given the people they would reverse their verdict of 1878. Well, in 1882, that opportunity was given, and this Government was returned with a stronger majority than it previously enjoyed, showing conclusively that their policy had not lost any ground in the minds of the people, but on the contrary had gained in strength since its inauguration. Since then we have had several bye elections, and on each occasion the same approval of the people was manifested, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite will rise here and denounce the policy of the Government, charge the Government with all sorts of extravagance, I might almost say with corruption in high places. The people, however had a bitter lesson and will no longer trust hon. gentlemen opposite. They tried them once but found them wanting and are determined that we shall not see a revival of that brief period when the late Administration was in office, a period which was the saddest which the people of Canada witnessed since Confederation. In vain hon. gentlemen on this side endeavor to make this question clear to hon. gentlemen opposite. They will not learn: they have eyes and will not see and ears and will not hear. The electors have spoken to them; the verdict of the people is that the National Policy is as strong in their hearts to-day as ever it was, yet hon. gentlemen opposite refuse to accept that verdict. I would ask hon. gentlemen to take into consideration this fact. If the policy of the Government which has been in operation the last six years were injurious to the people would we not see this Table loaded down with petitions from the electors of Canada asking the Government to change its policy? Has a single petition been presented to this House, asking hon. members to reconsider the policy of the Government or to change it in one iota? No, on the contrary, what do we witness? We witness this fact that, if we have been called upon to change anything of that policy, it has been to lengthen our cords and strengthen our stakes, and here and there we may be called upon to increase the protection, if it is found to be necessary in the interests of the struggling industries of Canada. That is the kind of application that has been made to the Government, not to relax in one single iota, but to pursue that policy and, if they have not gone sufficiently far, to go somewhat further still. Now, I propose for a few moments to direct my attention to the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). He chose the other evening to make certain statements, which I should have preferred answering there and then. My hon. friend very properly refused to be interrupted. I will not complain of that. Very often it is very unpleasant indeed, but it frequently occurs to me that it would be much more proper to the subject to answer there and then to a question that might be suggested by any member of the House who is looking for information or asking for an opinion.

My hon. friend on that occasion referred to the industry of cheese. He wanted to know what the Government had done for the cheese industry of Canada, what protection they had given to it. The hon. gentleman dared not deny that it was a great success in Canada. He did not undertake to deny that, but he asked what had the Government done to protect the cheese industry of Canada. I can tell the hon. gentleman that this very same party that is now responsible for the legislation of this country, when in power before they fell in 1873, introduced that policy of protection and protected the cheese industry of Canada 3 cents a pound. I will ask the hon. gentleman if he dare go into his constituency or put his foot on a platform in my constituency and ask the electors of that county or of his own county to withdraw that protection to the cheese of Canada. I will ask, if that single industry has prospered with a duty of 3 cents a pound, whether it is not possible that other industries might prosper with a similar protection. If my hon. friend cannot see it, I am perfectly certain the farmers of Canada can see it to-day. Is my hon. friend afraid of a monopoly in the cheese industry? Well, I should say that there is not a single farmer in Canada but would like to see those monopolies very much increased. My hon. friend grew very warm, too, over the proposed resolutions of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, when he proposed to put a further tax upon wineceys. Why, he said, it enters into the use and consumption of every poor family in the country, and the Minister dares to tax the poor man's fabric, to charge upon it a heavier duty. My hon. friend is in trade. He knows the value of wineceys to-day, he knows that the duty was increased upon them long ago, and he knows that the prices have been very much reduced. I have been half a life in trade myself—over 30 years—and I never handled goods so cheap in all classes that my hon. friend has been dealing in, and that I myself deal in, and amongst them all I never handled any that show the reduction so much as cottons and wineceys. If my hon. friend is giving us a better quality at a lower price, if he does not impose higher charges upon these goods which enter into the consumption of every household in the country, then why should the Government be charged with taxing the poor man's family for what they wear? I give that answer to the hon. gentleman, and he knows that he dares not rise in his place and say that he does not get as good and even a better value than ever before in these lines of goods. My hon. friend, and a great many others on that side of the House as well as himself, referred in former Sessions of this House to the duty that was imposed on the farmer's implements of the North-West. The sympathy of those gentlemen was so great that one would have supposed that they, and not the gentlemen who lead the Government, should have been trusted with the destinies of that great country. We know how sympathetic they became, how they appealed to the Government in reference to the heavy rate of taxation they were imposing upon the agricultural implements of that Province. What are the facts? The hon. gentleman's whole course is changed to-day, and it turns out that it was not with the poor struggling settlers of that country that he was in sympathy, but with the manufacturers, who were to be the bloated aristocrats under the National Policy. Yes, the hon. gentleman dared to stand up and changed the whole of his past record in the House, and other gentlemen opposite spoke in the same direction and changed all their references to the high taxation imposed upon the people of that country, and turned round and sympathised with the unfortunate manufacturers. Did not my hon. friend say that the price of farming implements sent into that country was 50 per cent. lower than the manufacturers could afford to sell them for, that they were selling them for 50 cents on the dollar, that he knew manufacturers who had hundreds and thousands of implements they would be glad

Mr. HESSON.

to sell at 50 cents on the dollar? Where is his sympathy now for the poor struggling settler of the North-West? Has the price of implements increased? Did not the Government and other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House reiterate again and again to the gentlemen that, if you encouraged home production, you would create competition so keen and close that the prices would be reduced, and that the articles would not necessarily cost more to the farmers? Experience has verified the statements made on this side of the House at that time, but my hon. friend's visions of those days will lack verification, and he will find it by-and-bye necessary to change his tune once more, and to say that neither the manufacturers nor the farmers of that country are to be sympathised with or commiserated. The hon. gentleman referred to some photographic pamphlets, some literature for immigration purposes that he pointed out had been adorned with the photographs of the hon. Ministers. Possibly the hon. member had in mind a little pamphlet that was once circulated by an hon. gentleman on that side of the House, having in view, I presume, the settlement of a Province different from that of Manitoba and the North-West—the Province of Kansas. The hon. gentleman will recognize the leader of his own party in that pamphlet.

Mr. MILLS. Printed at the *Mail* office.

Mr. HESSON. It was printed as a business speculation, because gentlemen on that side of the House left themselves open then as they do now to be quoted by the American press and by the American speculators of railway and other land corporations, it was because they were always so unwise to leave themselves open in that direction that they had that sort of documents held up to them. The hon. gentleman waxed warm on that point, and said the photographs of Ministers adorned the pamphlets for circulation in the old county, and the result would probably be to induce such enormous immigration into this country that there would be nothing but starvation for the people of Canada. I think I can discover a remedy for that. Let the hon. gentlemen opposite issue a pamphlet and adorn it with the photograph of my hon. friend from North Wellington, and you will not have the people of the old country, if they attach any value to the utterances in the pamphlet, coming to this country, and so there will be no danger of starvation in consequence of over-immigration. My hon. friend referred to the enormous reduction in the United States debt. Now it is undoubtedly satisfactory, not only to this House but to the country and to the world, to know that the national debt of the United States has very largely decreased; and I trust the time may come in our country when we shall have reached a position, not only in prosperity and in general development, but in the settlement of the country as well, when we may also be enabled to point to a large reduction in our national debt. My hon. friend has referred to the fact that the reduction of the national debt of the United States since 1878 has been over \$425,000,000. Well, Sir, that is perfectly true. But when he was making the statement did the hon. gentleman forget that this state of things in the United States was only brought about by paying great attention to the industries of that country? Did my hon. friend forget altogether that he was talking about a country that was not blessed with free trade doctrines, or with philosophers such as my hon. friend and those associated with him on that side of the House? Did he forget that they had a policy of protection which, as compared with our own, I may safely say, is intensified three-fold? Had the hon. gentleman forgotten that in the history of that country, and until a very recent period, not even a bottle of patent medicine could be put up, nor a box of matches laid upon the shelf of a householder, without the Government stamp upon it? Did my hon. friend forget that they imposed

a very much higher rate of duty on every article that was permitted to come into that country than we do. Now if it is owing to a policy of this kind that the national debt of the United States has been so greatly diminished, may we not fairly infer that it is possible for us also, in pursuing the policy this Government has been pursuing since it came into power, to arrive at such a state of things as that we may also be enabled to reduce our national indebtedness to a large extent? So much for the remarks of the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen). Now I desire to pay some attention to the speech that was made by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Cockburn). My hon. friend became very eloquent the other day upon the injustice we were doing to Great Britain by imposing such a high rate of duty upon the imports from that country. He did not take the trouble, however, to go into the figures. That would have been a dangerous operation for him; but he drew my attention to the fact that on another occasion when this question was under discussion in this House, I had taken the trouble to investigate it somewhat. Now if there is a party in this country specially desirous of remaining attached to Great Britain I think the Conservative party may fairly claim to stand pre-eminently in that position, and any policy that would operate in favor of the United States as against Great Britain would not receive, and could not receive, the endorsement of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. Now, Sir, I took the trouble to look into the Trade and Navigation Returns for a few years past, and I find that in 1873 the imports from Great Britain amounted to \$68,522,776. Mr. Speaker, that was the year the Conservative party went out of power, and that was the last year that the imports from Great Britain reached such enormous figure. Our hon. friends opposite came into power, and whilst the total imports of the country did not decline, I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to show that there was not a decline in the import from Great Britain. Why, Sir, they went down by leaps and bounds until the year they left power in 1878, when the imports from Great Britain had decreased until they amounted to only \$37,091,596, as against \$68,522,776 in the year when the Conservative party went out of power. Now, what was the state of our trade with the United States during the term those hon. gentlemen were in power? Did it also decline, or did it decline in the same proportion? If they will investigate those returns carefully, as I have done, they will find that it did not decline, but on the contrary, it increased to a very considerable extent. Now, Mr. Speaker, a question occurs to me here—what length of time would it have required, if that party had remained in power, for our imports from Great Britain to have disappeared altogether, if they had kept on declining in the same ratio? It is very easy matter to make the calculation. It would have required but about six short years, if the decline had kept on in the same ratio, for every dollar's worth of imports from that country to have ceased to appear in Trade and Navigation Returns. Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the imposition of a heavier duty upon imports from Great Britain, allow me to say this: I have taken up the Trade and Navigation Returns, and they exhibit this fact, that the imports from the United States from 1874 to 1878 amounted to \$251,107,385; and the Reform party who were in power at that time collected duties on that sum to the amount of \$20,894,657. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the comparison between that state of things and the state of things existing under the Administration of my right hon. friend, the leader of the present Government? I will take the years from 1880 to 1884. I leave out 1879 for the reason that the policy of the Government had not really began to take effect during that year and it would not be fair to take that year into account in the comparison. But I find that during this Administration from 1880 to 1884, the total imports from the United States amounted to \$217,865,271,

and upon this amount the Conservative Government collected a duty of no less than \$32,839,809, as against the \$20,894,657 collected by the Reform Government on a very much larger amount of imports. Now, Sir, I think that answers pretty well the statements of the hon. gentleman from North Ontario. If my hon. friend is as clever as I give him credit for being, I think he will be able to see that what he stated here does not bear upon it the stamp of truth. It is clear, Sir, in this statement I have made, that upon \$33,000,000 less imports from the United States we have collected about \$12,000,000 more duty. That is the answer. I might, in order to do justice to that state of things, also point to this fact: that during the Administration of the Reform party the total amount of raw cotton imported into this country, from 1874 to 1878, was only 25,641,459 lbs.—that of course was free—whilst during this Administration for a like period, from 1878 to 1882, there were imported 94,038,219 lbs., or a difference in favor of this Administration of 68,397,760 lbs. When that fact is taken into consideration as being a part of the total imports of production under the Conservative Administration, and as the policy of this and of the last Administration was that that being a raw product and not coming into competition with any product in Canada, and it being required in order to carry on the manufacturing industries of this country, it had to be admitted free under the policy of both Governments—you find on the goods imported from Great Britain nothing like so high a proportionate duty has been imposed as on goods imported from the United States under the régime of this Government. While on the question of imports I might as well deal with the question talked of on both sides of the House and referred to particularly by the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), that of the balance of trade. The balance of trade has been a dangerous question for hon. gentlemen opposite; and let me point out this, that is policy of the Reform party is—and I have heard it stated on every platform where I have had the pleasure of being present,—that the prosperity of a country is best advanced by importing larger quantities of goods than the country exports, and that such a state of things is an evidence of the growth and prosperity of the people. It is all very well if the exports keep pace with imports; it is far better if the exports exceed them; and it should be the policy of a Government to endeavor to equalise and balance those trades. We have evidence on the other side of the border that, by the trade policy the United States has pursued, they have been enabled during a number of years past to annually pile up the balance in favor of exports and against imports, and it is surely the best evidence and the clearest indication of a country becoming wealthy, where a country is a producing and exporting country, that the balance of trade is in favor of their exports. Do hon. gentlemen recognise the fact that the imports being in excess of the exports and the balance being against the country, it is in a dangerous condition? Does it not occur to hon. gentlemen that it is much better for the balance to be on the side of exports rather than on the side of imports? Let us see what the state of things was under hon. gentlemen opposite. From 1873 to 1878 the total imports was of the value of \$529,256,154; exports for the same period, \$403,403,402, a difference against Canada of \$125,752,782. It would occur to any sensible person, I think, that the difference had to be paid for in some way, either that we owed it or it was settled by failures; and it appears to me that that was a very dangerous state of affairs. A great difference exists between a country like Great Britain, which has imports of gold and interest accruing from her loans, and great wealth and prosperity, and a country like our own, which is a borrower and an exporter of gold, and is continually required to pay interest on our loans and our liabilities for foreign pur-

chases. It would not be a fair or reasonable argument for hon. gentlemen to use in favor of an excess of imports, that in the case of Great Britain her imports were greater than her exports, because they are large consumers and not producers in the sense of producers of a food supply and of raw material. To compare that state of things with the position in a new country like Canada is not only unfair but unjust. Dividing that difference of \$125,752,782 by the five years, we obtain a sum of \$25,150,556 as the excess of imports over exports annually during those five years. Hon. gentlemen say we had failures in crops during that period. Grant for the sake of argument that we had one or two short harvests, although I will not admit it and am prepared to prove that it is not correct. Were they shorter than the harvest of 1883, or were they as bad? Let hon. gentlemen refer to the Trade and Navigation Returns, and they will find I am within the mark when I say we did not export one million dollars worth of wheat from the country in that year. Let us take the period from 1879 to 1884 when this party came into power and the present leader took the responsibilities of Government on his shoulders. During those five years we imported goods to the value of \$587,702,151, and the value of our exports was \$548,323,039, the difference being \$39,379,112, and dividing it by six leaves an average of \$6,563,171 per annum. Compare that with the operations of that extraordinary policy pursued by the party now in Opposition and let the people of Canada judge; and if they can believe that, under the policy pursued by hon. gentleman opposite, they can become wealthy, then I wonder the people have not placed them in power before this. I now come to a very important part of the imports from 1874 to 1878. Hon. gentleman opposite may be charged with this folly, that they permitted goods to the value of no less than \$182,307,627 to come in duty free. They may say that this was a wise policy, and one which the people supported. I deny it. The public verdict was given on that policy in 1878. The farmers and manufacturers of Canada demanded a different policy, and I regret that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have not yet learned to accept the verdict of the people but will follow their own theories and fallacies. Let us investigate that amount of \$182,000,000 of free imports and see of what it is composed. During those five years, I repeat, goods to the value of \$182,207,657 were admitted free, and those were for home consumption (I have been careful about that) and were largely composed of items that were being produced in this country by the hardest working part of our population. Let me give the House some idea of what those articles were. Will the House believe that the party in Opposition to-day were so fully committed to their foolish policy as to permit wheat to the value of \$33,995,349 to come in duty free. Did that mean nothing to the farmers of Canada? Was that of no importance to the people? Did we require that wheat? Not at all; and I am talking only of that which was imported for home consumption. That, Sir, was the amount which they have allowed to come in free in five years. We will take the item of flour, not only a product of the farm, but a product of the manufactory, a product of the mill, and what do we find that their folly led them to do? It led them to allow \$12,388,485 worth of that product to come in free; of corn and meal there was \$15,285,929 came in free; of all other grains there were \$3,429,064—making a total of \$65,098,827 of products of the farm which came into this country in those five years, and which must to that extent have driven out the products of our own farmers. Is that giving the people of Canada their home market? Is that the policy which hon. gentlemen opposite would follow to-morrow if they came into power—to give up their home market to their near neighbors and allow our own people to be driven out of their own market to a foreign market, and take their

Mr. HESSON.

chances there at whatever prices they might get? I was always led to believe that the home market was the best market, and the people of Canada, the farmers and laborers of Canada, believe to-day it is the best market. They believe that it is better that they should find employment at home and a market at home for the products of their labor. Now, Sir, it is only fair to hon. gentlemen opposite to compare this showing of the actions of their Government with the condition of things under the present Government. I take the years 1880 to 1884, leaving out 1879 for the reason I have already stated, that the National Policy had not begun in that year to have its proper effect. In those five years, of the goods I have enumerated, there were only \$14,856,685 worth imported, against their sixty-five millions. Take also into consideration the fact that those fourteen million dollars worth of goods were not admitted free, but that we imposed on them a duty of \$1,884,958. Under these circumstances I think I have given an answer to the hon. gentlemen on the question of why the industries of Canada were in an unfortunate and unprosperous condition when they were in power, and why the people cried out with a loud voice, and with almost one accord, "Give us a change of policy." It is only necessary to show that we excluded \$50,212,142 worth of those very products which came in competition with the honest farmers of Canada, or an average of over \$10,000,000 a year to show why the farmers of Canada are in favor of the present policy. It was only taking a leaf from the chapter of hon. gentlemen opposite, or at all events a chapter from the history of the Opposition party, when they advised the Lower Provinces that they should trade with their American neighbors because they were nearer to them. Is that what we expected from the Confederation when we entered in 1867? Is that the policy which we supposed the Federal Parliament of Canada would adopt? I am glad to say that even from the Eastern Provinces comes the cry for more of that inter-provincial trade. What was the object of the investigation of that committee which was appointed in this House but a year ago, headed, I believe, by an hon. gentleman from the Lower Provinces, Mr. Paint? Was not the object of that committee, if possible, to encourage and foster that inter-provincial trade to a greater extent? The policy of the Reform party would be to do away with all that and to trade with our neighbors. I say, first give us control of our own markets; put us on an equal footing with our neighbors, and then we are free to say to them on equal terms that we will open our markets to them when they open their markets to us. The policy of the Reform party never would have given us access to the American markets and never will; we cannot ask them to open their doors to us unless we have something to give them in return for what we ask. I must ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments while I speak on this question, and put some facts on record, so that it may be known to the people of Canada what the imports of these farm products were from the United States for home use during the past year. They were as follows:—

1884.		Duty.
Barley.....	\$ 13,168	\$ 4,214
Beans.....	29,820	2,317
Corn.....	1,277,131	171,772
Oats.....	27,751	4,458
Wheat.....	292,033	44,799
Flour.....	2,439,999	265,594
Mill feed.....	292,033	51,455
All other grain.....	168,750	16,511
Totals.....	\$4,529,685	\$541,120

I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite if the farmers of Canada are any worse by that duty being imposed and collected? I ask them if the price of grain has been so enhanced by it that poor men have not been able to buy the wherewithal to

live? I ask them if they should come into power to-morrow would they dare to take off that duty? I ask them if they would not find it necessary to carry out the wishes of the people by imposing that duty and carry out this policy? Then I say it would be much more honorable to these gentlemen to have ceased this discussion long ago, and accept the position that they would not and dare not remove that duty if they were on this side of the House. I see the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Vail) is now in his place. In the course of the eloquent and able address which he made the other day he told us that this policy had destroyed the West Indian trade. I made a note of this statement at the time because I thought it somewhat a strange statement to be made by an hon. gentleman living down by the sea, one who happens to be in a position to know that his statement was not absolutely correct, if he had only taken the trouble to enquire. I had the Trade and Navigation Returns before me and I ventured to attempt to point out at the time that the hon. gentleman was wrong, but I was called to order by the Speaker, though I think then was the proper time to point out that the hon. gentleman was making a mistake. I have taken the trouble to look into the question, and I find that from 1874 to 1878 the total imports from the West Indies were \$8,394,908. I looked at the items which compose this total and I found that when the Conservative party went out of power the imports from those islands were something more than \$2,000,000 a year, and I found that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite was such that it gradually declined year after year, until the last year they were in power it was but a fraction over \$1,000,000. Again the Conservative party came into power, and what is the result of their policy? I will show you exactly what change took place. I find that the imports from the West Indies from 1880 to 1884, were no less than \$18,759,862, or an increase over their period of \$10,354,854; an increase in the five years under the present Government over the five years under their predecessors of \$10,354,854 in our imports from that country. Now, Sir, amongst all the countries the hon. gentleman referred to, he could not have made a more unfortunate selection than the West Indies to show that our foreign trade has been destroyed by the policy of this Government. On that very question, we may go further and consider the condition of our trade with other countries. We believe that the country knows that the policy of this Government has increased our trade with other countries, and has prevented the Americans from being the middlemen to supply us with the products of foreign countries, as was formerly the case. I find that in the five years from 1874 to 1878, our total imports from Belgium were \$1,440,330; we increased them to \$1,939,687 from 1880 to 1884, or an increase of \$499,356. The same increase will be found in our trade with South America. During the five years preceding the departure of hon. gentlemen opposite from power, there was \$1,060,297 imported direct from South America; we have improved that to the extent of \$5,283,377, or an increase in our five years of \$4,177,080. From France we imported during the five years of hon. gentlemen opposite \$8,480,410, and during our five years, \$8,830,850, or an increase of \$350,450. From Germany we imported during their five years, \$2,957,847, which we improved during our five years to the extent of \$6,648,986, an increase of \$3,691,139. Now, Sir, what do we find with regard to our trade with China? During the five years term of hon. gentlemen opposite, our direct imports from China were \$3,633,453; during this Government's five years, from 1880 to 1884, they were \$7,588,742, an increase of \$3,956,289. Then, Sir, come to little Switzerland, and we find that our imports from that country have increased from \$440,214 in their five years to \$1,082,527 in the five years under the Conservative régime. And with regard to the little country Italy, what do we find? That the imports were \$213,015 during their term of five years, and that we

improved them to the extent of \$821,109 during our five years, an increase of \$608,094. Taking our imports from all of these countries and other countries, including those from the West Indies, we find that we have increased our foreign trade during the five years of Conservative Government over the five years of the Government of hon. gentlemen opposite to the extent of no less than \$26,286,269. Now, I give that as an answer to my hon. friend opposite and those who sit behind him, and I think it ought to satisfy them that on that ground at least they have no reason to find fault with the policy of the Government. Now, Sir, the hon. member for North Norfolk (Mr. Charlton), the hon. member for West Elgin (Mr. Casey), and I may almost say every gentleman on that side of the House who spoke, declared that the agriculturists of Canada had not obtained the slightest advantage from the policy of the Government. Both the hon. member for North Norfolk and the hon. member for West Elgin dwelt very strongly on this point, and endeavored to show by columns of figures, which are placed on record in the *Hansard*, that the farmers of Canada had suffered rather than improved their condition in consequence of this policy. Let me read what the hon. member for North Norfolk said on that subject:

"As to agricultural productions, it will be found, upon comparison, that never yet, since 1879 has the imposition of grain duties conferred upon the farmers of this country any advantage whatever."

He goes on further to say:

"We have had a tariff which was to afford the farmers of this country protection, and the very utmost claim the hon. gentleman has ever made with regard to the benefit the farmers derived from that tariff was made two Sessions ago, that possibly the farmers were receiving 3 cents per bushel more for wheat than they would if there had been no duties. That is the very utmost advantage that they ever claimed from the operations of the grain duties."

Now, Sir, I am prepared to take up that challenge. I am prepared to prove that hon. gentlemen opposite were wrong years ago when they declared that the National Policy would not have a beneficial effect on the products of the farmers, and that they are wrong to day. They learn nothing, and so gentlemen on this side are compelled to get up again and again and reaffirm what has been or ought to have been established long as a well founded fact. Sir, I have undertaken to go through the reports of the markets of the country for years back—not the Conservative reports, but those in the *Globe*, the author, I might almost claim, if not the finisher, of that party—and what has been the course of prices during those years? If hon. gentlemen dispute any single figure I will simply refer them to that paper, which I believe reports the market prices from day to day as faithfully as any other; although if there was a single point it could make against the policy of the Conservative party, it would no doubt make it in the interest of its own party. The hon. member for West Elgin made a similar comparison of quotations the other day in order to show what the effect of the National Policy ought to be on the price of wheat. I take the market prices at Toronto and Oswego in December of each year, and compare them for two periods of years, and what do we find? In 1874 the price of wheat in Toronto was 94 cts., and in Oswego \$1.36, or 43 cts. in favor of Oswego; in 1875 the price in Toronto was 96 cts., and the price in Oswego \$1.55, or 59 cts. in favor of Oswego; in 1876 the price in Toronto was \$1.28, and in Oswego \$1.50, or 32 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1877 the price in Toronto was \$1.25, and in Oswego \$1.45, or 20 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1878, the last year of that period, the price in Toronto was 85 cents, and in Oswego \$1.09, or 24 cents in favor of Oswego. Now, if we strike an average for that period, we have as the average price in Toronto \$1.05½, and in Oswego \$1.39, or 33½ cents in favor of Oswego market during the period the party of hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, as against the Toronto market. Now, I come to the period during which the Conservative policy was in operation. On the adoption of that

policy we expected that there would be a change, but not to the extent of the duty of 15 cents a bushel imposed on wheat. It was never claimed by the leaders of the Conservative party that the people of Canada were going to get the full benefit of all that protection, but it was claimed that it would give them the home market; and if it was sufficient to shut out the foreign products that came into competition with the products of the farmers of this country, it was sufficient for our purpose. Then, if we did not get the whole 15 cents duty imposed by that policy, I want to show exactly what benefit we did get; and I think I can find that in the commercial columns of the *Globe*. In 1879, the price in Toronto for the best quality of wheat was \$1.31, and in Oswego \$1.35, or 4 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1880, the highest price in Toronto was \$1.16, and \$1.15 in Oswego, being 1 cent in favor of Toronto. Hon. gentlemen opposite are wonderfully surprised at this, but they will find it all in the *Globe*. Every single figure I quote I have taken from the *Globe*, and I challenge hon. gentlemen to deny the accuracy of my figures; nor have I taken them from particular days, but, as I stated before, on a particular week throughout the whole ten years' period. In 1881, the price in Toronto was \$1.29, and in Oswego \$1.39; in 1882, in Toronto it was 92 cents, and in Oswego 97 cents, 5 cents in favor of Oswego; in 1883, Toronto, \$1.16; Oswego, \$1.12, or 4 cents in favor of Toronto; in 1884, Toronto, 74 cents; Oswego, 82 cents, or 8 cents in favor of Oswego. Averaging the price for five years, I find that at Toronto the average was \$1.09½, and in Oswego \$1.16¾, or 7¾ cents in favor of Oswego, under the operation of the National Policy, while, as I have shown you, the price was 33 cents against the farmers of Canada during the period hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. I do not pretend to say that the National Policy did this. It may be we have had better communication with the seaboard, or improved railway accommodation, or there may be other causes, but nevertheless the facts exist and let hon. gentlemen answer them if they can. I will take the price of wheat in Chicago and in Toronto. In 1879, on the 30th December, it was \$1.35 in Chicago and \$1.32 in Toronto. That was the year the National Policy came into operation and before it had time to have its full effect. Compare prices in 1885 between Chicago and Toronto. On the 19th March, 1885, the price in Chicago was 73½ cents and in Toronto 82 cents, or 8½ cents in favor of Toronto; or, adding the 3 cents that stood against Toronto in 1879, the difference in favor of Toronto now compared with the difference then is 11½ cent. I will take another illustration also from the *Globe*. I will compare Montreal with New York. On the 30th December, 1879, the price of wheat in New York was \$1.49 and in Montreal \$1.45, 4 cents in favor of New York; on the 19th March, 1885, the price in New York was 90 cents and in Montreal 93 cents, 3 cents in favor of Montreal; or adding the difference of 4 cents that stood against Montreal when hon. gentleman opposite were in power, the comparison shows 7 cents in favor of Montreal compared with that period. We thus find that in Montreal which is, I might almost say, the capital of Canada, we have the best market to-day that there is on the continent; and beyond doubt, a large portion of this improvement is due to the beneficial effect of the National Policy on the farming interests of the country. The hon. member for Queen's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Davies) in discussing this question the other day, referred to the Government savings banks; and it will be in the recollection of hon. gentlemen that he stated those banks were upheld, not by the working people of Canada, but by its wealthy men, by its business and professional men. He said it was the business men and the professional men who took advantage of the Government savings banks and the

Mr. HESSON.

post office savings banks. I would like to see if that is correct.

Mr. DAVIES. I did not refer to the post office savings banks because we have not got them in the Maritime Provinces. I referred to the Government savings banks.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. It was the Government savings banks that you asked for and argued on.

Mr. DAVIES. But not the post office savings banks.

Mr. HESSON. I find that in 1874 the total deposits in the Government savings banks were \$3,466,136; in 1878 they were \$5,526,955, or an average increase of \$500,000 a year. Now, since the introduction of the National Policy, since the country has rid itself of the Grit incubus of ruin and decay, what do we find? We find that the average increase during the period this Government has been in power has been at the rate of over \$2,000,000 per year. But a few days ago we had a report published which, I presume, is in the hands of hon. members, showing the deposits on the 31st January, 1885, in the Government savings banks. They are as follows:—

Toronto	\$ 789,050
Manitoba	671,461
British Columbia.....	2,199,319
Nova Scotia.....	7,027,222
New Brunswick.....	4,556,644
Prince Edward Island	1,626,896
	\$16,867,532

Deduct the amount of \$5,526,955 at the credit of that fund when hon. gentlemen opposite went out of power in 1878, and you have an increase under this Administration of \$11,340,577. I would say further, that there are in Nova Scotia some twenty-nine of these banks where deposits of that character are made, and in every one of them, with the exception of four, there has been an increase, showing that prosperity is pretty widespread and not confined to the cities, where the business and professional men have to reside. The deposits being so widespread, it is evident they must have come from the great bulk of the people and not from any particular section of the people. I think I shall be able to prove, before I leave this subject, not only that the hon. gentlemen are incorrect in their views on that matter, but that they are grossly incorrect. I will take the period when the post office savings bank was established, 1869, with a total deposit of \$356,814. In 1874 that had increased to \$3,207,051. That was the period when the Conservative party left power and the Reform party became responsible for conducting the affairs of the country. From 1874 to 1878, under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, do we find a large increase? Do we find any increase? No, I am sorry to say—because a reference to that period must bring rather unpleasant recollections with it, must bring to some people who discuss these questions, recollections which are altogether unpleasant—instead of there being an increase during the five years of the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, there was a decline of no less than \$453,570 in the deposits. What was the effect upon the depositors? The number of depositors in 1874 was 45,329, pretty well distributed over the people, and in 1878 that number had declined to 40,097, or a decline of 5,232 who had ceased to deposit in the post office savings banks of Canada. Now let me come to the period from 1878 to 1885. The total deposits now are \$14,411,857. Deduct the sum at the credit of the savings bank account when the Reform party went out of power, \$2,751,481, and we have an increase during the period of the administration of this Government of \$11,657,376. The number of depositors in 1878 was 40,097; in 1884 it had risen to 100,489, an increase of 60,392. Now, to meet the statement of my hon. friend from Queen's, P. E. I., (Mr. Davies), who said it was

wealthy men who were depositors in these banks, I will give you a statement showing the classes of depositors, the amount deposited by each class, and the average amount of each deposit:

Class.	No. of Depositors.	Amt.	Average.
Farmers.....	14,000	\$4,722,000	\$337
Mechanics.....	7,850	1,422,000	182
Trust account and young children.....	5,500	170,000	31
Laborers.....	4,270	724,000	169
Clerks.....	3,000	522,000	174
Tradesmen.....	1,600	468,000	292
Farm servants.....	1,470	277,000	188
Professional.....	1,572	392,000	249
Married women.....	12,000	2,350,000	195
Single women.....	19,500	1,275,000	121
Widows.....	3,240	708,000	218
Miscellaneous.....	1,680	215,000	

I think that ought to be a sufficient answer to my hon. friend, who says it is the wealthy men of Canada who take advantage of that bank; it ought to be sufficient proof that he has been boring in the wrong place. I am satisfied, from the enormous increase in the number of depositors, and taking the average of these figures, which are furnished by Mr. Cunningham Stewart, who has charge of this Department, that my hon. friend will find it is not correct that deposits are made to the extent of thousands of dollars, one individual making deposits in the names of a number of his family in order to get round the intentions of the Government in this matter.

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

After Recess.

Mr. HESSON. When the House rose for recess I had been dealing with the Government and post office savings banks; I had completed my remarks on that phase of the subject, and now, with the permission of the House, I will draw the attention of hon. members for a few moments to another evidence of the prosperity of Canada. I may say that the object of my remarks with reference to the Government savings banks and the post office savings banks was to present, not only my own impression of the light in which these facts should be regarded, but to present it as the general opinion, I believe, of the country. If my memory serves me correctly the ex-Finance Minister when he had the honor of sitting on this side of the House, and his former colleagues in the Reform Government, assumed the position that the accumulation of wealth in the various institutions in the country might be legitimately viewed as an evidence of prosperity. I do not suppose that hon. gentlemen, because they have changed places, can have changed their views. If they were consistent then we would expect them to be so now, and as they then gave utterances to expressions for which they must have felt themselves responsible before the country as Ministers of the Crown, I suppose that any humble individual of this House may assume the same position as one that is defensible. Now, Sir, in dealing with this question of the large accumulation of wealth in the country, as exhibited by the various institutions in which that wealth may be stored, I may be permitted to refer to the chartered banks of the country during the period the Reform Government were in power. The total amount of deposits in the chartered banks of Canada in 1875 were \$55,984,000; in 1876 they had increased to \$59,516,000; in 1877 they were \$58,444,000; in 1878, \$58,946,000; in 1879, \$58,659,000. We see that the deposits were almost stationary during that period, which gives no evidence of an accumulation of wealth during the whole period that that Government were in power. Whether that may be fairly attributable to the policy of that Government is not for me to say, but it is my strong conviction that those hon. gentlemen, having failed to adopt a proper policy for the interest of Canada, were really responsible for that state of

affairs. Now, Sir, the total increase during the whole five years that those hon. gentlemen were in power was but \$2,741,000, an average of \$548,200 per annum. That was certainly a very small evidence of prosperity during the days these hon. gentlemen were in power. They will probably say again, as they have said before, that it was all due to bad harvests. Sir, I cannot credit that; the country will not accept that statement, because if we take the exports of farm products in those years we will find a sufficient refutation of that argument. Now, Sir, I come to the second period, during the existence of the National Policy, under the administration of the present Government. In 1880 the deposits in the chartered banks rose to \$69,742,000. It will be observed that this was only one year after the National Policy had come into effect, which was early in 1879; and yet so marked was that increase of prosperity that the deposits rose to over \$69,000,000. In 1881 they had increased to \$78,078,000; in 1882, \$77,078,000; in 1883, \$89,553,000; in 1884, \$87,341,000; in 1885, bringing the deposits up to the present month, they are \$93,309,870. Now, Sir, that ought to be taken as some evidence of the increased wealth of this country. How hon. gentlemen will get rid of that, I cannot see. I believe a few who have spoken have taken the line that the trade of the country had been so dormant that the people could not, or dare not, invest their money in business, and so they withdrew their money from the trade and commerce of the country and deposited it in the banks as a better and safer way of investing it. Now, Sir, I deny that contentional together; and I appeal to the facts, that business has very largely developed in this country, that manufacturing industries have largely developed, and that trade, although, perhaps in some lines, overdone, is still in a most satisfactory condition, as compared with its condition under the do-nothing policy, as I may fairly call it, of the hon. gentlemen opposite. During the six years, from 1880 to 1885 inclusive, we find that the total increase of the deposits amounted to \$34,650,870, or an average increase of the deposits in the chartered banks of \$5,775,145 per annum, as against the half a million in the period the hon. gentlemen were in power. Now, it does seem to me that, even granting that this fact is not an evidence of prosperity—which, I think, no hon. gentleman of common sense would assume, as an honest man—but assuming for a moment that it was not a correct evidence of prosperity, I think we could find plenty of other evidence elsewhere of the prosperity of the country. I will take three institutions, omitting the operations of the loaning associations, the deposits in these companies and in the private banks; I will take just three of the more important institutions in the country over which this policy must exercise a great influence, and summarise them in this way: In the chartered banks we find that the increase of deposits under the policy of this Government, from 1879 to 1885, is \$34,650,870; in the Government savings banks the increase has been \$11,340,577; in the post office savings banks the increase has been \$11,657,376, or a total of \$57,648,823. Now, Sir, if that is not accepted by hon. gentlemen opposite as an evidence of the increased prosperity of Canada, I believe it will be accepted as most substantial evidence by the electors and the common sense people of Canada. We have been asked by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, What has the Government done for the people of Canada? Hon. gentlemen rise and assert that the Government have not bettered the condition of the farmer, that they have not improved the position of the poor man, or afforded any relief to the laboring man. We have answered them from this side of the House over and over again, refuting their arguments, beating them at every turn, proving that the position of the farmer is improved, and that the labor of his hands is better protected than it was under the Reform Government, and that the farmers

get better prices now as compared with the prices in former days, when they had the American farmer to compete with. Still, hon. gentlemen will be found to rise—and to-night, probably, some one will follow me, and repeat that fallacy; which has been exposed over and over again. Sir, in reply to the question, What has this Government done for the people of Canada? I say they have given back to the people a duty on tea of \$1,184,016; a duty on coffee of \$76,313; a duty on tin of \$91,719; a stamp tax, a most objectionable tax, as every hon. member will agree, has been taken off, affording the people a relief of \$200,000. They have been relieved from the postage on newspapers and periodicals to the extent of \$64,250; there has been a reduction of the wire, turpentine and scrap iron duty, \$31,000; and of the Excise tax on tobaccos, \$700,000. Will hon. gentlemen say that that is not doing something for the people of Canada? On these items alone that I have enumerated—and I might go on and extend the list—the Government have remitted to the people of Canada \$2,027,298 in duties on these goods that enter into the consumption of the people of Canada in their daily life. But some gentlemen may say: You have taxed the farmers' coal. This has been frequently repeated, not only during this debate, but in the debates of former years. I was led to enquire as to whether that was really a fact, and could be substantiated by the circumstances of the years gone by. I had the patience to refer to the quotations in the *Globe*, that very excellent newspaper which hon. gentlemen opposite will not discredit, and which I will not discredit when questions of prevailing prices are at issue. I say I considered it advisable, when hon. gentlemen opposite made that statement, to enquire into the facts; and what did I find? I take a period of the year when the coal is laid in by the poor man, and when it is consumed, namely, in December. According to the *Globe* the price of coal on 30th December, 1874—and I will take the last week of each year—was: hard, \$8; soft, \$7. 1875, hard, \$8.50; soft, \$7. 1876, hard, \$6.50; soft, \$7. 1877, hard, \$6.50; soft, \$6.50. 1878, hard, \$5.50; soft, \$5.50. The average is \$7 for hard coal and \$6.50 for soft coal during the term of the Reform Administration. I now come to the time during which the National Policy was in force, and a tax was imposed on coal. I am not going to debate again, as it has been debated here and throughout the country, as to who pays the duty in that case; but after I have submitted the figures and compared the two periods, I think every intelligent citizen, if not hon. gentlemen opposite, will arrive at the conclusion that the tax on coal has not been actually charged to the consumer. I find, according to the *Globe*: in 1879, hard coal, \$4.75; soft, \$6.50. 1880, hard, \$7; soft, \$6.50. 1881, hard, \$7; soft, \$7. 1882, hard, \$6.50; soft, \$6.50. 1883, hard, \$7; soft, \$6.50. The average price of hard coal during the time of the National Policy and when a tax was imposed on coal, was \$6.45 per ton, against \$7 under the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite; and for soft coal the average price was \$6.60 against \$6.50 during the Administration of hon. gentlemen opposite. The figures actually show a difference of 10 cents for soft coal in favor of the time when the Reform party was in power; and, singular to say, that difference is the exact amount of the difference in the duty between hard and soft coal, the duty on the former being 50 cents per ton and on the latter 60 cents. Those are facts gleaned with a great deal of care from the organ of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I warrant them to be correct, as having come from that source. I now come to another part of the subject, which has been discussed until hon. gentlemen have been able to get as near the facts as they will be ever likely to do. We have heard a great deal about the exodus, and if the House will pardon me for a few moments, I will deal with that matter as it is reported on by the secretary of the Department.

Mr. HESSON.

ment, Mr. Lowe. In his report presented to this House, dated 20th February, 1885, we have the following remarks:

"Sir—I have the honor to report that, in obedience to your instructions, I have again made an examination into the figures published by the Washington Bureau of Statistics, as representing the alleged emigration from Canada to the United States during the fiscal year ended 30th June, 1884.

"The figures given are 60,584, including 124 from Newfoundland, against 70,241 the previous year, showing a decrease of 9,657, or 13.07 per cent., under the heading of 'Dominion of Canada.'"

Those figures are taken from the United States Bureau of Statistics. They are not of our furnishing; they have not been obtained by this Government; and hon. gentlemen opposite have been in the habit of quoting American figures as being more correct than our statistics, and they should be willing to accept that part of the statement, coming from that source. The report continues:

"The way in which the figures are alleged to have fallen off at Port Huron is, at least, a curious circumstance. They stand as follow since 1880:—

Years.	Total alleged immigration.	Huron Port.
1880	99,706	94,375
1881	125,391	111,170
1882	98,808	71,422
1883	70,241	45,393
1884	60,460	22,801

I think this is worthy of some little consideration. When it is observed that an enormous number had crossed at Port Huron, and that after this Government had made enquiries for themselves, and sent the secretary of the Department to spend a long time enquiring into the fact and examining as to the manner in which the Americans obtained those statistics, it is most remarkable that ever since that work was undertaken by this Government the number of persons passing at that particular point, where nearly all the immigrants crossed, according to American statement, only 22,000 crossed in 1884, as against 99,000 in 1882. The explanation seems quite clear. It is simply this, that our Government have found a way of verifying the figures as regards this matter. And that leads me to another point, which I think of considerable importance—the best method of ascertaining the exact state of affairs, as regards the alleged exodus. I come to the intimation on the part of our Government to ascertain for the themselves the exact state of affairs. The secretary reports in this way:

"Before coming to the examination of the question as it actually exists at Port Huron, I think it is better to point out the leading fact, which is established by the figures representing the total movement of passengers from Canada and to Canada by the whole of the Grand Trunk system in the east and in the west.

"The figures are as follows:—

Total outs from Canada to the United States....	210,941
Less—European passengers.....	9,010
Total net outs	201,931
Totals ins to Canada from the States.....	206,616
Less—European passengers.....	1,778
Total net ins.....	204,838
Net gain to Canada of difference between ins and outs.....	2,907

I hope I have made that clear, as it was intended to be by the secretary in his report. I think, if we take the whole of the passenger traffic on the Grand Trunk and Great Western, east, west and south—I think, if you take the entire travel out and in, and strike the difference between the two, you must arrive as close to the facts as ever you will be able to do, unless you have men placed there taking an actual count of them. These facts are taken from the Grand Trunk Company, and the exhibits are in the Minister's report, marked from "A" to "G," showing the official report by Mr. T. B. Hawson, the Traffic Auditor of the Grand Trunk. As they have to account, not only for all

tickets issued—not only for the output, but for the collection of them, I think this is probably as fair a way as we will ever be able to devise, in order to reach a determination of this vexed question. He says further:

“If we test the figures at the two points of Sarnia and Detroit by the figures of the Grand Trunk system referred to, we have the following results:—

Net outs at Sarnia (Port Huron).....	38,657
do Windsor (Detroit).....	36,312
Total.....	74,969
Net ins at Sarnia.....	31,411
do Windsor.....	39,338
Total.....	70,749
Difference, showing net loss by Canada at the two ports named.....	4,220

In dealing further with this question, I have only to say that in the Lower Provinces it is not possible to arrive at the facts in connection with these figures; but if we allow a very large margin, in order to reach what the Americans claim as being over 60,000, I think it would be easy for hon. gentlemen to show what the Dominion has lost as against the number which the Americans claim have gone into their country. I say that if the Lower Provinces have suffered a depletion of nearly 40,000 people, they will have little difficulty in proving to the entire satisfaction of members on this side that an exodus did exist. Now, Sir, permit me, for a few moments, to deal with another matter which has been brought before this House. My attention has been particularly directed to it, from the fact that the hon. member from West Elgin (Mr. Casey) dwelt upon it the other day to a very great extent, and I fancied at the time that he was taking his facts from his own imagination. I had not at that time looked at the report of Mr. Blue, of the Bureau of Industries, but my attention has been drawn to it, and what do we find is the position of Ontario to-day? It was said that the agricultural interests have not been benefited, that the price of grain has not been improved, that the value of our farms was diminishing, that the position of the farmer was altogether worse now than it was under the Administration of the Reform party, and that, in short, our policy had proved to be a humbug. Now let us see what the authority of the Reform Government of the Province of Ontario says on that subject. He says that the increases in the value of farm property, in 1883 over 1882, are as follows:—

	Increase.
Farm Lands.....	\$22,450,525
Buildings.....	30,319,100
Implements.....	6,492,715
Live stock.....	19,341,645
Total for Province.....	\$78,604,985

Or an increase of over \$78,000,000 in one year, and we take the authority from the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. LANDERKIN. Good authority.

Mr. HESSON. Yes, good authority; because I believe they would have put the worst side forward if there had been a worst side. I think these figures are an answer to my hon. friend, as to the position the farmers are in to-day, and the position they found themselves in when the Reform party unfortunately were in power. The hon. gentleman was kind enough to take the failures in 1879, the year of the inauguration of the National Policy, and its indorsement by the people of Canada, and he said that the failures in that year were the largest they ever had. Now, Sir, I have taken the trouble to investigate that question somewhat further than my hon. friend thought it advisable to do—I have gone a little further back, and have not simply taken the first year, when

the shrieks of the dying industries of the country—the shrieks of manufacturers and workmen of the country were still in our ears, on the winding up of the policy of the late Government. The hon. gentleman, in taking that year, gave us an illustration of his opinion of fair play, and he threw out the figures as an index of what the National Policy has produced in the country. If he had gone a little further back he might have given more information to the House and country, which would have been equally valuable. I will begin with the year 1875. I will not go back to 1874; I will do them the justice of saying that they may not have held themselves responsible for the results of that year any more than we did for the results of 1879, as it was not at all likely that the policy of the Reform Government could have fairly taken effect in 1874. I therefore take 1875, not because I think it would do my argument any harm to throw out the previous year, but because I think it is fair to begin with 1875. The failures, in number and amount, for the years 1875 to 1879 were as follows:

Year.	No.	Amount.
1875	1,968	\$28,843,997
1876	1,728	25,517,991
1877	1,892	25,523,903
1878	1,697	23,523,803
1879	1,902	26,347,937
Totals	9,187	\$133,142,505

Sir, the average during all that time was \$26,500,000 a year. Now, Sir, we come to the succeeding five years, and we find the number of failures, and the amount in each year, to be as follows:—

Year.	No.	Amount.
1880	907	\$7,988,077
1881	635	5,761,207
1882	787	8,587,657
1883	1,284	15,872,000
1884	1,308	18,939,770
Totals	5,021	\$47,138,711

against 9,187 failures, and a total amount of \$133,142,505 during their period. I give that statement in answer to the hon. gentleman, and if he doubts it, let him go and look at Dun, Wiman & Co.'s report in the *Monetary Times*, and he will find it to be strictly correct. These figures have been correctly copied by myself, and I know whereof I speak. If hon. gentlemen claim that we are responsible for the failures of 1874, what do they amount to? I have the figures here, and I am not afraid to put them before the people. In 1874 the total failures, if they are chargeable to the Conservative Administration which held office up to 1873, were 991, and the amount was \$12,324,191. I give that, Sir, as the condition of affairs in our worst period, against their \$26,500,000 yearly average during the period that they were in power. Now, Sir, I heard the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) the other evening ask, What has this Government done for Canada? Well, Sir, I have been endeavoring to-day to tell the hon. gentlemen what they have been doing. I feel that they have first protected our farming industries. They have levelled up, as I have shown by figures this afternoon, the prices of the products of our farmers, by giving us our own markets, which are always the best. But my hon. friend says: O, what of that? Look at Bangor; see how they are taxed in Bangor! I say they have protected the industries of this country; they have increased manufactures for our own industries. Then he says: Look at Amsterdam; they have many industries there. Then, I say, the Government have given us cheaper and better goods than we have ever had before, and our own products at that. But the hon. gentleman says: Look at Akron, Ohio; and see how little they are taxed there. I say again, we have given employment to more laborers and mechanics than ever had employment in this country before. But the hon. gentleman says: Go to Baltimore; they have low taxes

there. Well, Sir, I try to answer the question, and I say we have given employment to capital as well as labor; we have more capital employed in the country than has ever been employed before. Ah, but, says he, go to Kansas city. Well, we do not choose to travel so far; but I say we have increased the deposits in the savings banks of the country. Then he says: Go to Cedar Rapids, Iowa. Well, I say, we have lowered the rate of interest to the poor man who has to borrow. Then the hon. gentleman says: Reduce still further the rate of interest paid in the post office savings banks to the workingmen. That is the kind of reply the hon. gentlemen give, and it is about as far as the get. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say a few words in closing, for I do not wish to weary the House. I think it is but fair to revert to the statement made by the Finance Minister when he introduced his Budget Speech. I think it but fair that hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side, should accept that utterance, feeling that the country will hold the Government responsible for it, and will hold them responsible also. The hon. Minister of Finance, the other day, pointed out what had been accomplished by the Government in their expenditures, not only on the Welland canal, but in completing that great iron band which is necessary to cement our Confederation, in giving increased employment to labor and capital, bringing about accumulations of wealth in the savings banks, and after all that, the hon. Minister could tell us that it was all done at an increase of taxation of only about 12 cents *per capita* on the people of Canada. And when the hon. Minister of Finance told this House, in his able and eloquent way, that after all this was accomplished the taxation for the year 1885-86 would not be more than \$5 a head, hon. gentlemen opposite might have accepted that statement, and the debate might have been ended there and then. But the House has been wearied with the length of this debate, as I probably have wearied it myself. But I think the House and the country have been wearied with a debate that might have been terminated three weeks ago; and so far as this Government is concerned, we are prepared to leave it in the hands of the people.

THE DISTURBANCE IN THE NORTH-WEST.

Mr. BLAKE. I agree with the hon. member for North Perth in the substance of his closing remarks. I think it is about a week since this debate was dead, and it is pretty near time it was buried. Before it died I was minded myself to trouble the House, in order to answer some representations made by some hon. members of my own public utterances. But I do not intend on this occasion to inflict on the House any suggestions with reference to those utterances. I shall simply say, having regard to the fact that we are celebrating the obsequies of the defunct debate, that I do not accept the statements which hon. gentlemen opposite have made of my public utterances on various occasions, and I do not wish them to understand that they go undenied because I do not enter into an investigation of them. I was also minded, before this debate closed, to say something of the hon. gentleman's tariff resolutions. But that is a difficult operation, because we do not know from day to day what the tariff resolutions are to be. The hon. gentleman this afternoon, in answer to an hon. member, who asked if the Government would alter the duty on wheat, said that the Government announced their tariff policy when they brought down their Budget; but it does not seem that they always do it, because the tariff resolutions the hon. gentleman announced on that occasion are very different from those he expects to submit to our attention in the Committee of Ways and Means; and if the hon. gentleman will only take a thought, as another great person was asked to do, and alter his proposals with reference to the duties on inland freight charges, we shall have a very different Budget in the committee from that

Mr. HESSON.

which he proposed in his speech. But, as I said, it is not my intention to trespass on the attention of the House, with reference to the financial position of the country or the policy of the Administration in this regard, but to avail myself of the constitutional opportunity afforded by this debate, as I announced my intention to do this afternoon, to call the attention of the House to a subject of considerable pressing importance, in respect to which I do not conceive that this House or this country has been treated in the manner in which the Government ought to treat it. I refer to the events which are transpiring at this moment in a portion of the Dominion, and to the action which the Government has taken in reference to those events. The House will recollect that on Monday last I called the attention of the Government to the subject, and invited them to give the House such information as they could upon it. On that occasion the First Minister answered me, giving me as the reason which he understood was assigned for the present condition of things, that some letter or the other was said to have been written, to the effect that Louis Riel was not a British subject. He further stated that certain questions connected with the half-breed claims were in process of settlement, that some of their demands were admitted to be reasonable and that others were very unreasonable; but he informed us that nothing in the nature of a bill of rights had come to the cognisance of the Government. The Winnipeg Field Battery had not been dispatched to the scene of action; but, he said last summer it was deemed prudent to have some additional force near Prince Albert, and Fort Carlton had been occupied with the consent of the Hudson Bay Company, by a considerable force of Mounted Police. I resumed enquiry on the following day. I asked whether the Government had any additional intelligence to communicate to the House, and the hon. gentleman said they had nothing further: To-day we have elicited from him some further information, but not such as, I believe, the occasion justified, or rather demanded. The hon. gentleman has informed us to-day, it having become public in the newspapers, that a portion of the militia force of the country have been enrolled and are in active movement towards the scene of action, and he gave us something of the proximate and something of the remote causes to which he said the disturbance was due. But the hon. gentleman even now did not give us that information which I think it was his duty to have given us, as to what the Government are doing. The newspapers tell us that the general commanding the forces is on his way to, if he has not reached, Winnipeg, in order to take command of the forces which are to be engaged in this movement. I think upon that subject we should have been informed, and I think we ought to have much more and fuller information with reference to the whole causes and circumstances which have preceded this outbreak. I find in the Ministerial organs statements made upon this subject, to which it is worth while to refer. I find in the *Mail* newspaper, its issue of the 25th inst., a special despatch from the correspondent of that paper at Winnipeg, from which I will read some extracts:

"The half-breeds have, undoubtedly, good grounds for complaining; but they do not intend to resort to physical force, regarding that as utterly out of the question."

Then I find:

"The following orders were issued last night—Military District No. 10.—District orders, 23rd March. Orders having been this day received from headquarters, to hold the Winnipeg Field Battery and 90th Battalion Rifles in readiness for immediate active service, these corps are hereby notified to govern themselves accordingly. The officers commanding the above corps are requested to make the necessary arrangements to have the men under their command ready for embarkation for the North-West Territory at any time that may be arranged on or after the above mentioned day. Military District No. 10, Headquarters of 90th Battalion. The regiment will parade Tuesday evening, 24th inst., etc. Major Jarvis, commanding the Winnipeg Field Battery, issued the following orders at a late hour:—The Winnipeg Field Battery having

received orders to prepare for active service, are recruiting up to full strength. They will parade at the drill shed, and so forth."

Now, this is a statement in a telegram from Winnipeg, dated 24th March, and speaking of the orders which had been received from Ottawa, 23rd March; yet the hon. gentleman, when he was invited to give us explanations on the 23rd, vouchsafed to tell us that the Winnipeg Field Battery had not been ordered to proceed to the scene of disturbance, but he told us that the year before the Government thought prudent to occupy Fort Carlton with a force of Mounted Police. Not a word did he say about orders having been issued to the Winnipeg Field Battery to hold themselves in readiness to depart at a moment's notice, or about the 90th Rifles having been called out, and he let the House adjourn on that occasion without giving them any information that such a step had been taken by the Government. The correspondent goes on to say:

"Governor Dewdney, Hudson Bay Company's Commissioner Wrigley, and Lieut.-Col. Houghton held a conference here this afternoon. Mr. Wrigley on being interviewed, said he did not consider there was anything at all alarming in the situation. There had not been one drop of blood shed or a single shot fired. It was true there was what might be called an uprising in Carlton and Battleford, but it appeared to be of periodical occurrence. This time the misguided half-breeds, commanded by the outlaw, Louis Riel, have seized and made prisoners about forty whites, and confined them in a church at St. Laurent. Among the prisoners are (then he quotes the names) * * * * Further reinforcements of police are proceeding to the scene of trouble."

Then the *Mail* newspaper of the same day, in its editorial article, says:

"That dissatisfaction has existed among the half-breeds in the Saskatchewan country for years past is undeniable. They complain, as we have before explained, that while the Métis of Manitoba were given grants of 240 acres under the Act of 1870, their claims have been ignored; and they say, with equal truth, that the Government should at least give them free patents for the farms which they have been cultivating, and compensation for disturbances in cases where the Dominion surveyors may find it necessary to re-arrange the shape of their holdings, the old French form of delimitation being at variance with the modern system. These claims the Interior Department is trying to adjust, but it takes time to deal with questions affecting the rights of property."

Then the *Montreal Gazette*, another organ of the Government, on the 26th inst. published a dispatch from Winnipeg in these terms:

"There is little doubt but that the French half-breeds are mustering to bring pressure on the Dominion authorities to redeem grievances that they think have existed in regard to land claims for years, and raids are believed to have been made on stores of both the Hudson's Bay posts and Indian agents and the officials arrested, to be held as hostages for the immediate action of the Federal authorities."

"Not more than 500 of the rebels are armed, but they possess Remington and Winchester rifles, and, from long experience on the plains, are skilled in their use. The Indians have not yet been induced to join the rebels. Pi-a-pot is the only chief of whom the authorities are afraid, as Riel and his agents have been operating with the Indians north of Regina and Qu'Appelle with some success. Poundmaker and Big Bear are 200 miles north-west of the scene of the troubles, and not likely to be induced to rebel. A large number of white settlers are said to be in sympathy with the cause of the trouble, but are not disposed to take up arms, feeling sure that the Dominion Government will at once treat with the settlers and adjust the grievances. Parties who have been on lands for years have been unable, it is claimed, to procure their patents, and speculators and others, who have given fees to persons having influence, have obtained deeds and, in many instances, taken lands over the heads of the first settlers, who improved them for fifteen to eighteen years. This is the real cause of the troubles. The militia authorities are moving with alacrity. The Rifle regiment, 300 strong, under arms for two days, paraded to-night in full force, with the Field Battery and brass band. Five thousand people must have thronged the main street during the parade to the depot, where 125 men of the Rifles, under command of Major Boswell and Captains Ruttan and Clark, embarked for Qu'Appelle, taking ammunition and supplies. They will there await the arrival of the remainder of the battalion, as well as the artillery, who expect to leave on Friday with General Middleton, now en route to Winnipeg."

Then another statement:

"A prominent Catholic clergyman telegraphed last night from Edmonton that the announcement that the Dominion Government had appointed a commission to consider the claims of the half-breeds and investigate the cause of the present troubles was having a very beneficial and pacific effect on the half-breeds. He expressed the opinion that the appointment of the commission would result in an amicable settlement of the difficulty."

And then there is a note:

"No official notice of the appointment of the commission alluded to has been made, so far, at Ottawa."

Then there is this from the Ottawa correspondent of the paper:

"As a precautionary measure, 100 men of the 90th Battalion, Winnipeg, have left that city for Qu'Appelle, when, in case of necessity, they will proceed to the scene of operation."

Then, in to-day's edition of the Government organ in this city, the *Citizen*, I find a special despatch from Winnipeg, giving in substance the same information as that I have just now read from the *Mail* newspaper. I observe that the Government newspapers, while they give this account which I have just read of what is occurring, and these statements as to the causes of what is occurring, in their editorial columns complain most grievously of the Opposition newspapers and the course they are taking in reference to this matter, and so I have preferred, in view of the vials of wrath which are being poured down upon these unfortunate newspapers, to draw my information solely from the unimpeachable organs which sustain hon. gentlemen opposite, and which, of course, would be guided by the highest dictates of patriotism, of prudence, of accuracy, and of scrupulous regard to veracity in the statements they make in reference to the conjuncture which has occurred. You will observe that it is stated in these papers that the French half-breeds have had grievances for years; that their patents have not issued, and that influential persons have influenced officials and obtained lands belonging to settlers; that the half-breeds have good grounds of complaint, and that a Government commission has at this convenient season been issued upon the subject. And it is very plain, from what the hon. gentleman told us this afternoon, that, in so far as action is concerned, serious action was decided upon by the Administration, in the way of putting the military forces of the country in motion, on the 23rd, the period at which the hon. gentleman did not think fit to inform this House, which was then in session, and which had invited him to give it information, upon the subject at all. Now, it seems to me that the Government has not done that which it ought to have done in this regard. I say it is a very serious thing that the militia forces of this country should have been obliged to be called out. I am not in the slightest degree condemning the Administration for calling them out, but I say it is a serious and grave occurrence. For, I suppose, nearly two centuries, the law of England has been that, when the militia forces of that country are called out, the Parliament of that country is to be summoned within fourteen days from that date, and that law has been altered in late years, I think in the year 1875, upon the consolidation of the laws regulating the militia, by shortening the period within which Parliament is to be summoned to ten days, which is the present law there. It is obvious that it is regarded as a reasonably serious thing that the militia should be called out, not as we sometimes arrange that the municipal authorities shall call out the militia for purposes of avoiding local riots, but by the authority of the Executive Government, and that the Parliament, the great council of the nation, should be called in such an emergency. Well, Parliament was sitting at this time. The great council of our country was sitting. The Government decided to call out the troops in order to quell this disturbance, and did not think fit to inform us of the fact. On the contrary, being invited to give us information, the hon. gentleman told us they had thought it prudent last year, forsooth, to put 100 men of the Mounted Police in Fort Carlton, but what they had decided upon doing that very day, calling out a battalion and a company of artillery, he did not think fit to tell us anything about. The action of last year was news to us, not very fresh, but still it was news, but what they had done now he did not state. The difficulties are stated by Commissioner Wrigley, in the

interview I have read from the columns of the *Mail*. It is true, he says, there is a disturbance at Carlton and Battleford, but it is one of the periodical disturbances which are always going on there. According to him, that country is in a condition of chronic disturbance, and we know there was some trouble, not with the half-breeds, upon the occasion to which I am about to refer, but with the Indians, during the last summer. The *Saskatchewan Herald*, of the 26th June, 1884, gives an account of the trouble that then arose with the Indians, which appears to have been for a short time a critical state of affairs. We had, of course, some information from the ordinary sources of public information of trouble brewing in the North-West in this quarter. We were aware from the newspapers of the visit of Louis Riel to those quarters. The newspapers informed us, in the month of July last, that, at the request of some of the inhabitants of those quarters, Riel had gone into the North-West, and then spoke thus:

"Considering, then, that my interests are identical with yours, I accept your very kind invitation, and will go and spend some months amongst you, in the hope that, by petitioning the Government, we will obtain the redress of all our grievances."

The committee say:

"Mr. Riel comes to help us without any pretensions. He hopes that before long the North-West will be quite united, and that the Government will see its way to do what is right towards every class of our people."

At a meeting afterwards held at Prince Albert, at which Riel was the chief speaker, he said:

"He knew that his hearers were laboring under Government difficulties, and urged that they should seek the proper remedy, suggested that instead of petitioning for each of their rights, severally, and struggling for each in turn, they should apply for them all at once. The three districts of Assiniboia, Alberta and Saskatchewan should apply for admission to the Confederation as Provinces, ask for Legislatures of their own, and responsible government, and take all the steps within constitutional limits to secure their rights. If the people were denied some of their rights, they should take all they can gain, without yielding the rest, and they would thus keep in their hands the key needed to open future difficulties."

Then the newspaper from which I have made these quotations, the *Globe* newspaper, adds:

"There can be no doubt that this invitation of Riel by the half-breeds to return to Canada, resume the leadership of them, and guide their efforts for the redress of the grievances of which they complain, is a serious matter. They declare that their purposes are peaceful, and Riel talks peace. We are willing to believe that they mean what they say. But they must have regarded the grievances of which they complain as very grave indeed, and must almost have despaired of obtaining justice from the Dominion Government by ordinary means, when they resolved to invite the man who led them in rebellion to return to Canada and place himself at their head."

That was the state of things with reference to Riel last summer, and the hon. gentleman has informed us, within a day or two, that the Government thought it so serious that they thought it necessary to obtain the permission of the Hudson's Bay Company to occupy Fort Carlton, which is a defensible post, with 100 men of the Mounted Police, in view of what was then going on. I observe an interview reported in the *Globe* newspaper, of the 3rd of January last, with Mr. S. E. Chapleau, sheriff of the North-West, a Government official:

"Mr. Chapleau states that Riel has been, to all appearances, very quiet during the summer, but it is well known that he is secretly advising the half-breeds to make a demand upon the Government for compensation for the whole North-West. Riel's argument is, that the whole country belonged to the half-breeds and Indians before the Canadian Government took possession, and that, to extinguish the half-breed claim, a sum equal to 25 cents for every acre of land sold by the Government should be paid to them."

There is the condition of affairs, as far as we are informed. You find it stated in various Government organs that there have been complaints and dissatisfaction amongst the half-breeds for several years. You find it stated by the *Mail* newspaper, the principal organ of the Government, that these complaints, or some of these complaints and griev-

Mr. BLAKE.

ances, are well founded and ought to be redressed. You find it apparent that they called upon Louis Riel to come and help them and lead them last summer. You find it apparent that he came. You find it clear that, although he was talking peace, as the newspaper I have quoted says, the situation was somewhat critical. You find the Government recognising that fact in one sense, by taking precautionary steps with reference to the occupation of Fort Carlton, but you find no active step taken, that we can see, to prevent this long-continued condition of dissatisfaction from coming to that head to which it appeared to have been coming. I have looked at the reports of the Minister of the Interior for the last few years, with a view to seeing what their views were. It is almost worth while perhaps to advert to some of these reports, first of all with reference to the claim of those who are actually settled along the river banks in that quarter of the country, and who had taken up their lands according to the French fashion—a long, narrow frontage lot. That claim appears to have been recognised as a reasonable one a long time ago, because I have before me a map of the surveys that have been made under the new system, and in those parts I find cut out of the regular rectangular system of survey, those lots which fronted upon the river. One would almost suppose from some portion of these complaints that that policy had been departed from since. But I am loath to believe it; I do not say it; I should be very glad to have a distinct assurance upon this point; but I can hardly conceive that anything so unreasonable should have been done.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. As what?

Mr. BLAKE. As to depart from the policy which was arranged in 1878, of leaving the lands which were actually occupied by these people in long and irregular lots, to be occupied by them, and their titles to be settled according to their occupation practically, instead of insisting upon the rectangular system of survey to the disturbance of their homesteads. I do not charge the Government with having come to this conclusion, because we have no information, but it is one of the things upon which we ought to have information, and if in that there is nothing, then one of the alleged causes of grievances could not have had any effect at all. Now, then, in the year 1881, I find His Excellency informed, in the report of the Department of the Interior, as follows:—

"Your Excellency will be pleased to learn that the white and half-breed population of the Territories have, throughout the past season, enjoyed complete immunity from contagious and epidemic disease, that their crops have been good, that commerce has been brisk, and that altogether they have experienced during the year the inestimable advantages of peace, confidence and prosperity."

Then I come to the report of the next year, and I find it stated:

"The condition of the half-breed population of the Territories, and the claims which have been preferred in their behalf, to be dealt with somewhat similarly to those of the half-breeds of the Red River, have been receiving careful consideration, with a view to meeting them reasonably."

Then, in the year 1883, I find it stated:

"In the Edmonton district, surveys of lands settled on have been completed; and when the report of the surveyors, to whom the duty was entrusted, has been examined and approved in the usual way, the claims of actual settlers at that point will be considered and disposed of."

I find also the report of the Chief Inspector of Surveys, who says:

"A survey has been made of the old settlement at Edmonton. The adjustment suggested of the claims between the settlers seems to have been made to the general satisfaction of the parties concerned."

Then I turn to the report for the year 1884, and I find only one statement, so far as I can see, which bears upon the case, and that is the report of the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West Territory, who says:

"In conclusion, I may state that there is a general contentment throughout the Territories and great confidence in the future. My

experience of five years in the Territories has convinced me that there can be no better country for settlers, with even a slight knowledge of farming and a small capital, or where a comfortable home can be secured at so small a cost and in so short a time."

Then we come to the year 1885. The report for the year 1884 is presented for this year of 1885, in which the same reference is made to the claims of the old settlers:

"At the time the offices of Deputy Head and Surveyor-General were separated, and Mr. Lindsay Russell was charged with the duties appertaining to the latter position, it was provided that he should also investigate and settle the claims to land by virtue of long occupations advanced by the old settlers along the North Saskatchewan. When it was found that Mr. Russell's health did not admit of his visiting the settlements, an Order in Council was passed remitting this portion of his work to the Land Board. Accordingly, early in the year, Mr. Pearce went to Prince Albert, and from thence to Battleford, Edmonton and St. Albert, and made a careful personal enquiry into all the claims of this class at those places, with the result that all, with one or two exceptions, at Battleford and Edmonton, have been finally and satisfactorily disposed of. The only claims of old settlers remaining unsettled are at Lac la Biche, Victoria and Battle River. The necessary investigation at the two latter places will be made early next spring, but the claims at Lac la Biche cannot be properly adjusted until the surveys reach that point."

Then, turning to the report from the Dominion Land Commissioner of the Saskatchewan claims I find:

"The question of the claims of old settlers on the Saskatchewan is one of long standing; but, with the exception of the claims in the immediate vicinity of Prince Albert, nothing could be done in the matter until the surveys were completed. These surveys were not finished until this summer, and could not have been completed at an earlier date; for, had these been prosecuted in any other way than the one adopted, it would have been at a great sacrifice of both accuracy and economy."

"Very full reports accompanied the evidence forwarded to the Minister so soon as the investigations were completed. The claims at Prince Albert have been finally disposed of. Those at the other points may reasonably be expected to be settled within a few weeks."

"The most liberal construction possible under the circumstances was put upon all the claims; and, judging by the result at Prince Albert, it is confidently anticipated that the percentage of claimants who will be dissatisfied therewith will be very small—probably not 5 per cent.—and of these more than one-half will be only on the grounds that their claims have not had as liberal treatment as the claims of others. It may be said of these claimants—upwards of seven hundred in number—that, as a class, the 'land shark' formed a very small number."

"The difficulty in obtaining explicit evidence has been referred to in the special reports; and in this it need only be mentioned that this difficulty did not arise from unwillingness, but from inability."

"It is somewhat remarkable that, out of the large number of cases investigated, but few were advanced through a residence on and peaceable possession of the land on the 15th July, 1870; the only points at which such were preferred being Prince Albert and St. Albert—some half dozen at the former, and about forty at the latter. This would go to demonstrate that it has been only within the past few years that any idea of making a livelihood by husbandry has occurred to the inhabitants of the district; and, when this fact is considered, the progress they have made is really wonderful."

Now, these are all the statements which I have been able to find bearing on this subject, with the exception of one, and that is an allusion, in a report two or three years ago, in reference to the claims to be treated in a manner analagous to that which was accorded to the half-breeds of Manitoba—one slight allusion to that subject; and it is the only allusion that you find in these reports. But you find a statement that a process of adjustment, slow indeed, procrastinating, has been going on with reference to those in actual occupation; and as to the other part, it is going to be considered with a view to reasonable treatment being administered. Now, Sir, it does appear to me that it was the duty of the Government long ago to have disposed of these questions. It seems to me that they have been complicated, and the difficulties have been enhanced by a systematic delay or neglect of their treatment; and that only after the statements which I have read, after the statements from the Government organs; which admitted a chronic state of dissatisfaction to have existed in that country for years, which also admitted territorial grounds for that state of dissatisfaction—the one circumstance was added that Louis Riel had been asked to go into the country. But when the Government felt that the situation was so serious that it was necessary to act in some way or other in order to preserve the peace by the occupation of Fort Carleton, whatever impressed it on their

minds as a thing still more essential—and I admit that it was essential; I admit that their prime duty was to see that the forces at their disposal were so placed as to be enabled to the utmost to preserve the peace—I say it was their prime duty to have addressed themselves to the removal of these causes of discontent, to have addressed themselves to such measures as would prevent this festering sore from festering still further, and this outbreak from taking place. Force is no remedy there any more than elsewhere. But what they did was to appeal to force, to put 100 men of the mounted police into Fort Carleton, and we hear that they did nothing more. We did not hear of the situation being grave, of any difficulty existing. The report speaks of nothing but peace, prosperity and contentment, and they tell us in those reports, this year, in respect to the only claims which they admit at all, which they think worth mentioning in the reports, that they are almost all settled, and settled in a manner eminently satisfactory. From outside, I hear a report that a very considerable number of persons, insignificant indeed, compared with the armed forces which are advancing to meet them, but a considerable number of persons, with their families, settled within a recent period on lands which belong to some colonisation company, or which had been assigned to some colonisation company, which had not been surveyed and which the colonisation company would not take possession of because they had not been surveyed. And there has been a difficulty going on for some time past, the colonisation company calling on the Government to give them their lands after being surveyed, because since then they have been surveyed, and the Government declining to exercise their powers of ejection, whatever they may be, over settlers on those lands—I say a difficulty existed. I have no doubt whatever that there is correspondence upon this subject, that there are reports on this subject; and I cannot conceive, with the hoards and hosts of officials, from the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-West down, with the inspector of colonisation companies, with the commissioners and assistant commissioners in the North-West, that the Government has not demanded or, even without demand, has not received reports from time to time, informing them as to what the condition of the country was, as to what the nature of the feeling was, of what the difficulty was which grew up and culminated in this disturbance. Now, Mr. Speaker, that the Government should have allowed this matter to get to this head, having had a warning when Riel came into that country last summer, having accepted the warning by putting in a force within striking distance, as the hon. gentleman says, of the scene of action—that the Government did not take intelligent and well-concerted measures to remove the causes of grievance, whatever they may be, is, in my opinion, an act worthy of very general condemnation. It certainly demands explanation at the hands of the Government to this House, because they could not have inflicted a more serious blow upon our prospects in the North-West than they have done by permitting this outbreak to get to this head. I do not care what its proportions are; I trust they are as insignificant as some of the newspapers tell us they are. I have not ventured myself to estimate them. I have given the account which the Ministerial organs give of them, and that alone. That they are considered important is shown by the fact that you have a force of some 580 armed men, of whom 190 are mounted, and half a battery of artillery in full array marching toward the scene of action, with General Middleton, commanding the forces of Canada, as we are informed by the newspapers, on his way to join those forces and see that everything is well and rightly done. I say that the circumstance that the Government should have thought this of sufficient importance to demand such a demonstration in force and such action as this, is, of itself, though I do not,

in the least degree, blame the Government for calling out the troops, although they may have acted in the wisest manner, is, of itself, an unfortunate event. It is an unfortunate circumstance, because it will be made to appear that this affair, slight though it may be, is yet serious enough to call out this action and this display of force, and the opinions of people outside, in which their good opinion as to the peace, the order, the contentment, the prosperity, the good administration, the safety, the security and the harmony in which we dwell, which is important to us at this junction, and particularly with respect to this locality, will be rudely shaken by the occurrence of the last few days. I say that hon. gentlemen opposite, having found it necessary to take this action, ought to have informed us; and they ought to have informed us fully of the action they deemed it necessary to take. When the hon. gentleman was asked, and even without his being asked, what was being done on the 23rd, we should have known then that the Government had decided that the field battery and battalion should be called out; we should have known that they had taken this step. Although hon. gentlemen were asked, we were not told it. It is hardly possible that the decision should have been reached after the session of the House, and at a late hour; but if the information given at an earlier hour became incorrect by change of events at a subsequent time, before the House adjourned, the information should have been given us and an opportunity afforded of deciding as to the exact condition of affairs, so far as the Government knew it. But the Government seems to have treated this question with apathy and neglect. What force there is in the accusation, launched at them by their most devoted partisans through the columns of the public press, that the lands of the settlers have been patented for favorites and supporters, through bribes given to officials, I cannot say; I do not know. It is not their enemies who have said this but their own familiar friends, their influential, their patriotic, their subsidised organs. However that may be, we know they have been very active in the North-West; so active, that with other things they have not had time to attend to this one. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Hesson), the other day, caused a large bundle of documents to be laid on the Table of the House; and it was not the only package which the hon. gentleman can cause to be laid on the Table, because there is another and a still larger bundle of similar documents on a similar subject. He can find thousands of applications for timber limits and grants of land in the North-West. He can find influential members of Parliament, influential partisans of the Government outside of Parliament, influential members from all quarters of the Dominion who have made application; he can find that there was the carcass at which the eagles that follow in the wake of the Government were gathered together; and I suppose the effort to organise those various applications to suit and please everybody, that everybody and his son-in-law or daughter-in-law, or his friend, or his ally, should have a suitable timber limit, or mine, or location of some kind, was perhaps enough to exhaust the energies of hon. gentlemen opposite, and leave them little time to deal, in the course of the seven or eight years during which the claims have been pending with them, until they have reached this head. I say it is most unfortunate that this question was not dealt with. What is done now? The hon. gentleman says, forsooth, that he has issued a commission. I asked, When? The hon. gentleman said that one of the commissioners selected was selected some time ago, but he resigned. Perhaps he did not want to go into that quarter just then, so he said another has been selected. I asked, When? He replied, the other day. I suppose that means the day before yesterday. It means as soon as the row broke out, when the militia was called out, when the trouble had come. The hon. gentleman then thought it worth while to issue a com-

Mr. BLAKE.

mission to investigate the new and fresh grievances of the half-breeds of the North-West, which he had not been able to glance at for a long time; and he hopes, with the assistance of the cavalry, of the foot guards, of the artillery, of the militia-men, and of General Middleton on the one hand, and the olive branch, to be borne by his commissioners on the other, he may get himself out of the scrape. I am sure I hope he will; but without serious damage having resulted to the country, by having allowed this matter to go so long and so far, and reach this point, without taking the proper steps, that, I regret to say, is absolutely impossible. Now, we have a peculiar anxiety to know what the hon. gentleman is going to do on this occasion, having regard to the *personnel* involved in this transaction. What will he do with Louis Riel?

An hon. MEMBER. Catch him.

Mr. BLAKE. Some years ago the hon. gentleman announced in the town of Peterborough that "he wished to God he could catch Louis Riel." Riel was at that time out of the country; and the hon. gentleman inveighed against me as being the cause of his being unable to gratify that fervent prayer to his Maker, that patriotic aspiration for his country, because, forsooth, with the almost unanimous assent of the Legislature of Ontario, I had caused to be issued a proclamation, offering a reward for the arrest and trial of the same Louis Riel. He said by issuing that proclamation I had forced him across the line, where, in safety and comfort and security, he could plot against the peace of Canada; and the patriotic cheers of his Tory friends greeted the hon. gentleman's fervent prayer that he wished to God he might catch him, and those patriotic cheers were redoubled when they found that it was due to the malign influence of the humble individual who now addresses you, by offering a reward for Louis Riel, that he had crossed the border, and that the hon. gentleman's fervent prayer could not be realised. A little while afterwards, in the course of some investigations which went on here, a right reverend prelate informed us—and he brought the letters to prove it—that the hon. gentleman had appointed him a special commissioner to arrange with Louis Riel to leave the country; that he had handed him out of the secret service money \$1,000, to pay his expenses when he was out of the country; and that it was at the hon. gentleman's own instance, at the hon. gentleman's own request, with the public moneys of this country, supplied by the hon. gentleman for the purpose, that Riel was induced to leave Canada and remain in the foreign country to which, he said, Louis Riel had been driven by me, and where, he said, wrongly driven by me, he was plotting in peace, and safety, and security, against the country. Under these circumstances, it is extremely desirable that we should know, what will he do with him? What is the hon. gentleman going to do with Louis Riel on this occasion? He told us with—I was going to say *naïveté*—but that word would hardly be applicable to the hon. gentleman—this afternoon, that he had received a sort of intimation, that Riel had actually expressed a sort of an idea that if he got a sum of money out of the public treasury he would not disturb them any more. Of course, the hon. gentleman said that was impossible—for the second time such a thing was impossible. Why should he think so? Where did Riel learn the lesson? Who taught him it paid to kick up a row here, that he might get an Archbishop to negotiate for the public money of Canada to console him? It was from the hon. gentleman he learned the lesson which he was endeavoring to repeat this year, but which, the hon. gentleman forcibly says, could not be thought of on this occasion—I suppose from the fact that no secret service money was available. There is yet another policy which may be adopted. The hon. gentleman may catch him, or he might bribe him to go away, or he might do what one of his most influential organs suggests

he—no, not he, might do, for we know that these things are never done by persons in authority, but a little bird suggests them, and they get done some how or other. Here is the suggestion :

“ But one thing is clear, namely, that when Riel is captured he ought to be strung up on the first convenient tree, without ceremony.”

Now, that is a sort of sanguinary mode of dealing with the question—a summary method of punishment. Where do I find it? Why, I find it in the *Montreal Gazette*—in the special correspondence from Ottawa, of the *Montreal Gazette*, of the 23rd of March. Now, is that the policy of the Government? Is it to be understood—indicated as this is by the *Montreal Gazette*, by its special correspondent at Ottawa, where the Government is, and where the correspondent is, and where the principal proprietor is, and where are the sources from which it draws its wealth and means—I say is it to be understood that the policy of the Government is to establish lynch law, and string up Louis Riel to a tree, in short order? We have a variety of policies. We have the two policies of the hon. gentleman to which I referred, and now we have the *Montreal Gazette* policy; and really under the circumstances we are pardonably anxious to know what he will do about it. I say it is our duty to vindicate the national authority which has been outraged, to restore the peace which has been disturbed—decidedly, but if it be at all possible, without the shedding of one drop of blood. I say that that done, the course of law should be pursued, the course of law and justice should be pursued in the regular course of law and order; and I regret extremely that in the columns of an influential Canadian newspaper a suggestion so disgraceful as that this act should be committed should have appeared. But there is more to do than that. There is more to do than vindicate the national authority and vindicate the course of justice and law. There is the redress of whatever grievances may exist—those grievances which are said by the Government organs to be substantial—those grievances which existed for a long time, and which the issuance of this commission indicates must have existed. There is another thing which is to be done; for us more is to be done. We ought to receive full information; we ought to have that information which will enable us to know where the responsibility has to be fixed for the delays, for the apathy, for the procrastination, for the neglect, for the want of proper regard and apprehension of the situation, the want of proper decision and fair dealing in the administration of power which have resulted in the present state of things. We want full information upon it. There must be information in the records of the Government. They must have in their offices reports on this subject. If they do not know, if their officers in that country have not reported, we want to know it. We want to know what they are doing with a Lieutenant-Governor there, and other officials, who have not been able to find out that this case has not been serious. But there must be some information; because the hon. gentleman told us, the other day, that he thought it prudent to fortify Fort Carlton and throw a force of men into it, so that there must have been news justifying such a course as long ago as last summer. Why was not a commission issued then, since it had been found that this disturber of the peace was in the country and remained there? Why were not the steps which are now regarded as fit to be taken for a peaceable solution of the difficulty not then taken? We want full and immediate information of every description, which may enable us to ascertain what these grievances are, and of how long standing they are; what steps have been taken towards redressing them; what information the Government has asked from its officers, from time to time, to appreciate the situation; what information has from time to time been received, with a view of dealing with the situation; what the hon. gentleman has learned last summer; what he did

last summer, besides throwing the police into Fort Carlton; and, in a word, we want to know how it comes that a long-standing condition of grievances and dissatisfaction, notorious, at any rate, for a very considerable time, has resulted in the questionable step of last year, of calling on this man to come to the country, with a view to advise—has resulted in the prudential action of the Government last year—how it is that no effectual step was taken to do that which ought to have been done—to convince those people, by all methods of appealing to their reason, their justice, and their consideration, that they were to be dealt with promptly, by removing the causes of dissatisfaction, and thus avoiding the painful condition we are now in, and the difficulty under which we must inevitably labor, no matter how this occasion may end; and I am sure there is a unanimous feeling and hope on the part of every man in this House that it may end very well indeed, and that the precautions the Government have taken may be in excess of the occasion. But I maintain that Parliament would be wanting in its duty if it did not insist on having that information early and immediately, and I maintain that the Government has been wanting in its duty in not granting that information early and immediately, and enabling us to judge. I do not censure; I point out where I conceive the conduct of the Government to require explanation; but the grounds of judgment, either of acquittal or condemnation, ought to be laid before Parliament, and ought to be laid before Parliament at once; and to that end I move, in amendment thereto, to leave out all the words after “that,” and insert the following instead thereof:

“ In the opinion of this House, it is the duty of the Government forthwith to lay before this House the fullest information on the subject of the claims and alleged grievances of the inhabitants of Prince Albert, North-West Territories, and the neighborhood, and of the action of the Government and its officers thereon; and of their action in reference to the movement of last summer, and in reference to the present disturbances.”

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman concluded his speech by saying that he hoped this thing would end well—that it was the wish of every man in this House and every man in the country that it should end well. All I can say, Sir, is that if it does not end well, some of the responsibility will rest upon the hon. gentleman himself. I deeply regret that a man holding the responsible position of the hon. gentleman, once having been a member of a Government, and once having been responsible for the government of that country, should take this opportunity—when men are in armed insurrection, so far as we know, against the authorities of the land; when we do not know whether they may be assisted or not by the savages of the plains—to make a speech for the purpose of attacking the Government, reckless of the consequences, reckless of the knowledge that every word he uses will not only be truly repeated, but will be falsely exaggerated all over the world. It will be read by the Métis from the Rocky Mountains to Winnipeg, that the hon. gentleman has assumed that the Government has been wrong—that he has assumed that there has been delay, neglect, and all the rest of it—that they are oppressed and wronged, and driven to desperation, by the wrong-doing of the Government, by the wilful apathy, the wilful delay, and the corrupt delay of the Government, in preferring to help speculators and friends and influential members of Parliament to settling the wrongs of the Métis. This is the statement that will go abroad, coming from the hon. gentleman; and if they have any encouragement to renew there an exhibition of that spirit, which I believe at this moment is depressed, it will be owing to the statements made at this time by the hon. gentleman, not thinking of his responsibility—careless, rather, of his responsibility—and for the sake of making what he considers a clever speech;—risking the continuance of the peace of this country, risking the chance of an immediate suppression of this insur-

rection—if it can be dignified by that name—all for the miserable and unstatesmanlike desire of having a little attack on the Government. I have heard that hon. gentleman make many lugubrious speeches; but I have never heard him make a speech in which such an utter want of patriotism, such a mere factious spirit, was displayed as in this. The hon. gentleman says we ought to have given information on the 23rd that the militia were called out. I tell the hon. gentleman that the militia were not called out then, and I could not have given that information without stating what was untrue. The fact of the matter was this: Taking time by the forelock, after having shown, not apathy or neglect, but as a military man told me to-day, having shown extraordinary quickness in making all precautionary arrangements, my hon. friend, the Minister of Militia, sent a telegram on that day to ask if there was any want of militia, how many men the militia force could supply. That was the message he sent on that day, and therefore we could not communicate to this House what was not in existence. But if we had called out the militia, I say it was not our duty to inform this House. It was not our duty to spread wide, as the hon. gentleman has done to-day, the fact that there were men wild and foolish and desperate enough to take arms, or to pretend to take arms, against the Crown, or against the authorities of the country. It was our duty to localise and minimise the occasion there. It was our duty to put down this riot—for it is little more—without alarming the country, without alarming the timid people in that country, without alarming the expectant immigrants who are coming to this country. It was our duty to put it down as quietly and peaceably as possible, to neglect no precaution or care, to be fully armed in any case, so that if, contrary to our expectation, it, contrary to our belief, if, contrary to our hope, it should turn out to be a serious thing, if instead of being a riot, it should rise to the dignity of an insurrection, we were not to be found wanting. But it was arranged to keep this matter quiet. We had quietly collected our forces and made the arrangements, and we know and believe that if the trouble be merely confined to the Métis, it will be localised. Mr. Speaker, instead of the Government being justly subject to the attack for the manner in which that country has been governed, I say, if there is one thing which Canada ought to be more proud of than another, it is the peace, the quiet, and the order that have existed in the North-West ever since the successful result of the Red River expedition under General Wolseley. Sir, since that time there has been rising after rising in the United States, although they had their whole frontier lined with soldiery, 25,000 men, or nearly so, watching the western frontier and the northern frontier. There they had continued trouble; we heard of Indians being shot down like dogs; we heard of cruelties and outrages committed upon the aborigines. Sir, there has not been one single blow struck in anger in our North-West, until this thing happened the other day; with a small force of 300, and latterly 500 men—and I say that force is insufficient for the enormous duty it has to perform—peace has been preserved from one end of the country to the other. The Ontario and Quebec farmer has gone up and settled there with just as full a feeling of security and safety as if he were settling in Muskoka, or away up on the River Desert. We had no right to expect, at the time we assumed the responsibility of governing that country, that we would have been so uniformly successful in governing it in peace and quiet as we have been. You must recollect that country is occupied by savages, or semi-savages, by men who are now driven to desperation through the disappearance of their only means of procuring food; and hungry men are desperate, starving men are ready to grasp at anything, ready to charge those in power with being the cause of their starvation. Look back at the *Hansard* for

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

the last three or four years, and you will find that when I came forward here, in my capacity as Minister of the Interior, and asked for votes to support these poor people, we were taunted across the floor with our extravagance. I stated then we were obliged to ask for these votes; I stated that as christian men we could not afford to let these poor people starve; I stated that the buffalo had disappeared, that the game they depended on for support had disappeared; they were surrounded by whites; all their old opportunities of support were taken away; they were crowded out of their country—and yet we were told, again and again, and I appeal to hon. members if they did not hear the taunts of hon. gentlemen opposite, about the increased, lavish expenditure of this extravagant Government in the North-West; that we were wasting the means of the white people of the five or six Provinces in that insatiable gulf, the North-West. We have succeeded; we have kept that country quiet; and when Louis Riel was sent for last summer, he was sent for by these poor people, suffering from hunger; because, while we went to a large expenditure in keeping them, we did not give them such a quantity of food as would make them hang around the different stations and become habitual beggars. We kept them on short rations, on short allowances, and we tried to force them—I am speaking now of the Indians—and we have forced them upon their reserves; by slow degrees we are introducing among them habits of cultivation. Well, the Métis are, as you know, half Indian; they have many of the characteristics of the Indians, especially the Métis of the plain. Those who are in Manitoba and in some of the settlements have become, to a certain degree, like the Indians in the older Provinces; they have become agriculturists; they have taken to agricultural pursuits; but the nomads are just as wild in their habits, as irregular in their conduct, and as impulsive in their actions as their full-blooded red brethren. The hon. gentleman says there has been procrastination and delay. If there is one thing more than another on which I think the Department of Indian Affairs can plume itself, it is upon its treatment of the aborigines and its treatment of the half-breeds, in settling all their claims peacefully and quietly. The hon. gentleman will not deny that the Métis in Manitoba proper have been carefully attended to; he will not deny that the Indians there and that the half-breeds there are satisfied. Although I say it is an improper thing; although I say it was an unjust thing, it was an inopportune thing for the hon. gentleman to foist a discussion on the land policy of the Government at this time, yet I will say this, that the course taken towards the Métis has been kind, paternal, and in every way for the purpose of forwarding their best interests. The hon. gentleman asked the question, whether the new system of surveying had not been introduced with respect to the old settlement along the North and South Saskatchewan. In accordance with the principle of the surveyors, the surveyors had commenced and had decided to carry out that principle of laying out all the lines under the normal practice of surveying that has been laid down in the Dominion Land Act; but while that was being done, it was not for the purpose of depriving any man, woman or child of land they had a title to, by possession or otherwise; it was not that they had the remotest idea of taking possession of it. Only, the regular piece of land would be so much in one quarter, so much in another, and so much in another. That was the original arrangement made by the Surveyor-General, and it naturally raised the suspicion, as you can quite understand, among the half-breeds, that they were going to be forced out of their irregular tracts of which they were in possession, and would be compelled to take square blocks. The moment that was brought to the notice of the Department it was altered; and the half-breeds were informed they would keep and get their lands according to their custom. They have got their

lands; many of the lots are settled; and of those that are not settled, the majority are fraudulent claims, made by Métis who got their 240 acres as Manitoba half-breeds, and then went out to the plains, having squandered the value of the scrip of the land they got in Manitoba, saying: One Métis looks like another; the Government will never know it; and they claimed the land again. The cause of the delay was that the Government tried to prevent these frauds being practised, that they tried to prevent the man who got his 240 acres in Manitoba from getting 240 more on the plains, and after that, asking for 160 more as a settler under the homestead right. That has been the cause of all the delay; and many of the claims have been settled. When the hon. gentleman speaks about a commission having been issued the other day, I may tell him that we have had official after official examining and settling those claims, and it is only the residuum of those claims that have not been settled. Mr. Pearce, for instance, who was Inspector of Dominion Lands, and is a very efficient officer, was appointed to examine into these claims, but the Métis thought that he did not adopt towards them a sufficiently conciliatory manner, and this to a certain extent interfered with the success of his mission. He, however, settled many of those claims in a most benevolent manner, if I may use the expression, towards these people. Mr. Duck also settled a large number of claims in the immediate vicinity of Duck Lake, where these people have taken the law into their own hands; and it was only to wind up the matter that some months ago it was decided to send a commission up there in the spring—we could not well send it in the middle of winter—for the purpose of settling up and winding up the final claims. In the meantime not one of those half-breeds has been disturbed; more than that, they have been personally assured that their possession was just as good as if they had the deeds in their pockets; but, mind you, these men are quarreling among themselves, just as white speculators do, when they try to jump each other's claims; and it is to settle the residuum of these claims this commission has been appointed. We asked some time ago, but we could not get, the gentleman we wanted to go. We wanted to press him; he accepted at first, but found his health would not allow him to go; and I will mention the names of the chief commissioners who are appointed to wind up the troublesome claims, the litigated claims, in which these people are disagreeing amongst themselves. Mr. Street, a lawyer at London, whom everybody knows, a man of the highest position as a man of honor and a professional man; Mr. Goulin, who is on the spot, a half-breed himself; and Mr. Forget, a very able man, a French Canadian, who has been there for many years, and is the clerk of the Council of the North-West. These three men have been appointed to go up on the spot and sit judicially, and settle the quarrels, not only the claims against the Government, but the quarrels and the contradictory and conflicting claims of the Métis themselves. That is the course taken by the Government, and I ask the House if there could be any other course, if there could be any more proper course adopted, than has been taken by the Government—first, to assure the people, from door to door, that their rights would be respected, that not an acre would be taken from them, that their possession was as good as a deed. But, oh, says the hon. gentleman, there has been apathy in this matter; these people have been driven to desperation; these people would not have sent for Riel if the sense of injustice, if the denial of justice, had not forced them to take this extraordinary step. If the hon. gentleman waits until the Indian or the half-breed ceases to grumble, he will have to wait till the day of doom. They always grumble. If you give an Indian four pounds of pork, and it is two pounds more than he is entitled to, he will grumble because he does not get six; and the half-breed has

all the acquisitiveness of the Indian, and the strong desire to press his claims of the white man. But the hon. gentleman rests his attacks upon what he calls the organs of the Government, and it is in this Parliament and at this time, with men in arms against us, that he sees fit to quote the organs of the Government, the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Mail*, and the *Ottawa Citizen*, as speaking for the Government. Mr. Speaker, the Government speaks for itself. I have heard the hon. gentleman, when he sat on this side of the House, indignantly deny that he would be responsible for the *Globe*, or for any of the papers that usually supported his party. Fancy Sir Stafford Northcote getting up just now and reading the *Standard* or the *Morning Post* as a charge to be brought against Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Gladstone's Government. In the first place, he would not be allowed to read the newspaper; and, in the next, he would neither have the want of patriotism nor the want of taste to do it. But, Mr. Speaker, lo, and behold, according to the old law of England, whenever the militia is called out Parliament must be summoned. That has disappeared to a great extent, and the reason for the original rule has altogether gone. We all remember that, in those days, when the kings of England not only reigned but governed, there was a permanent standing fight between the House of Commons and the Crown, as to who should command the militia. There was always a jealousy against the standing army, because the Crown had the clear right and the only right to command the standing armies, but the militia force was a citizen soldiery, they were under the command and control of Parliament, and the Government could not call them out. They were under the complete check of the House of Commons. Read the contests that were fought with the Crown from the time of Charles I. upwards, as to who should have the control of the trained bands, the Crown or the people. The people gained it, and, with their usual conservatism, they held to that principle that the militia should not be summoned in any way except with the command, with the sanction, with the immediate knowledge of the representatives of the people. But that was because there was a danger that the citizen soldiery might be used as the army of a despot to crush the, at that time, infant liberties of England. Here we have no such fear; our militiamen are the same as ourselves. We are all militiamen. I am not very sure, but I suppose that, at my age, I am in the reserved rank, and that I cannot be called out, even to put down Louis Riel. The hon. gentleman is, fortunately for himself, not over the age, and he may be drawn. I wonder, if he is called out to put down Louis Riel, if he will say: It is unconstitutional; Parliament must be called and Parliament must meet; I won't go; when Parliament is consulted, and after three or four votes of censure and want of confidence, perhaps Parliament may say that the riot has become a rebellion, and then constitutionally we will go and kill a great many thousand half-breeds and lose a great many people of our own; but we will, at all events, back up the constitution. So strange is the utter want of fear of the militia in this country, or rather, to use the hon. gentleman's phrase, the apathy of the people when such an attempt, such an atrocious attempt against their liberties is made by this Government as calling out the militia, that Parliament has actually handed over the right to call out the militiamen to any two justices of the peace; the mayor of a town and a couple of magistrates—I forget exactly the provisions of the Act—can call them out and crush an incipient rebellion, and I think that, if the warden of a county or the mayor of a town or incorporated village, or two councillors can exercise that power, in order to keep the peace, Her Majesty's Government can do it. But we are to be considered guilty of a great breach of the liberties of the subject because we did not consult Parliament, because we did not make a low bow and explain the whole

thing. We did not want to explain the thing. We do not want to explain it until it is over. First let it be put down, let the law be vindicated, let the insurrection be suppressed, and then let the gentleman bring as many votes as he likes, as many charges as he likes, but let him not appeal to the organs of the press. And, by the same token, he reads a number of sensational despatches going to these different newspapers, as if they were true, as if the Government were responsible for them. I suppose, if the Government is responsible for the newspaper, then it is responsible for every sensational piece of information that comes to it from any source over the wires. That is the hon. gentleman's style. What do you think, Mr. Speaker? I take it that all these rumors come from Winnipeg. Winnipeg, for all practical purposes, is not so far from the scene of action as we are. We get the news as quickly as they do; but, of course, from the fact that the Métis and the Indians are nearer to them, they are more interested than we are; and, like all persons specially interested, they are timid, they are nervous; one man frightens another; the story goes that there are fifteen policemen killed, that the stores have been sacked, that Fort Carlton has fallen; and all these come from Winnipeg. We all know how it is with correspondents, especially the man that handles the wires; when he has a sensational story on one hand and the truth on the other, I rather think that he will neglect the true and prefer to send the sensational story. And this is the foundation, the sole foundation, on which the leader of Her Majesty's Opposition gets up a story here for the purpose of its going home—not for the purpose—God forbid I should say so—but it will have the effect of going to England, and of enabling the enemies of Canada, of enabling those who try to stop emigration to Canada, those who try to discredit us, who try to prevent our great railways from getting credit in England, to accomplish their purpose, if that were possible. It will go, Mr. Speaker. I got a cablegram from Sir Charles Tupper, wanting to know about it—he had heard of it himself—and he wanted to know if it was the case. Of course it came from St. Paul and Minneapolis, from some of the American railways, and from New York. He said he had heard that three Indian chiefs had joined Riel, and that he had a thousand men under his command. That was the telegram published in England. But the hon. gentleman spoke and cited these sensational paragraphs. His speech will go to England, and it will get an importance, Mr. Speaker, which it would not otherwise have obtained. But the hon. gentleman says: Oh! we must have been frightened ourselves, because we took possession of Fort Carlton, and sent 100 men up there during last year. Well, Sir, we did not take Fort Carlton in the first place; and, in the second place, we did not send 100 men. We have our police force moving from one part to the other. I suppose that the most active army of Uhlans, during the French and German war, or of Cossacks, never have moved so continuously and so speedily and successfully as that small body of men over that immense country. Well, Sir, before Riel came in these settlers had never sent in a Bill of Rights to us, never sent any complaints to the Government. We saw in the papers, in the same way, I suppose, that he has seen these sensational despatches—we saw that Riel had arrived there, and was asking for everything. The grievances that have been spoken about in reference to their lands were never scarcely noticed by them in comparison to other things. Riel came in there. As the hon. gentleman says, he made his profit out of it before, and he came in there again, perhaps driven to poverty and starvation by bad habits and ill-luck. He had too readily listened to the invitation of the poor, starving people, the Métis, in the vicinity of Duck Lake. He came there for his own purpose. He had excited them, and made them believe he was a sort of El Mahdi. He had led them in the great war—unfortunately, but the unfortunate chief has always had the

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD.

sentiment of the people with him, like the unfortunate Bourbon, La Roche Jaquelein, or Charles the Pretender; it is the unfortunate man that has the popular sentiment with him. He came in there and appealed to the sympathies of the half-educated or uneducated men. Mr. Speaker, the policemen were moved to the barracks at Prince Albert, which were held by a very few men, and in order to have additional reinforcements. The fort then stationed at Carlton was empty; the Hudson Bay people were not using it, and we asked them if we could send men there. They told us at once that we might have it as long as we liked, and we sent fifty men. We had 100 men at Regina, and fifty at Fort MacLeod, from whom they were drawn. There was no great force there; we were just quietly keeping the men there, without anybody knowing anything about it, or exciting observation, in order to be ready should there be an unfortunate outcome from this man's want of loyalty, and the other men's want of common sense in listening to him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say that the complaint of these people, as published and as alluded to by the hon. gentleman, has very little reference to this land question. This land question is a bagatelle compared with their other complaints. There are a very few things unsettled, and they will be easily settled. There are points which are not yet settled, but these men will not be dispossessed. When the boundaries are settled and all their quarrels with their neighbors are arranged, they will get their patents fully, that they have a right to. But the hon. gentleman went over their "grievances"; he rolled that word under his tongue as a sweet morsel—the "grievances" of these people; their "just claims" denied. But I say there have been no just claims denied. Every just claim has been acknowledged. The most of those just claims have been settled, and those that are not settled will be settled as soon as it can be ascertained beyond doubt that fraud is not being practised upon the people. What interest can this Government, or any Government—the hon. gentleman's Government, if it were in power—have in keeping up a grievance? It can do no Government any good. It would be much easier for us to give everything to anybody that asks it. There would be no grievances if we gave away everything. But we are guardians of the public property; we are bound by oath to see that, in the performance of our duties, the Crown, that is to say the people, shall not be defrauded of an acre of land by unjust claims; they are bound to protect the public Treasury, to protect the money of the public, and their money's worth, whether in land or goods. That is what we are doing, that is what we will do, what we will continue to do, notwithstanding the inopportune, the unpatriotic attempt of the Opposition to assail us. But the hon. gentleman must lug in something about colonisation companies; that he heard the colonisation companies were not using the people right. What had that to do with this question of Riel's rights? What had that to do with the claims of the Métis? But the hon. gentleman's organised *claqueurs* behind him clap him on in everything. Any stick is good enough to hit the Government with, and so he lugs in the colonisation companies, some claims made against the Métis. What in the world had that to do with the Métis? It was brought in, and it shows the spirit with which the hon. gentleman is actuated and guided in the whole of this business. But the hon. gentleman wants to know what we will do with Riel. Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman offered \$5,000 to try and catch him, and he did it with the same object with which he makes this speech to-day. The man who was shot, Thomas Scott, was of Irish origin. The French Canadians from Lower Canada stood like a wall behind Sir George E. Cartier and myself. He could not gain them, and so he tried to gain the Irish. Who, then, was so strong a patriot as he? How loud-mouthed was he in regard to this Irishman, one of his own country-

men, and one of his own faith: \$5,000 was offered for this traitor and murderer, and it never was paid. Riel came down to Ottawa and took the oath as a good and loyal subject of Her Majesty; and he had a right to come and take his seat. But I do not think the present Government countenanced Riel. I think it was not this Government that brought him here. But I had made a speech, it appears, at Peterboro', saying that I wished to God we could catch Riel. There never was a prayer more sincerely offered than that which I uttered at that time. If we had got Riel then, he would have been brought and tried in the Province of Ontario or in Quebec. We have got a special statute, under which such criminals can be tried, and he would have been tried and found guilty. But he could not be tried were the jury was *particeps criminis*, his fellow soldiers who had fought under him; if he had been brought down here we would have got a conviction against him, and the consequence of conviction would have followed. I was, therefore, very anxious to catch him. But the hon. gentleman made unwittingly a misstatement of the facts, when he said that we asked Archbishop Taché to bribe him to leave the country. That was not the case. We tried to arrest him, and the hon. gentleman sought to help us by offering the reward. But it was offered so loudly, it was trumpeted abroad so strongly, that the man ran away.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Hon. members may laugh. The man was in the United States; he was living under the security which he obtained under the American flag. It was of primary importance—it was of the utmost importance—that he should no longer be a disturbing quantity. We could not catch him; the American Government would not surrender him, though he had committed murder, because it was a political offence. His sympathisers crossed the lines to him and kept hatching fresh troubles. Then, in the interests of peace and of this country—and if the same thing should happen now, I would do it again—I asked Archbishop Taché to see that man with whom he had some influence, and induce him to go away to a distant part—to California or any where, some distance from the frontier—and cease to agitate the country, and allow us to settle the North-West and make it what it has since become, a scene of peace and order. We asked Archbishop Taché to get Riel to go away, and we said we would pay his expenses for one year. I ask the House whether that was not good policy; I ask if that was not practical statesmanship? He went away, and the country has grown to its present position, which it would have never done if Riel had remained on the frontier still agitating, still arousing and still inciting those misguided people who had faith in him. I say I was justified, in the interests of the country, in the interests of peace, in the interests of the great future of the North-West. What I did in that respect was for the purpose of promoting the interests of that country; whatever the hon. gentleman did in that respect was for the purpose of setting race against race, religion against religion. I leave it to this House, and I leave it to the sober judgment of this country, when this subject is carefully looked into, whether it will not be said that what I did was done to promote peace and prosperity; whereas, every action of the hon. gentleman, from the time he offered the \$5,000 and made those incendiary speeches in the House of Assembly, at Toronto, up to this moment, and the equally incendiary motion he has made, and supported by an incendiary speech, I am willing that our actions should be compared. With respect to this motion, I will say that in the interests of the country, I will bring down just such information as I think will best conduce to the settlement of the question as it now stands, and I will not, unless I am compelled by a

vote of this House, which, of course, I must obey with all humility, be forced prematurely to make one single statement that will have a tendency, in my opinion, to postpone, for one single day, the settlement of that country.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have had the pleasure of sitting in this House for any length of time with the First Minister, are tolerably well aware that the justice of his cause is always in inverse ratio to the violence of his declamation. When the First Minister has a good, straightforward case, he is, as a lawyer of his position should be, always able to place it before the House in a quiet, intelligent and reasonable manner. When, on the other hand, the First Minister knows that his conduct has been utterly indefensible, then we have an exhibition such as that which we have lately witnessed. We have every unworthy taunt, every unjust insinuation, every calumny and sneer that his imagination can think of.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. If hon. gentlemen did not hear me, I will repeat it. We have all these things hurled against men who dare to bring him to account, and invariably we are told that criticism of the conduct of the Government of the day means want of patriotism to our country. That is the invariable refrain which rings from those benches. They may do what they please; they may drive the people to revolt; they may plunder the people in every imaginable way; but if one word of condemnation comes from these benches, we are unpatriotic, because it does not suit their high mightinesses that their conduct should be criticised. I regret exceedingly that this thing should have occurred. I believe, as the leader of the Opposition and the First Minister says, this occurrence is going to do a very considerable amount of mischief to the future of this country, and I regret that, for every possible reason. But I put it to the common sense of the House and of the people of this country, is there to-day one newspaper, from one end of Canada to the other, which is not filled with accounts of the disturbance in the North-West? Are not these things already known from one end of North America to the other? Have we not had the statement of the First Minister himself, that before he knew it, and let the House mark the words, these things were made public in England and in the English press; and, Sir, these things being known, these things being of common record, these things being in the highest sense public property, is the only place in all North America where this matter is not to be discussed the Parliament of Canada? That, Sir, is the position which the hon. the First Minister has taken. Sir, I say there is no sense, no expediency in that position. I say it is infinitely better that it should go forth that the members of this House are unanimously in favor of upholding law, that we are disposed to assist the Government in putting down armed revolt or riot, or whatever you may choose to call it, but that at the same time they should declare they are willing to redress all just grievances; and that they, the great inquest of the nation, are prepared to make examination into the causes which are alleged to have brought about this unfortunate occurrence. Now, I call the attention of the House to this: That the leader of the Opposition has shown clearly and distinctly that, year by year, through a whole series of years, it has been known that these people were discontented, that the Government have had ample warning, ample opportunity to remedy these wrongs. Why, Sir, I recollect myself—and I think the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Mills) can bear testimony, too—that in 1878, about the time we went out of office, these men were making complaints, and my hon. friend then found it necessary to take special precautions and measures to allay

their apprehensions. Now, that is seven years ago. Ample time has elapsed for issuing the commission. More than ample time has elapsed for the redress of grievances and the settlement of claims. The hon. gentleman admitted that they knew a year ago that this dangerous agitator, a man who has been an outlaw, guilty of rising in armed insurrection against the Government of this country—that this man had come into that country. They had every kind of warning that men could have, that there was danger brewing; and my hon. friend simply declares—he does not censure the Government—he asks how it is, with these patent facts before them, with this information, with a knowledge of the character of Riel, and of the character of these Métis—whom the First Minister described, if I heard him aright, as little better than semi-savages—that with all these elements of danger before them, the Government omitted to take the most ordinary precautions. That is the complaint; and can complaint be juster or more reasonable. I was very sorry, indeed, to find that the First Minister on this occasion should have repeated the assertion, which, I think, he must have regretted, which, I think, he must have wished buried in the oblivion, that when, in June, 1872, he brought, what I must call, a most slanderous charge against the leader of the Opposition, that he had deliberately deprived him, the present First Minister, of the opportunity of bringing Riel to justice. He knew, and we have here the evidence of Archbishop Taché, to show that he knew that when he made this charge in July, 1872, in December, 1871, he had himself supplied Riel with the means of leaving the country, and of maintaining himself in a foreign country, for the purpose, as the First Minister stated, of hatching plots against this country. Here is an extract from Archbishop Taché's testimony in our journals:

"I came to Canada, 5th October, 1871. I saw Sir George Cartier in Montreal and Quebec, and he spoke to me about Riel's leaving the country, and he strongly advised me to use my influence to get Riel to leave the country for a while. This was in October or November, 1871."

That charge, to which I alluded being made in June or July, 1872.—

"I told Sir George that I agreed in his opinion, but that it was extremely difficult for me to interfere, as I had been so badly treated, being deceived about the amnesty. He urged me, saying I was the pastor of the people, and he insisted so much that I at last said I would try, but I said: 'You must remember that man is poor; his mother is a widow, with four young girls and three young boys, and she has no means of support, especially when her eldest son is away. He himself has only his labor for his support'—"

The hon. gentleman will observe that Riel was here in October or November, 1871.—

"and I do not think it is fair to ask him to leave his home without some compensation or some means of travelling.' 'That is true,' said Sir George; 'we will see about that.' He then asked me if I would go to Ottawa. 'Yes,' said I, 'I intend to be there the beginning of December.' 'Then,' said he, 'we will settle the matter there.' I came to Ottawa the beginning of December. Sir George also came, and then I saw him and Sir John. I had several conversations with both of them, but one especially I remember with Sir John. It was on the 7th of December, about noon, in his office. I do not remember who began, but he insisted that I should advise Riel to leave the country for a while, and added these words, so far as I can recollect them: 'If you can succeed in keeping him out of the way for a while, I will make his case mine, and I will carry the point.'

"The question of amnesty has caused me so much pain already that I thought I would be justified in using all honest means to secure Sir John's assistance in the granting of the amnesty, and it was on that ground, and on that ground only, that I promised, as I did then, promise Sir John, that I would endeavor to persuade Riel to leave Red River for a while. I made to Sir John the same observations which I had already made to Sir George about the necessity of giving some money to Riel if he were asked to leave the country. It was agreed by Sir John that they would do something about that matter—that he would consult with Sir George Cartier and give me an answer afterwards. I got an answer, dated 27th December, 1871, from Sir John, which I produce under direction of the committee, as follows:—

"[Private and strictly confidential.]

"OTTAWA, 27th December, 1871.

"MY DEAR LORD ARCHBISHOP—I have been able to make the arrangement for the individual that we have talked about. I now send you a Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

sight draft on the Bank of Montreal for \$1,000; I need not press upon Your Grace the importance of the money being paid to him periodically—say monthly or quarterly, and not in a lump, otherwise the money would be wasted, and our embarrassment begin again. The payment should spread over a year. Believe me, Your Grace's

"Very obedient servant,

"(Signed) JOHN A. MACDONALD.

"His Grace, the Archbishop of St. Boniface, Montreal."

Now, I ask what possible justification could there be in July, 1872, for charging my hon. friend with having driven Louis Riel out of the country, to hatch plots and mischief against the State, as the First Minister declared my hon. friend had done? I might just add one word. Archbishop Taché goes on to say:

"In my conversations with Sir John and Sir George there was no allusion to the Ontario proclamation which, indeed, was not ordered till a later period."

Sir, it strikes me that the First Minister would do well to refresh his memory before he again, in this House, declares that in July, 1872, it was his sincere prayer that he might catch Louis Riel. Now, he and Archbishop Taché can settle the matter between them. I have never heard the Archbishop's veracity impugned. Sir, if we are to go to the root of this trouble I believe it will be found to a great extent to be this. I do not in the slightest degree dispute the ability of the First Minister, but I only say to him here what I have said in many other places, that he and his successor in office have been guilty of a great and grievous error in their dealing with the North-West. Sir, I speak with knowledge when I say that it is utterly impossible for any man to administer the affairs of that country properly unless he has been frequently in it or is a native of it. The First Minister, when he entered office, took upon himself the charge of that huge Department. No man knew better than he that it was utterly impossible—and I use the words advisedly—for him to discharge the arduous duties of First Minister and leader of his party, and at the same time to administer that great Department. Unless my memory altogether fails, over and over again the First Minister had declared that it was a grievous error on the part of his predecessor, my friend from East York (Mr. Mackenzie) to attempt to discharge, at one and the same time, the functions of First Minister and Minister of Public Works. There is no doubt that my hon. friend has ruined his health in the public service by attempting to discharge duties which were too much for the strength of any single man to discharge. But, Sir, what does the First Minister do? It was of the greatest possible importance that the man who took charge of the Department of the Interior should give his whole soul and mind and strength to it, and the whole soul and mind and strength of any man in Canada would have been barely adequate (even had he taken the precautions, which the hon. gentleman neglected, to visit the country every year of his administration) to the proper discharge of the duties of the office. Now, I believe it is true that, during all the years the First Minister held office, neither he nor his successor set foot in that country. We have here the spectacle, which has always led to great evils and troubles, of attempting to govern a country requiring close and accurate knowledge at a distance of 2,000 or 3,000 miles. Consequently, these men are ignorant of facts which would have been apparent to them had they taken up their residence in the country or visited it, or had they used those means which any man having the smallest stake in the country would have used to acquaint himself with its wants and necessities. As a consequence, the present and the late Minister of the Interior have been perfectly ignorant of all these things; they have been in the hands of their subordinates. No doubt their intentions were good enough; but they have no knowledge, and they have neglected the plain and easy means of knowledge. What has been the result? One result

the First Minister alluded to, and one result is plain enough to us all. Never has there been a more wanton waste of public money than in connection with the Department specially under the control of the First Minister and his successor. On the mounted police we expended last year \$489,000; on surveys and Dominion lands, \$895,000; and on Indians \$1,166,000; or we spent, in all, in the year 1883-84, \$2,547,560 on these three services; and we have had to spend a great deal more for Mr. Dewdney and all the other officials, who have taken our money and left us in utter ignorance of everything it behoved us to know. Then, as my hon. friend truly said, there has been a far more serious error committed. Practically, to all intentions and purposes, the North-West has been looked on for many years as one great field for plunder. Was there a man who you dared not put in office down here? You sent him up to the North-West. Was there a man whose character was too bad—and it must be pretty bad—to provide an office for under the immediate inspection of the hon. gentleman, he was sent up to the North-West. Was there a man you could not supply with printing or other contracts; he must get a timber limit, a coal area, a colonisation company, or this, that or the other, out of the North-West. This has been within the knowledge of every one who has gone there. No wonder that the people are discontented and leave the country. Their rights, as we all know, have been interfered with. Had these hon. gentlemen simply sat still and allowed the people to go in and develop that country there would have been none of these risings or disturbances; we should have had a strong and prosperous Province there, and the hon. gentleman's position would have been tenfold stronger to-day, and the condition of Canada infinitely better. The hon. gentleman charged my hon. friend with unpatriotic conduct and quoted English precedents to him. The hon. gentleman is very fond of quoting English precedents. Has he looked at the precedents set us from day to day by the Conservative leaders in England, in their criticisms of the conduct of the Government in Egypt and the Soudan; in their criticisms—which I do not approve of—on the conduct of officers who have just been engaged with the enemy at the front. Let him consult the English newspaper files, let him consult the organ of the party whom he says he is affiliated with, and he will find that my hon. friend's motion and language are mildness itself compared with English precedents, to which the hon. gentleman might have appealed. Sir, my hon. friend stated—and I believe every man behind him, and I hope every man in this House agreed with him—although, recollecting certain things which happened before, I fancy he is more likely to get support for that sentiment from this side than his own—that he was willing to assist the Government to the best of his power to re-establish law and order in that country. He said that he was not going to censure them for neglecting to take the steps they should have taken; but he said: We are ready to help you to put down this revolt, but we say you ought to explain to us and give us information; it is idle for you to attempt to conceal it; it is being discussed from one end of the country to the other, and it is the merest child's play to say it should not be discussed in this House. This House is the proper place to discuss it; the people's representatives have a right to be informed of the doings of the Government, and to consider whether it is blameable or not.

Mr. McNEILL. If the hon. gentleman consults the English newspapers he will find that Mr. Gladstone refused to give information.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. Well, Sir, Mr. Gladstone may have refused to give information about matters of negotiation with foreign potentates, but my hon. friend will find that the Conservative party did not accept that as a sufficient reason for not pressing for information.

Mr. McNEILL. I think they have.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. And as my hon. friends opposite are always citing the actions of that party as being just what is good and right, we may be pardoned for citing them now and then, although we do not go one-fourth or one-tenth as far as they do. My hon. friend's motion, I repeat, is exceedingly mild, compared with the comments and resolutions offered day by day and hour by hour by the Conservative party in England, with respect to the serious matters in which the country is engaged at this moment. The plain matter of fact is this: The hon. gentleman knew that he ought to have taken this matter up, and ought long ago to have appointed a commission. He has been, according to his custom, according to the title he has earned among the Indian tribes, putting it off until to-morrow—until it is too late, I fear, to expect to settle it by a commission. Now, he is responsible for the mistakes which resulted from that neglect; and it is too late to ask us, who recollect the events of 1871, who recollect his blundering and the blundering of his Government in 1871, who recollect the mischievous consequences which flowed from his mistakes and errors, to sit still while he repeats those errors, with even more mischievous consequences, to-day. Now, just let us come back to the plain facts. Is anything clearer than this: that at least a year, practically a year and a half, ago, as the facts read by my friend show, the Government were aware that there was danger; they were aware that there were complaints; they were aware that these men had serious grounds for complaint; and they were, above all, aware that the man whom the hon. gentleman (Sir John A. Macdonald) admits has great and undue influence with the half-breeds was in the midst of them, stirring them up to strife; and, if I understand what the hon. gentleman said this afternoon, deliberately offered to the Government to withdraw from the country on payment of a certain sum of money. Was there no warning in that? Certainly, remembering what had already occurred, the hon. gentleman should have immediately taken precautions; he should have sent his commissioners, not now, but then, about a year ago, and then, in all probability, we would have cut the ground from under Monsieur Riel's feet, and we would not have had, at this most inconvenient period—and it is a most inconvenient period, in many ways, for the hon. gentleman—to deal with this trouble which, as the hon. gentleman has truly said—and I am sorry I cannot contradict him—may ultimately inflict very considerable injury upon us. We are quite willing to cooperate with him in every reasonable movement he requires to make, for the purpose of restoring good order in that country; but we require an open statement of his intentions. Everybody will admit that such a statement will not in the slightest degree prejudice or interfere with our warlike operations; everybody will admit that it is not possible for Mr. Riel to derive any considerable assistance from the knowledge that the hon. gentleman has ordered half a battery or a regiment to proceed to the scene of action. I approve of the hon. gentleman taking all reasonable precautions that the expedition, when it goes forward, should go forward in such strength that it will over-awe these people and bring them to their senses, without injury to any single man, without any blood being shed in that territory; but I say we ought to face the situation. There is no use in hiding from ourselves what the plain facts are. If we conceal our knowledge of the situation it will not, in the slightest degree, benefit us; because it is already a matter of public discussion and notoriety from one end of the English speaking world to the other. We have no wish to urge the Government to hasty action, but what we desire is that they should give us, in Parliament assembled, such information as my hon. friend desires, information which will enable

us to form an intelligent idea of the ground upon which the Government now propose to act.

Mr. CASEY. I do not think it has been made quite sufficiently clear yet, by quotations made on the present occasion, what the object was for which the hon. gentleman who now leads the Government induced Riel to leave the country in 1871. It has been shown by my hon. friend who has just sat down (Sir Richard Cartwright) that the First Minister induced him to leave in the autumn of 1871, and stipulated that he should remain away for a year at least, and that several months before that year expired the First Minister said he "would to God he could catch him." He says now, "never was there a prayer more fervently uttered than that which he uttered on that occasion." He has so far forgotten the transaction—we must charitably hope he has forgotten the facts—as to tell us he did not pay Riel to leave the country, but to get him further from the frontier into the United States after he had already entered that country. Sufficient has been quoted from the evidence of Mgr. Taché to show that the hon. gentleman is utterly mistaken on that point. It appears there were two other questions which troubled him, with regard to Riel, at that time, and made it advisable to get Riel away. Mgr. Taché said, in his evidence, on 22nd April, 1874:—

"I saw Sir George Cartier in Quebec, Montreal, and different other places, in November and December. When I spoke to Sir John A. Macdonald on the subject he never denied that the amnesty had been promised, but he said 'No Government could stand on that question.' I told him there had been promises of amnesty frequently, and he did not deny the statements. He repeated that no Government could stand that endeavored to procure the amnesty."

This was the amnesty which had been promised to Riel by the Government, and which Archbishop Taché reproached the right hon. gentleman with not giving. Ultimately the hon. gentleman went out of office, leaving this question unsettled, which he declared he could not settle, which he declared no Government could settle and live. He went out, having deceived those to whom he had promised that amnesty, having deceived the reverend prelate himself, who had taken the trouble to negotiate that amnesty, and he left that question to be settled by his successor, and his successor did settle it, in a manner satisfactory to all sections of the Dominion. The right hon. gentleman has accused the leader of the Opposition with having tried to set race against race and class against class; but was it not under the Government of which my hon. friend who leads the Opposition was a member that this burning question, which had separated race from race, which had made bad blood between our French and English speaking people, which had excited feud between the Orangemen and Roman Catholics, was settled? But now, under the management of the right hon. gentleman, for which he claims so many virtues, that burning question which we hoped we had settled forever has been re-opened. I wish to give you the real reason why it was thought best by the right hon. gentleman not to have Riel in the country; I wish to state the reason why it was considered by the right hon. gentleman worth a \$1,000 then to have Riel out of the country, and the same reason partly exists to-day. There were then general elections coming on in Canada; there are now at least two elections coming on, and it may be desirable now, as it was then, to get Riel out of the country. Mark you, the right hon. gentleman told us that there had been danger of Fenian plots being hatched on the other side of the line with Riel's assistance, and that was the reason he wanted to get him out of the country; but Archbishop Taché says:

"Nothing whatever was at any time said by Sir John or Sir George, to the effect that there was any danger that Riel, or those who had been acting with him, might join the Fenians. The only reason given for having Riel leave, was to prevent any increase in the excitement at the coming general elections. This reason was given both by Sir John and Sir George. The reason was, that the presence of Riel in Manitoba during the election would be taken up by the press, and would cause excitement in the Province of Ontario during the elections there."

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT.

It was not, therefore, in order to secure the safety of Manitoba, as the right hon. gentleman has told us; it was not in order to "give security to that country and enable it to grow up as it has since," but it was in order to "prevent excitement in Ontario during the elections."

"There was nothing that I remember said as to any excitement in Manitoba itself created by Riel's presence in Manitoba."

It was not for the sake of Manitoba at all that Riel was obliged to leave that Province, but for the sake of avoiding embarrassment to the Government.

"Sir George told me, as one of the reasons to induce me to exercise myself to procure Riel's departure, that by this act they would likely obtain a larger support in the elections, and would thus be better able to procure the amnesty. In the conversation, both with Sir George and Sir John, they said that the absence should last over the time of the elections."

Over the very time when the right hon. gentleman was saying in Ontario: "would to God I could catch him."

"I understood the words in Sir John's letter, and 'our embarrassment begin again,' to refer to the possibility of Riel's coming back before the Ontario elections and the embarrassment caused thereby to the Government."

The Archbishop goes on to record his negotiations and to say that he had further instructions from Sir George Cartier in regard to the matter, and that he thought it proper to pay the money in a lump instead of instalments, as the hon. gentleman first proposed, and he negotiated on this basis with Riel and Lepine together, and they said:

"We have had enough of the trouble and the risk for ourselves, and I wish it to be understood that all the expenses are to be paid by the Canadian Government, because I consider we are going away on their behalf, and we would consider ourselves as under pay in their service; otherwise we would not accept one cent from them."

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CASEY. The hon. gentlemen opposite cheer that statement, that they considered themselves in the pay of the Government which they support; and, as we know the money was paid, and that they would not accept it under any other conditions, that must have been the understanding, that they went away in the pay of hon. gentlemen opposite. Enough on that subject. I wish to protest again, in the name of the House and in the name of the country, against the unconstitutional statement, that it is no time to find fault with the Government when there happens to be what the right hon. gentleman chooses to call a mere riot, an insignificant riot, in some part of the North-West Territory. No matter how large or how insignificant it may be, it is not only the privilege, but the duty of this House to criticise any action on his part which may have brought about that riot. He has tried to turn away the attention of the House from the issue by making it appear that the leader of the Opposition found fault with him for calling out the troops. He quoted a lot of his phrases and argued the question as if my hon. friend had been urging that the militia could not be called out here without the consent of Parliament or previous notification of Parliament. He never said anything of the kind. He took particular pains to say he did not mean that; that probably it was necessary to call out the militia, and he was not criticising the action of the Government in calling them out. But he did say, what is quite true, and the only constitutional view of the question, the only view a House respecting itself can take of the question, that this House has a right to be told when the militia have been ordered out, if it is in session at the time. Even if they were ordered out in a city, to quell a riot at a workshop, the House would have a right to be told; how much more when they are ordered out by the authority of the Government, on a special despatch from the Minister of War himself. Have we not the right to be told when we are at war? Those are the hon. gentleman's words. He spoke of our being "at war," and of armed men standing up against us. Have we not a right

to be told? I think we have, and we have a right to get information in an authentic and satisfactory form. We have had plenty of information on this subject. The papers all over America and Europe have been full of it for days, and there have been these sensational despatches which the right hon. gentleman referred to, and which my hon. friend and leader did not quote from. He quoted from special despatches sent to Government organs and from editorials in Government organs, which are generally understood to be inspired.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD. Oh! hear, hear!

Mr. CASEY. They are not inspired? Well, it will be a sad announcement to the thousands, or perhaps millions who hang upon the words of those organs, as representing the policy of the Government which they admire and of the leader whom they adore, when they are told that what they took for inspired gospel is only the irresponsible utterance of an editor! These editorials are supposed to be inspired, and I believe rightly, as a general thing, and it was from editorials of that kind that my hon. friend quoted. We have had sensational despatches and editorials, and the Government which the right hon. gentleman says speaks for itself, did not speak for itself. That is what we complain of, that it would not speak and give us the correct information to do away with all the sensational trash which has been agitating us so much.

Mr. DAWSON. I cannot allow this debate to close without expressing my opinion of the present position of matters in the North-West and the action of the Government in dealing with that country. I think the House and the country have great reason to be satisfied with the manner in which the North-West Territory has been dealt with, that is, as regards the half-breeds and the native races. It is a well-known fact that these native races, the different tribes of Indians, have been for many years, for centuries, I may say, fighting among themselves. Since they came under the care of this country, since the Government undertook the care and the charge of these Indians, we have had peace among them, all over the country, until now. I think a great deal too much importance is attached to this rising in the North-West. I know these people who are now threatening, who are now probably in arms. I know them thoroughly and well. I have lived among them, and I know their disposition and tendencies. The people are naturally a good people; they are a brave and, I may say, a generous people; descended, on one side, from the native hunters of the plains, and on the other from the French voyageurs who first settled in that country, and among them are names which are historical in France; the restlessness of disposition of these people has been brought about by the nature of the life they lead. Before Canada became at all connected with the country, while it was yet under the Hudson's Bay Company, they were not a quiet or a sedentary people. They lived by hunting, and they were often at strife. If I chose to go very far back, I could show that they were frequently at war with their neighbors. In 1816, during the time of the troubles in the North-West, it is well known that there were fights, and that Governor Semple and his followers were killed at the Frog plains, quite near where Winnipeg now stands. It is known that on two occasions the Imperial Government had to send troops out. It is nearly half a century since the first troops were sent out by the way of Hudson's Bay, and they had to remain to keep order among the ancestors of these very people who are now in arms on the Saskatchewan. When the troops were withdrawn there were pensioners established in the Red River settlement, and when the Riel rebellion broke out, we saw what sort of people they were. Supposing the same thing, that is a rebellion, had broken out among a tribe of savage Indians, or among any other

wild people usually looked upon as savages, would they have behaved themselves with the general moderation these people did? Certainly not. The half-breeds did not then proceed to extreme violence, but acted with general moderation, and they had, as they thought, grievances to complain of. The people who are on the Saskatchewan now, who are settled at Duck Lake, are the same people that joined Riel before—the old French half-breeds; and my opinion is that they will not be a difficult people to deal with. My opinion also is that the Government have taken the very best manner of dealing with them, having quietly sent out the troops to overawe them with a superior force. They are not naturally disposed to resort to violence, and I think with good management the disturbance will subside and peace be restored in a very short time. I think the Government have taken the very best means they could to bring about that very desirable end. Now, it is well known, as the First Minister said, that the food on which they relied, that is, the buffalo, have disappeared from the plains, and they have not yet taken to agriculture, as they, no doubt, will, in a little time. But, sweep away the means of subsistence, to which they have been accustomed, from any people, and you cannot expect them at once to settle down into a different kind of life. The fact is, the half-breeds were born hunters and soldiers. They used formerly to be frequently at war with the Black-foot or the Crees. Now, Sir, we have got into a great discussion here to-night about this matter. It will look as if we wished it to go abroad that we had a great war on hand, such as that now in progress in the Soudan or threatening in India. A few discontented people in the North-West Territories take up arms, and the police are sent to control and subdue them. We immediately magnify that into a great war, and our discussion upon it will be looked upon abroad as if Canadians were giving themselves unnecessary trouble about a very small matter. My impression is, Sir, that the whole thing will collapse; that these people will return to a quiet life; that if prudently managed, as I am sure it will be, there will soon be an end of the disturbance.

Mr. WATSON. I can sympathise with the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, and it is to be hoped that there will be no bloodshed, and that the trouble will pass over quietly. I fear, however, that it will injure the country to a considerable extent, by preventing people from Europe emigrating to that country, who have hitherto been led to believe that the North-West is in a very peaceable condition. But I rise to explain a point stated by the First Minister, that the Government ought to be thankful for the peace of that country. Well, as a resident of that country, in which I have lived for about nine years, I say we ought to be thankful for the peace of the country, because I do not believe there is a people on the face of the earth who have had more patience with the Government than the people in that country to-day. I do not believe it would be possible for a body of men to come together and misgovern a country more than the present Administration have misgoverned Manitoba and the North-West for the last six or seven years. I do not state this with the simple object of opposition, but as a warning to gentlemen opposite. The First Minister knows very well that the people of that country have had grievances, which have been presented to him in memorials from the Local Government of Manitoba, through its Premier. As the hon. gentleman is noted for smoothing down all the delegations that come to Ottawa, he has succeeded, apparently, in smoothing down the Premier of that Province, who now seems to be one of his servile followers. He knows that previous to that gentleman coming down here a Bill of Rights was passed by the Local Legislature. He knows that that gentleman has been down here since with-

out any additional instructions, and has agreed to a certain settlement of all claims made by the Local Legislature. Now, I could give my opinion as to the probable results of the settlement of those claims. The people claim they have certain rights which the other Provinces enjoy, but of which they have been deprived. Among those rights they claim the right to build railways in any part of that Province, without interference, and that right has been denied them. They have presented this bill of rights, and I understand by the First Minister, he assured the Local Government through the Premier, that those rights would be accorded; and the Premier apparently has been, if I may say so, soft soldered by the First Minister, and has gone back satisfied. It is not known whether the Local Legislature will accept the terms as arranged by the Premier or not; in fact, it is not known that the Premier of the Province of Manitoba will press the proposed settlement of those rights. I think myself he will not, as he will be afraid of being defeated.

An hon. MEMBER. Who was elected in Winnipeg?

Mr. WATSON. Well, he was a supporter of the hon. gentlemen opposite; but I think that hon. gentlemen opposite realise that the election in the city of Winnipeg was actually a defeat for themselves. That gentleman was elected only after being taken into the Government and after being elected mayor of the city of Winnipeg; thus he had the patronage of the city of Winnipeg and the patronage of the Local Government, and the people up there have not the ballot, as you have here, but they vote openly, and that is the reason he was elected. He was supported by a horde of officials from the Dominion Government and a horde of officials from the Local Government. The people of that country are practically opposed to this Government. I can state that the Local Government does not represent the actual feeling of the people in that Province. The gentleman who seconded the Address in the Local Legislature is a gentleman who represents a constituency in that Province, but, Sir, he only represents thirty-five electors. In fact the Premier in the Province of Manitoba exercises the same power over the constituencies as the First Minister does here, by virtue of the Gerrymander Bill, which he passed in the session of 1881-82. I may also inform the First Minister that there are two members belonging to the Opposition in the Legislature of Manitoba, who represent one-quarter of the whole Province. That will give him an idea as to whether the Premier of Manitoba enjoys popular support. I can warn the right hon. gentleman and this House that he ought to be thankful that this is the only trouble he had in the North-West. The people of that country are as loyal to the Crown as the people of any other Province of the Dominion; but, as I said before, they claim that they are deprived of certain rights and that they have been deceived, and now they demand those rights to be recognised. They claim the right to build railways and the right to administer the lands of the Province.

Mr. ORTON. What are their grievances?

Mr. WATSON. The hon. member for Centre Wellington (Mr. Orton) knows the grievances of that country as well as I do, but he is so wedded to his party that he says it is all right, and that the people are contented and happy. I see by the Winnipeg papers that the Conservatives are banding themselves into what they call an Equal Rights Association.

Mr. FERGUSON (Leeds and Grenville). Farmers' unions.

Mr. WATSON. No; many of the gentlemen who have been holding those meetings are Conservatives and have elected a Conservative president, and they are strong supporters of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The people of the

Mr. WATSON.

Province, I repeat, have been deceived by this Government, in reference to the construction of railways. The people who are settled in north-western Manitoba were promised railway communication years ago. The Canadian Pacific Railway was located in that direction, and an Order in Council was passed that the Canadian Pacific Railway should follow the 4th base line until it came between range 21 and range 22, and that it should then run in a north-westerly direction to where the Shell River enters the Assiniboine. Settlers located along this proposed line, which has not been built, six or seven years ago, and have been working their land and spending their money ever since. These settlers have thousands of bushels of grain in their granaries which they cannot sell for want of railway communication. I might also state that the people of south-western Manitoba are to-day very much annoyed and very much agitated, from the fact that they have squandered their wealth in that country in cultivating large tracts of land on the promise of railway communication being afforded them. Maps showing routes were issued and afterwards withdrawn, I believe at the instigation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, with the assistance of the present Government. The Manitoba and South-Western Colonisation Railway was wiped out of existence, and the people of that district have not the advantages of railway communication which they would have had years ago, except for the joint action of the Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly and this Government. On the question that has been principally discussed in this House during the last two or three weeks—the tariff—I desire to say one or two words. There are no hon. gentlemen present and there are no residents of the North-West who are not satisfied that the tariff has been very injurious to the North-West interests.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. WATSON. The hon. gentleman is so wedded to his party he cannot see it. I think the truth of my statement was proved by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Robertson) the other night, when he stated the quantities of machinery imported into that country, in 1883 and 1884, when he stated that something over \$370,000 worth of machinery was imported when the duty was only 25 per cent., and when the Government saw fit to raise it to 35 per cent. the amount only reached the value of \$170,000. The people had either to buy inferior machinery or buy less, or they had to pay more for it. The policy of the Government, with respect to keeping immigrants in that country has also proved a failure. I am sorry to say that is the case. So far as regards the natural resources of the country, they cannot be beaten by any other country in the world; there is no better field for immigrants; and none offering better natural advantages. But the country must have railways and cheap implements.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have a few remarks to make and I will not take up much time.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh.

Mr. CASGRAIN. (Translation.) I will not detain the House long, and even if I am interrupted that will not hinder me from going on. The reason why I rise is because I have been provoked to do so; only for that I would not have risen; I would not have taken part in the discussion; but as the hon. French member who represents the city of Ottawa (Mr. Tassé) has been pleased to do me the honor of mentioning my humble self the other day, when he stated I had thrown mud on the memory of the late Sir George Etienne Cartier, I rise to state that what I said about Sir George Etienne Cartier is true. I have written it because I thought it was true, and let anyone dare to deny it. That is the reason why I have written it. Now, if I have thrown mud in the face of Sir George Etienne Cartier, it was he

himself who kneaded this mud with his own hands; and I repeat it loudly in this House. If what I said is untrue let it be pointed out to me. If it is not true, I will be the first to admit it. I do not at all conceal from myself the bearing of what I have written; but what I have written, I have seen, I have heard it; and I will say more, I have been attacked because I have said—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order; question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I hope the hon. gentleman will confine himself to the amendment. When the amendment has been disposed of, then he can speak on the main motion. The hon. member will see the inconvenience of raising that question, which may bring answers from other members on the other side of the House.

Mr. CASGRAIN. I claim the attention of the House for only a few minutes. My hon. friend, the member for Ottawa, has accused me of throwing aspersions on the memory of the late Sir George Cartier in a book I have lately written. Of course, this discussion may be out of place. My hon. friend has chosen the arena of this House instead of the arena of the journalist; but I ask the indulgence of the House for two or three moments, in order that I may put myself right on this matter. In my few remarks, it is said I appeared to cast aspersions on the private character of Sir George Cartier. I maintain that what I wrote then was true; that is the reason why I wrote it; if it was not true, I would not have written it. If the hon. gentleman wants the proof, I have got it here. Some fifteen years ago, the words I used have been repeated by Maurice Sand; so there is nothing new as regards the language attributed to Sir George. Let anyone read what is in this book of Maurice Sand—that is my justification. As to another point let him read the will of the late Sir George Cartier in the book I have published.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Blake:

That in the opinion of this House, it is the duty of the Government forthwith to lay before this House the fullest information on the subject of the claims and alleged grievances of the inhabitants of Prince Albert, North-West Territories, and the neighborhood, and of the action of the Government and its officers thereon; and of their action in reference to the movement of last summer, and in reference to the present disturbances.

YEAS:

Messieurs

Allen,
Armstrong,
Anger,
Bain (Wentworth),
Béchar,
Bernier,
Blake,
Bourassa,
Burpee,
Cameron (Middlesex),
Campbell (Renfrew),
Cartwright,
Casey,
Casgrain,
Catudal,
Charlton,
Cockburn,
Davies,
De St. Georges,

Fairbank,
Fisher,
Fleming,
Forbes,
Geoffrion,
Glen,
Gunn,
Harley,
Holton,
Innes,
Irvine,
Jackson,
King,
Kirk,
Landerkin,
Langelier,
Laurier,
McCraney,
McIsaac,

McMullen,
Mills,
Mulock,
Paterson (Brant),
Platt,
Ray,
Rinfret,
Robertson (Shelburne),
Sriver,
Somerville (Brant),
Somerville (Bruce),
Springer,
Sutherland (Oxford),
Trow,
Vail,
Watson,
Weldon,
Wilson,
Yeo.—57.

NAYS:

Messieurs

Abbott,
Allison,
Amyot,
Bain (Soulanges),
Baker (Victoria),
Barnard,
Beaty,
Bell,
Benoit,
Bergeron,
Bergin,
Blondeau,
Bowell,

Ferguson (Leeds & Gren),
Ferguson (Welland),
Fortin,
Foster,
Gagné,
Gault,
Gigault,
Gordon,
Grandbois,
Hackett,
Haggart,
Hall,
Hay,

Massue,
Moffat,
Montplaisir,
O'Brien,
Orton,
Paint,
Pinsonneault,
Pope,
Pruyn,
Reid,
Riobel,
Robertson (Hastings),
Ross,

Bryson,
Burns,
Cameron (Inverness),
Cameron (Victoria),
Campbell (Victoria),
Carling,
Caron,
Chapleau,
Cimon,
Cochrane,
Colby,
Costigan,
Coughlin,
Coursol,
Curran,
Cuthbert,
Daly,
Daoust,
Dawson,
Desaulniers (Mask'ngé),
Desaulniers (St. M'rice),
Desjardins,
Dickinson,
Dodd,
Dugas,
Dundas,
Dupont,
Farrow,

Hesson,
Hickey,
Hilliard,
Homer,
Hurteau,
Ives,
Jamieson,
Jenkins,
Kaulbach,
Kilvert,
Kinney,
Kranz,
Labrosse,
Landry (Montmagny),
Langevin,
Lesage,
Macdonald (King's),
Macdonald (Sir John),
Mackintosh,
Macmaster,
Macmillan (Middlesex),
McMillan (Vaudreuil),
McCallum,
McCarthy,
McDongald (Pictou),
McDongall (C. Breton),
McLelan,
McNeill,

Royal,
Rykert,
Shakespeare,
Small,
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stairs,
Taschereau,
Tassé,
Taylor,
Temple,
Tilley,
Townshend,
Tupper,
Tyrwhitt,
Valin,
Vanasse,
Wallace (Albert),
Wallace (York),
White (Cardwell),
White (Hastings),
White (Renfrew),
Wigle,
Williams,
Wood (Brockville),
Wood (Westmoreland),
Wright.—122.

Amendment negatived.

Motion (Sir Leonard Tilley) agreed to, and House again resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means.

(In the Committee.)

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Before we proceed with the resolutions with respect to prison labor, it is intended that I should make some statement, and I will make it here. The leader of the Opposition intimated, in the remarks he offered, that a great many changes had been proposed since we submitted the resolutions to the House. Practically, there are not a great many changes proposed. The first was with respect to the duty on carpets. The attention of the Minister of Customs was called to the fact, that under the wording of the original resolutions a question would arise as to druggets, printed felts, squares of carpets and carpet mats; and therefore it is proposed to name and specify them, so that no question may arise with respect to them. Next, with regard to the next item:

Towels of every description, 25 per cent., and damask of cotton, linen of cotton, and linen, bleached, unbleached or colored, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

That proposition was submitted by the Minister of Customs and myself for the consideration of the Government some time since, and it was favorably entertained; but the matter was afterwards overlooked, and was not submitted when the original resolutions were submitted to Council; and therefore these amendments are introduced now. Then it was found that a duty of 30 per cent. on umbrellas and parasols operated unfavorably against a portion of those articles—iron or brass ribs, runners, caps, notches, tin caps and ferrules, required for the manufacture of umbrellas; because, by a provision on the Customs laws it is declared that parts of articles shall pay the same duty as entire articles. Under that provision a duty of 30 per cent. would give no benefit to the manufacturers, as was intended by the original resolution. We, therefore, propose to provide that the parts I have named shall be admitted at 20 per cent. *ad valorem*. With respect to striking out items Nos. 1 and 2 in part 4, and substituting the following in lieu thereof:—

Checked, striped or fancy cotton winceys, over 25 inches wide, a specific duty of 2 cents per square yard and 15 per cent. *ad valorem*.

I call the attention of the Committee to the fact that the words struck out, "not more than one-fourth wool," form the only change made in the proposition. Difficulty has been found in deciding whether articles were one-fourth or one-sixth wool, or, indeed, whether they had any quantity

of wool in them. Therefore, that is struck out. Then another difficulty arose, under the proposition as to the classification of these goods, by which it would be difficult to decide between 20 and 25 per cent., and after consultation and conference with persons connected with the trade, as to the harmonious and smooth working of the matter, it was decided to make winceys of all kinds, not otherwise provided for, 22½ instead of 25. Then there are several items, under the heading of oysters, according to the size of the packages, and giving different rates of duties. They are as follows:—

Add the words 'including Oysters' after the word 'preserved' and before the words 'not specially,' etc., in the item respecting 'salmon and all other fish prepared,' &c.

And also adding the following items:—

Oysters, shelled, in bulk, a specific duty of 10 cents per gallon.

Oysters, canned, in cans not over one pint, a specific duty of three cents per can, including the cans.

In cans over one pint and not over one quart, a specific duty of five cents per can, including the cans.

In cans exceeding one quart an additional specific duty of five cents for each quart or fraction of a quart of greater capacity than a quart, including the cans.

Oysters in the shell, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

Packages containing oysters or other fish, not otherwise provided for, 25 per cent. *ad valorem*.

The next item has reference to foreign-caught fish. The attention of the Government was called to the fact that by naming ½ a cent on fresh fish, when the fish were smoked they weighed double or thereabout the fresh or boned fish, so it is proposed to make them 1 cent per pound. These are the alterations proposed by the amendment laid on the Table of the House.

Mr. BLAKE. Of course I do not propose to discuss the matter, but simply to ask for information. I observe a proposed change, by which the hon. gentleman reduces the duties from 25 per cent., on certain classes of articles, and makes a duty of 22½ per cent. on a much larger range of imports. Will that involve a considerable additional tax, so far as the returns to the revenue are concerned?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I will be able to state, when we come to that, what the estimate is.

Mr. BLAKE. When does the hon. gentleman mean?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I cannot state with reference to that item at this moment. The whole proposition, so far as the memorandum is given—I have not got it before me—the whole changes, including carpets, will give about \$75,000 additional revenue. I will give the hon. gentleman the details afterwards, but I have not got them at hand.

Mr. BLAKE. Is that addition proposed by virtue of these new changes?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. No; the whole of the changes proposed will give about \$75,000, making allowance for increased manufactures as the result.

Mr. BLAKE. Does that include tobacco and cigars?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. Oh, no; that is much larger. It is because, as I stated at the outset, the probability is that \$300,000 would be lost the next fiscal year on Excise duty, and this is for the purpose of obtaining a return.

Mr. BLAKE. The hon. gentleman said the whole of the change made that amount.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. I did not mean, of course, the whole result.

Mr. BLAKE. It is only the dry goods changes?

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The changes on dry goods; the others give very little indeed. I will be able afterwards to give the estimates in detail.

Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT. All you propose now to take is the prison labor resolution.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY.

Resolved, that it is expedient to prohibit the importation to Canada of all goods manufactured or produced by prison labor, or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, gaol or penitentiary and to attach a penalty to any such importation.

Mr. BLAKE. Will the hon. gentleman have the kindness to state what descriptions of goods manufactured by prison labor are customarily imported, and in what quantities?

Mr. BOWELL. The principal articles imported into the country bearing duty are scythes, hoes, shovels, forks, rakes and articles of that kind.

Mr. BLAKE. Any others?

Mr. BOWELL. I do not remember any just now. I think there may possibly be articles of carriage hardware, such as hames, axles, and some other articles under that general head. I think there are some very limited quantities of boots and shoes.

Mr. BLAKE. Could the hon. gentleman state where these goods are manufactured in the United States in prisons—at what points?

Mr. BOWELL. A large proportion are manufactured in Jackson, Michigan. It is one of the prisons from which I know a very large quantity of goods are imported. There are also some, I think, from Auburn, N.Y.; in fact, nearly every State's prison in the United States has utilised labor, which, as the hon. gentleman knows, is very cheap, in manufacturing these articles, and they come in at a low price, and come in direct competition with our manufactures.

Mr. BLAKE. Is the hon. gentleman able to make any statement of the value of the articles imported?

Mr. BOWELL. Not at present.

Mr. BLAKE. Nor of the quantities?

Mr. BOWELL. No.

Mr. BLAKE. Has no information been obtained by the Government on that subject?

Mr. BOWELL. The only information we have as to the value is the different invoices which are brought in constantly; and by comparing them with the product of free labor, both in the United States and this country, we have learned this important fact, that no free labor establishment can possibly exist while this is carried on. As to the total quantity, I have not taken the trouble to ascertain; it would be somewhat difficult to do it.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Has the hon. gentleman been in the habit of adding to the value of invoices, so as to bring them up to the fair market value of that class of goods manufactured by free labor? Or does the Department allow the invoices to come in without raising them?

Mr. BOWELL. There is no law to justify the Customs Department in taking the steps indicated by the hon. gentleman. If American prison labor is sold for home consumption, then the manufacturers of free labor—

Mr. PATERSON. Is it so sold?

Mr. BOWELL. I fancy it is.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to know that definitely?

Mr. BOWELL. From our information, it is in many cases; and wherever it can be ascertained that it has been shipped to this country—and I may say that it has been a constant source of trouble to the Department—wherever it can by any possibility be ascertained that these invoices cover goods at a lower rate than the rate at which they are sold at home, we have insisted upon the prices being raised.

Mr. BLAKE. I understood the Customs law to be, that the rule is, for duty purposes, to fix the price at which the

article is usually sold in the country of production, and that rule is carried out.

Mr. BOWELL. So far as we can carry it out.

Mr. BLAKE. Does the hon. gentleman mean to tell us that there are large quantities of these goods produced by free labor in the United States which are sold at a higher rate than similar goods produced by prison labor?

Mr. BOWELL. I tell the hon. gentleman that in many cases, even the goods which are manufactured by free labor are imported at a much more lower rate than they are sold to the consumer in the United States; and from this fact, that upon many articles manufactured, particularly if they be from imported goods, as, for instance, the article of scythes—they receive on that article \$1 or \$2 drawback on each dozen, according to quality. In many cases of that kind we have insisted upon the \$2 per dozen being added; but the largest proportion of the importations of these articles, so far as they have gone under my observation, have been the product of prison labor.

Mr. BLAKE. I have failed to express clearly my meaning. I asked the hon. gentleman if he had any information to enable him to tell the House whether these goods, competing with goods of the same quality, the product of free labor, are sold at a lower price in the United States market than the goods with which they compete.

Mr. BOWELL. On some occasions they are. Sometimes, when there is a large surplus, they will sell them off at any price. But in order to secure the foreign market, as they call that of Canada, they will sell the goods at a lower price at home than they will at other times; and after they fix the fact that they sell in the home market at a particular price, we, under our law, have to collect the duty on the prices at which they are sold in their own country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). Are not goods sold at a slaughter price in the United States, on which the Customs Department here charge the full value, which is higher?

Mr. BOWELL. Certainly not. If the hon. gentleman will read the regulation he will find that it matters not at what price the articles may be sold in the United States, that is the price fixed by law to be the value for duty when they come into this country.

Mr. PATERSON (Brant). I am certainly under the impression that the Minister would not be straining his powers if he insisted that the duty should be levied on the price at which the articles were sold in the United States, not at an exceptional period, but on the regular selling price. If I understand the Minister, at certain odd times there may be a large output of these goods, and they are thrown on the market; and I understand, so far as the working out of our law is concerned, that in valuing them for duty, the exceptional price he refers to would not be accepted by the Customs Department of Canada to guide them. When it is only at certain times when they are sold below the price at which the product of free labor is sold, I understand that the Customs Department is not bound to accept that low price, but that it is within their power to add to the value to bring them up to the price at which they are ordinarily sold; and that being the case, if the hon. gentleman had been as strict and efficient in watching that matter as he is in many other matters pertaining to his Department, it seems to me he could have obviated the difficulty almost wholly if not entirely without the necessity of this clause. I suppose, if the value of the goods is uniform, it makes little difference, so far as the valuation is concerned, if whether they are the product of free labor or of prison labor; the injustice is in admitting the product of prison labor at a lower valuation. With the exercise of due caution, therefore, it seems to me that the Minister had the power in his own hands for

excluding the product of prison labor which was sent into Canada at a lower price than the same goods, the product of free labor, were sold for in the United States; and an injustice has been done both to the artisans and to the manufacturers. Although he has had a remedy in his own hands, he has apparently allowed the evil to go on.

Mr. BOWELL. It would be well if the hon. gentleman would justify his remarks by reading the law.

Mr. PATERSON. I am judging you according to your action.

Mr. BOWELL. The hon. gentleman has not stated the law as it is. It matters not at what price the article is sold for consumption in the foreign market; that must be the price at which it is admitted here. The hon. gentleman says that if an article is sent into Canada at an exceptionally low price the law gives the power to the Department to add to the invoice for duty. That is not the case, unless the exceptional price be fixed specially for the foreign market. If it is sold at the same price in the home market, that must be the price accepted for duty. While the price of the product of free labor and that of the product of prison labor were the same, we had very little difficulty in this country; but as soon as the combination was broken, the articles manufactured in the prisons have been thrown on the market at a much lower price than they were previously sold for.

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask this question? Has it been the case that the Customs officers have, at certain times, added to these invoices, and at other times they have not? According to what the Minister says, sometimes the articles are sold at the price of the product of free labor in the United States, and at other times at a sacrificed price. Do the officers of his Department add to the price, instead of following a uniform rule in valuing?

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all. Invoices have been repeatedly added to, but that was only when the article was sent to this country to be sold at a lower rate than in the home market.

Mr. BLAKE. I think the law has been interpreted in practice to limit the power of the Customs authorities to add to the values, just because there was an exceptional drop by a particular manufacturer in the United States for a short time; but from my little experience, from the complaints made to me at different times by importers, I do not understand that the hon. gentleman holds that the price for duty should be kept down at that abnormally low point, although it was the price in the United States. But it is the general price at which the article is sold for home consumption on which the duty is charged, and a lower valuation cannot be justified by simply proving that there was a drop in one particular case. I pass to another point. The hon. gentleman has said that there was not much trouble with reference to this particular article in the way of exports, because there was until recently a combination between the various manufacturers, as well as those who employed free as those who employed prison labor, and so there was a uniform price, a comparatively high price. That combination, however, has been broken, and there is now competition and the price, of course, is reduced. If am incorrect I would like the hon. gentleman to make it clear. Will the hon. gentleman also state the method in which he proposes to ascertain practically whether goods are the product of prison or of free labor; because, of course, the moment this law is passed, means will be taken to evade it.

Mr. BOWELL. The latter question the hon. gentleman has put has been already considered, and all the difficulties he has mentioned presented themselves to my mind the moment the proposition was made to place this resolution

on the Statute Book. Not only will the manufacturers change the name in the future, but they have done so in the past. A very superior article is manufactured in the workshops, and it has a particular name in the United States; but when the Americans sell it to Canada, they give it another name, so as to put difficulties in the way of the Customs appraisers actually arriving at the exact value of the goods. The question as to how we are to ascertain whether goods come from the prison or not has been fully considered by myself and the officers of the Department, but I have not the slightest doubt the law will be evaded in many cases. The only way in which we can try to put a stop to its evasion is, when we can detect it to seize and confiscate the goods. With reference to the complaints made to the hon. gentleman, no doubt they have been very numerous; and if he will give me one of the cases presented to him, I will, in all probability, be able to show him that the matter has not been represented to him in its exact light. We have had many difficulties of the kind. Articles in the United States have a certain value in the American market, and undergo a certain discount when sent to Canada. The Americans have what are termed export lists and home consumption lists. The Canadian importers purchase the articles at export prices, as in the cases no doubt represented to the hon. gentleman, and we never accuse our merchants of fraud; but all we say is: If you have purchased at the export price, you must add to the value of the invoice for duty, the difference, as far as we can ascertain it, in value, of the prices at which the goods are sold at home and the export prices.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). In discussing the prison labor question, one important factor appears to have been overlooked. We have been discussing it from the standpoint of the extra cost entailed by the duty; but, as a matter of fact, Canadian importers can buy the products of prison labor in the United States at prices much cheaper than those at which the goods are sold for home consumption; and although the importers may be compelled to enter the goods at the full market price for duty, we cannot interfere in the slightest degree with the prices at which they purchased them; and in that respect the product of foreign prison labor, at 30 cents a day, has a great advantage over the product of our free labor, at \$2.50 or \$3 a day.

Mr. BLAKE. That observation has its application to all imports.

Mr. WHITE (Cardwell). No.

Mr. BLAKE. Not in precise terms, but in a certain degree. The case mentioned by the hon. Minister of Customs is another application of the difficulty. You buy your goods—I do not care whether they are the product of free or prison labor—at a reduced price, say 10 per cent. The Customs duty is 30 per cent; but the importer still gets the benefit of the 10 per cent. reduced invoice rate. The difficulty is, of course, exaggerated in the question of prison labor, if it would be the fact that the product of prison labor can be sold in the home market cheaper than the goods manufactured by free labor.

Sir LEONARD TILLEY. The illustration given by the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White), aptly covers the case. The hon. member who addressed himself to the House a few moments ago said it was competent for the Department, by the imposition of a duty upon the market value at home to remedy the difficulty. But the difficulty cannot be remedied. Take, as an illustration, a dozen of scythes, the market value of which is \$8; but the manufacturer, who has prison labor, will sell them to the Canadian importer at \$7 a dozen, because he has the labor at 30 to 35 cents a day. Substantially, the market value is \$8 a dozen, for that is the value for which they are sold in the American market. However, they are sent in here at \$7 and the

Mr. BOWELL.

Customs authorities make the importer pay 25 per cent. duty on the \$8 full value; that is \$2 added to the \$7, or a cost of \$9, where, if they were not sold for \$7 on account of prison labor the full cost would be \$10. It is therefore impossible, by the application of the law, to impose a duty that will cover the whole case, and the Government were compelled to prohibit altogether the importation of the products of prison labor. True, the consumer may have to pay more, but the question is, shall the honest labor of the country be driven out of it by the prison labor of any country?

Mr. PATERSON. No doubt there is force in the way in which the hon. member for Cardwell (Mr. White) and the Finance Minister have put the question, but what they say applies to the importation of all goods, and really, to believe the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite, with reference to the practice followed by American houses, we have only to tell them the goods are for Canada to get them at reduced rates.

Mr. BOWELL. That is not confined to American houses.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps not, but I shall base my remarks upon the statement of the Minister of Customs, that they reduce prices on the other side for the Canadian market, and that the only means we have of knowing that goods are prison labor goods is the fact that they are entered at a less value than that at which they are sold at home.

Mr. BOWELL. I did not say so.

Mr. PATERSON. I understood you to say that was the way you knew them to be prison-made goods.

Mr. BOWELL. Not at all. Those prison-made goods in the past, whatever may be the case in the future, bore the mark of the prison and the place where they were manufactured.

Mr. FAIRBANK. Is it proposed to insist upon the importer making a sworn statement that the goods are not made by prison labor.

Mr. BOWELL. That was the course which suggested itself at first, but I have grave doubts as to the propriety of doing it. You would place the importer in this position. He might go to a wholesale establishment for his goods and they might be falsely labelled, and he could not take that affidavit, except to the best of his knowledge and belief. I confess that, from what I have seen in four or five years' experience, great care must be taken in the wording of any affidavit or oath which may be drafted for the purpose of being taken by any importer.

Mr. BLAKE. That, of course, occurred to one in connection with the first suggestion I made. The affidavit of an importer to the best of his knowledge and belief would be based upon the fact that he did not buy from the prison man or his agent, and the goods did not bear the prison mark. He could not tell. He did not know they were made by prison labor. Suppose that were so, and the hon. gentleman required that, which is the more stringent affidavit any conscientious man could be asked to take under the circumstances, unless he were required to trace the goods from the factory, and it afterwards turned out that the man was deceived, would the goods be confiscated?

Mr. BOWELL. Under the law I suppose they would, just as the law gives power to the Customs Department in other cases. If an entry is made, and the goods are taken from the charge of the Customs authorities, and the duties are paid upon them, if you afterwards ascertain that they have been entered at a lower rate than the value for which they are sold in the home market, you ask them to amend their entries. In many cases that is done where the merchant has honestly purchased, and in other cases where it has been ascertained that it was fraudulent. I suppose we

shall have to adopt the same principle to ascertain these facts that is adopted now to ascertain the facts connected with the sale of goods by the different houses in the different markets in the United States—that is, for officers occasionally to visit those places, who are not known, and who report that a certain house is selling at a lower price for export than for home consumption. We follow that up, either by seizing or by compelling amendments to the entries which have been made. The same policy will have to be adopted in ascertaining where the goods have been made, and tracing them to the different houses from which they have been sent to Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. The Minister said I had misunderstood him. When I said I understood that the way in which they detected that the goods were coming in was by the invoice being lower in price, he corrected me, and said it was because the goods all bore the mark of the prison. Is that the fact in all cases?

Mr. BOWELL. When the hon. gentleman becomes my successor, a position which evidently he is working very hard to obtain, I can assure him that he will find hundreds of modes adopted by different people to evade the law. Very often the goods coming from the manufacturers do bear the mark. When they find they are caught in some attempt to defraud the revenue, they will adopt some other mode, either by changing the name of the article which it bears in the United States, when sold for home consumption, or, in other cases, by sending it to Canada without any mark at all.

Mr. PATERSON. Then you should not have said they always bore the mark.

Mr. BOWELL. I think I said, nearly always. If not, I correct the statement now. But, when they are invoiced in that way to Canada, we at once ascertain, upon the information we have and upon the information we obtain from the different wholesale markets in the United States, what the ruling price of that particular article is. Then a difficulty often presents itself as to the quality and value of the article, and we have to come to the best conclusion we can, from the circumstances and the facts that our officers can obtain. I will be a little more particular in saying "all" in future.

Mr. PATERSON. It struck me, when the Minister made that statement, that there might be some State regulation requiring that these goods should be so branded. Can the hon. Minister inform me on that?

Mr. BOWELL. There is nothing of that kind, that I am aware of.

Mr. PATERSON. I thought at once there would be no difficulty in tracing anything that came to Canada if it bore the prison mark and if it were compulsory to place a certain mark upon it before it went into competition. I thought it was likely that they were compelled by law to do so, as the goods were going into competition with free labor.

Mr. BOWELL. By the prison mark, I mean the name of the manufacturer. I can give the hon. gentleman an illustration, showing the difficulties which surround the carrying out of the law. In Michigan, in Jackson prison, I think it is, they have a workshop outside of the prison and one inside the prison, and they manufacture the goods outside ostensibly by free labor, when we have every reason to know that much of the prison labor is utilised in the workshops and in the manufacture of goods which come ostensibly from the free labor shops outside.

Mr. PATERSON. Will the Minister of Customs tell us when he first noticed that these goods were being imported into Canada?

Mr. BOWELL. These difficulties are so constantly arising that I have never charged my mind with the date of the first offence.

Mr. PATERSON. How many years ago?

Mr. BOWELL. Not more than ten, I think.

Mr. PATERSON. Ever since you came into office, and this is the first time you have taken any step to remedy it.

Mr. BLAKE. I thought the Minister said there had been no difficulty until recently, and it had arisen because a combination was broken up.

Mr. BOWELL. I said we had no difficulty to the same extent until the combination broke.

Mr. BLAKE. When was that?

Mr. BOWELL. About a year ago, as far as I can remember.

Mr. BLAKE. And, if I rightly understood the hon. gentleman, since that time there has been competition between the manufacturers by free and by prison labor, but there is a different level of prices in the home market for the same goods of the same quality. Is that so?

Mr. BOWELL. The moment a combination is broken the party who breaks it throws the goods into the market at a lower price, and very often he brings the other manufacturers down to his level, to a certain extent; but the hon. gentleman will see that, in the matter of prison labor, the illustration given by the Minister of Finance places it outside of the general breaking of a combination, as far as a foreign market is concerned.

Mr. BLAKE. That is where we differ.

Mr. BOWELL. Then, there is very little use arguing it.

Mr. BLAKE. I would fain hope there was some use in endeavoring to persuade the hon. gentleman to reach the true conclusion. The hon. gentleman has stated that there was a combination, and that the combination is broken; that since then there has been a competition, and that the result, of course, has been that some of the parties have lowered their prices, because it is absurd to suppose that there can be, for any length of time, two different prices for the same article, of the same quality, in the same country. The cheapest will get the trade. Well, the hon. gentleman says there is a specialty with reference to prison labor for exports. But close up free competition and you get the price of prison labor down to the ordinary level of prices in manufacturing, and you have the price at home so low that the prison laborer has a practical advantage. The manufacturer is reduced to the point at which he cannot manufacture profitably; the article being so low in the home market there is not really that opportunity for making a slaughter sale in the foreign market to which the hon. gentleman alluded. Now, I have no objection at all to the protection of free labor against prison labor. On the contrary, I think it is a very good thing that free labor should not come in competition with prison labor. But I have been anxious to ascertain what the facts were on which the hon. gentleman based his motion, that he would practically protect free against prison labor, either by the proposal that he makes or by the machinery he is making to carry out that proposal. So far as I can judge from his statement, he is not going to do much. It will be much cry and little wool.

Mr. DUNDAS. May I ask the hon. Minister of Customs if it is usual to charge a duty upon bags holding flour imported into this country ?

Mr. BOWELL. Yes ; it is now.

Mr. DUNDAS. How long has it been so ?

Mr. BOWELL. Not all the time, because bags were permitted to be imported in bond. When they were exported filled with grain or with flour they were allowed to make an ex-warehouse entry and send them out of the country without paying duty ; but at present they have to pay a duty upon all the bags that are imported.

Mr. DUNDAS. How long has that arrangement been in force ?

Mr. BOWELL. I think, since the 1st of August last.

Committee rose and reported progress.

Sir JOHN A. MACDONALD moved the adjournment of the House.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12:40 a.m., Friday.

INDEX.

THIRD SESSION, FIFTH PARLIAMENT, 1885.

Abbreviations of well-known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following:—1^o, 2^o, 3^o, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist; *, without remark or debate; Acts., Accounts; Adj., Adjourn; Adj., Adjourned; Amt., Amendment; Amts., Amendments; Amalg., Amalgamation; Ans., Answer; Ass., Assurance; B., Bill; B. C., British Columbia; Can., Canada or Canadian; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway; Com., Committee; Co., Company; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence; Consd., Consider; Consdn., Consideration; Cor., Correspondence; Deb., Debate; Dept., Department; Depts., Departments; Div., Division; Dom., Dominion; Govt., Government; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General; H., House; H. of C., House of Commons; Incorp., Incorporation; Ins., Insurance; Intercol., Intercolonial; Man., Manitoba; Mess., Message; M., Motion; Ms., Motions; m., Moved; Neg., Negatived; N. B., New Brunswick; N.W.T., North-West Territories; N.S., Nova Scotia; O.C., Order in Council; Ont., Ontario; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island; P.O., Post Office; Par., Paragraph; Priv. and Elec., Privileges and Elections; Prop., Proposed; Que., Quebec; Ques., Question; Recom., Recommit; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference; Rep., Report, Reported; Repts., Reports; Res., Resolution; Ret., Return; Ry., Railway; Rys., Railways; Sel., Select; Sen., Senate; Sp., Special; Stmt., Statement; Sup., Supply; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary; W. & M., Ways and Means; Wthdn., Withdrawn; Wthdrl., Withdrawal; Y., N., Yeas and Nays; Names in italic and parentheses are those of the movers.

Abbott, Hon. J. J. C., *Argenteuil.*

- Can. Congregational Missionary Society and the Congregational Union of N.S. and N.B., confirmation of Union (B. 54, 1^o*) 170 (vol. i).
C.P.R. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. on Res., 2734, 2735, 2739 (vol. iv).
Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2436 (vol. iii).
Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1446 (vol. ii); "revision of voters' lists," 2345, 2350; "general provisions," 1448, 2352, 2355; "appeal," 2363 (vol. iii).
Private Bills, reception of Repts. from Com. (Ms. to extend time) 505 (vol. i); 782 (vol. ii).

Allen, Mr. B., *North Grey.*

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1058 (vol. ii).
Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1493 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1853; "who shall not vote," 2166 (vol. iii).
Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (personal explanation) 2209 (vol. iii).

Allen, Mr. B.—*Continued.*

- Maritime Court of Ont. extension of jurisdiction B. 11 (2^o m.) 127; on Order for Com, 215; in Com., 495 (vol. i).
Rys. in the County of Grey, refund of bonuses to County Council, &c., on M. for memorials, 59 (vol. i).
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 590 (vol. i).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Consolid. Fund: Harbors and Rivers (Ont.) 3386 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 794 (vol. ii).

Allison, Mr. W. H., *Hants.*

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1398 (vol. ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 676 (vol. i).

Amyot, Mr. G., *Bellechasse.*

- Antwerp International Exhibition, on M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com. (Amt.) 306 (vol. i).
Can. Agricultural Insurance Co., receipts and expenditures of liquidators, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 303 (vol. i).
C.P.R. Extension to Can. ports on Atlantic, Vernon Smith's Rep., on M. for copies, 294 (vol. i).

Amyot, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Cholera, precautions against (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).
 Dom. Subsidies to the Provinces (M. for copies of Cor.) 303 (vol. i).
 France and Canada, Commercial relations between (M. for copies of Cor.) 825 (vol. ii).
 Gosselin, Eugène, record in the matter of (M. for copy) 703, 704 (vol. i).
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 504; (Amt.) to recom., neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504 (vol. i).
 Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
 Plant, J. B., of St. Charles, Claim of (M. for copies*) 147 (vol. i).
 Postage Privileges, Extension of, to Local Govt. (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).
 School of Navigation at Quebec (Ques.) 743 (vol. i).
 Steam Communication with France (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) to M. for 2°, 166 (vol. i).

Armstrong, Mr. J., South Middlesex.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1272-1274; on M. that Com. rise, 1434; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1469; "tenant," (Amt.) 1481; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1506, 1542; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1643 (vol. ii); 1883-1882; "manhood suffrage," 1970; (Amt.) 2001; "registration of voters," 2247, 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2433 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064 (vol. iv).

Infectious and Contagious diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070, 1086; (Amt.) 1090; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, 1331 (vol. ii).

Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 588 (vol. i).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 793 (vol. ii).

Auger, Mr. M., Shefford.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to M. for 3°, 1061 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1238-1241; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452, 1456, 1458; "tenant" (Amt.) 1482; "person" (Indian) 1543; "actual value," 1597, 1606 (vol. iii); "qualifications in towns and cities," 1987, 1995; "in counties," 2068; "registration of voters," 2296 (vol. iii).
 Holland, Messrs. Geo. and Andrew, services as Reporters, &c. (M. for Stmt.)* 147 (vol. i).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1068, 1070, 1079, 1091; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1323 (vol. ii).
 Liquor License Act, regulations directing License Fund under (Ques.) 76 (vol. i).
 Official Reporters of *Debates*, employment of, during recess (Ques.) 76 (vol. i)

Bain, Mr. T., North Wentworth.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2469, (vol. iii).
 Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2478; in Com., 2479-2483 (vol. iii).
 Cherrier, George E., Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, dismissal of (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road, Sale of, by Govt. (M. for copies of papers, &c.*) 147 (vol. i).
 Dundas Public Buildings, erection of (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1535; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1709-1712 (vol. ii); 1776-1779; "manhood suffrage," 1952-1954; (Amt.) 1993; "in counties," 2052, 2062 (vol. iii); 2758 (vol. iv); "registration of voters," 2252, 2280, 2289; "officers and duties," 2356 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310, 1313 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2554 (vol. iii).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 1333 (vol. ii).

Muskoka Lakes and River Severn Canal System (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Colonial Exhibitions) 1035 (vol. ii).

Immigration, 2833-2838, 2839, 2843 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 791 (vol. ii).

Wood Supply to Public Buildings, Ottawa (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).

Baker, Mr. E. C., Victoria, B.C.

- Buoys in Victoria and Nanaimo Harbors (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt., (B. 67, 1°) 246 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 963 (vol. ii).
 Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3013-3022; in Com., 3023, 3050 (vol. iv).
 Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1119, 1121, 1124-1129; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1282 (vol. ii).
 Civil Service Employés in B. C., names, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv).
Debates, Official Rep., on conc., 3371 (vol. iv).
 Deep-water Fisheries off coast of B.C. (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).
 Discovery Island, B.C., Lighthouse on (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).
 Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (vol. ii).
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, Length of (Ques.) 743; substitution of Granite for Sandstone (Ques.) 743 (vol. i).

Baker, Mr. E. C.—Continued.

Fisheries Inspector, B.C., name and date of appointment (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1587 (vol. ii); (Ques. of Order) 2015 (vol. iii).

Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).

Great American and European Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret. (correction) 79 (vol. i).

Immigrants settled in B.C. (Ques.) 189 (vol. i).

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2834 (vol. iv).

Indian Affairs in B.C., Cor. between Govt. of Can. and B.C., on M. for copies, 870 (vol. ii).

Indian Reserve Lands in B.C., purchase of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Indian Schools in B.C., establishment of (M. for copies of Cor.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3423 (vol. iv).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).

Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).

Militia, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (vol. iv).

Penitentiary in B.C., suspension of Rules, on M. for copies of Cor., 824 (vol. ii).

Postal Revenue at Vic., (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).

Public Reserves and "fore shore" rights in B.C. (M. for Ret.) 703 (vol. i).

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2916, 2920, 3386 (vol. iv).

Satama Island, B.C., Lighthouse (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).

Sir James Douglas, steamer, Repairs to, &c. (M. for copies of Cor.) 831 (vol. ii).

Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res. and in Com., 1280 (vol. ii).

Superior Court Judges, Quebec, B. 161 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 3375 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dominion Exhibition) 1027 (vol. ii).

Miscellaneous (Chinese Immigration Rep.) 3241 (vol. iv).

Collection of Revenues: Customs, 3237; *Public Works* (agent and contingencies, B.C.) 3308 (vol. iv).

Immigration, 2834 (vol. iv).

Legislation: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing of) conc., 3371.

Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3423 (vol. iv).

Mail Subsidies and Steamships Subventions (U.S. and Vic., B.C.) 2936; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).

Militia (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2915 (vol. iv).

Ocean and River Service (Exam. of Masters and Mates) 2946; (Govt. Steamers) 2946 (vol. iv).

Public Works—Capital: B.C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 2916.

Consolid. Fund: B.C., 3386. *Income: Harbors and Rivers* (Mar. Provs. generally) 2920 (vol. iv).

Telegraph Cable across Juan de Fuca Straits, cost of (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Telegraph and Signal Service in B.C. (Ques.) 743 (vol. i):

Ways and Means—in Com. (steel) 811 (vol. ii); (transportation charges) 3224 (vol. iv).

Beaty, Mr. J., Jun., West Toronto.

Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2433; (Amt.) 2438 (vol. iii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1874-1880 (vol. iii).

Insolvents, discharge of past (B. 34, 1°*) 113 (vol. i).

Insolvents Estates, distribution of (B. 39, 1°*) 113 (vol. i).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 185, (vol. i).

Private Bills, petitions for (M. to extend time for receiving) 40 (vol. i).

Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors (B. 125) prop. Res., 1040-1045; 1°* of B., 1063 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).

Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 272 (vol. i).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 157 (vol. i).

Béchar, Mr. F., Iberville.

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1069 (vol. ii).

Richelieu River Floods, memorials from riparian owners (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).

Ways and Means—The Tariff, on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 739-741 (vol. i).

Belleau, Mr. J. N., Levis.

Immigrant Buildings at Levis, construction of (Ques.) 89 (vol. i).

Official Arbitrators, legislation respecting (Ques.) 88 (vol. i).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 168 (vol. i).

Benson, Mr. T., South Grenville.

Privilege, Ques. of, personal paragraph in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 48 (vol. i).

Ways and Means—in Com. (glucose syrup) 852 (vol. ii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., Beauharnois.

Antwerp International Exhibition (M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com.) 305 (vol. i).

Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, &c. (M. for papers) 928; (reply) 935 (vol. ii).

Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 35, 1°*) 113 (vol. i).

Disturbance in the N.W., prisoners held for trial (remarks) 3440 (vol. iv).

Dom. License Act, working of (M. for Cor.) 307 (vol. i).

Privilege, Ques. of, article in *Toronto News*, French Aggression, &c. (remarks) 1678 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: H. of C. (increased expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Com.) 3449 (vol. iv).

Wheat and Flour Duties, alteration of (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).

Bergin, Mr. D., Cornwall and Stormont.

- British Medical Act and Amts. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.*) 33 (vol. i); Rets. respecting (remarks) 939 (vol. ii).
- Can. Southern Ry. Co. and the Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. (B. 9, 2^o*) 57 (vol. i).
- Factories, employment in, regulation (B. 2, 1^o*) 29; Order for 2^o dschgd., 362; (B. 85, 1^o*) 362; printing of B. in French (remarks) 605; 2^o m., 873-881; Order for rsmng. adjd. deb. on M. for 2^o, 940; (remarks) 943; (Ques. of Order) 944 (vol. ii).
- Factory Rep., printing and distribution of (Ans.) 211 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., (Ques. of Order) 1432; (explanation) 1432 (vol. ii); in Com. (remarks) 2203; "qualifications in counties," 2085 (vol. iii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2819 (vol. iv).
- Inspection of Factories, Res. respecting, on Order for Com. (remarks) 606 (vol. i).
- Militia clothing and great coats, in Com. of Sup., 2907 (vol. iv).
- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 72, 1^o*) 313 (vol. i).
- Rifle Associations, headquarters, annual grant, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 46 (vol. i).
- River St. Clair Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co. (B. 8, 2^o*) 57 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

- Immigration* 2819 (vol. iv).
- Militia* (Clothing and great coats) 2907 (vol. iv).

Billy, Mr. L. A., Rimouski.

- Insolvency (B. 32, 1^o) 101 (vol. i).

Blake, Hon. E., West Durham.

- Address, on the, 8.
- Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Res. (Amt. neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3^o, 3001 (vol. iv).
- Administration of the N.W.T. B. 144 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com. on Res., 2929, 2932-2934; in Com. on B., 2962, 2966; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 2967 (vol. iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467-2469; on M. for 2^o, 2466; in Com., 2541 (vol. iii); 2751; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751 (vol. iv).
- Advances to Local Govts. (M. for Cor., &c.) 45 (vol. i).
- Advances to Provinces B. 7 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. to introd. B., 32; on M. for 2^o, 102 (vol. i); in Com., 1064 (vol. ii).
- Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 905, 922 (vol. ii).
- Allan Line, payments to, for assisted passages (Ques.) 567 (vol. i); (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- American Mining Engineers' visit to N. S., in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Amherst and P.E.I. Ry. Incorp. B. on M. to introd., 349 (vol. i).
- Analysts, Public, Remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2541-2543 (vol. iii).
- André, Father, letter from, in Jan., 1883 (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Antwerp International Exhibition, on Amt. (*Mr. Amyot*) to M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com., 306 (vol. i).
- Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (vol. ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1025, 1026, 1029, 1033 (vol. ii).
- Assistant Rec. Gen. of Montreal, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).
- Auditor and Assist. Rec. Gen. of Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).
- Auditor and Rec. Gen. of St. John, in Com. of Sup., 858 (vol. ii).
- Bank Advances to the Govt. (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
- Bank of B.C. B. 105 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2396 (vol. iii).
- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 47; on M. to ref. His Ex.'s Mess. to Sp. Com., 102 (vol. i).
- Benson, Mr., M.P., Death of (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).
- Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825 (vol. iv).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Auditor Gen., &c., 137 (vol. i).
- Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature (personal explanation) on M. for Com. of Supply, 3445 (vol. iv).
- Boots for the Toronto Militia (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Bounty on Manufactures of Iron (M. for copies of O. C., &c.*) 100 (vol. i).
- Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2^o, 893 (vol. ii).
- British Medical Acts, Rets. respecting (remarks) 939 (vol. ii).
- Brokerage and Commission, in Com. of Sup., 896 (vol. ii).
- Buckram, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
- Can. and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2943 (vol. iv).
- Can. and Germany, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Can. Southern Ry. Co. and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. B. 9 (*Mr. Bergin*) in Com., 245 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on 1^o, 449; on ques. to fix day for 2^o, 713; on M. (*Mr. Jamieson*) to place B. 2nd Order on Pub. Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. for 2^o (Ques. of Order) 952; in Com., 955-957, 960, 961; in Com., 1056; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2645, 2648, 2651, 2654, 2657 (vol. iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 65 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1^o, 235 (vol. i).

INDEX.

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Can. Contingent for the Soudan (Ques.) 563 (vol. i).
- C. P. R., ability of Co. to fulfil engagements under prop. Res., 2238 (vol. iii).
- Agreement by Co. to Terms of Resolution (Ques.) 1915 (vol. iii).
- Allowances to Canadian manufacturers (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 44 (vol. i).
- Amended Plans and Profiles, B.C. (Ques.) 362 (vol. i).
- Avalanches in the Selkirk Range (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).
- Branch Lines (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).
- B. C. Sections, work on (M. for Rep., &c.) 204 (vol. i).
- Calgary and summit of Rocky Mountains, cost of (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Callander and Port Arthur, cost of and equipment (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Change in arrangement between Co. and Govt. (Ques.) 695 (vol. i); 1744, 1913 (vol. iii).
- Correspondence between Co. and Govt. re change in arrangements (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).
- Construction near Lytton, B.C. (M. for Ret.) 225 (vol. i).
- Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res. (reply to annual Stmtnt.) 2586-2619; in Com., 2724-2750; on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2858; on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2859; on Amt. (*Mr. Vail*) 2861; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) 2862; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) 2863; in Com., 3031, 3033; on M. for 3^d, 3293 (vol. iv).
- Cost of construction from Winnipeg to 615 miles west (M. for Stmtnt.) 226 (vol. i).
- Curves, Grades and Tangents (Ques.) 694, 744 (vol. i); 2239 (vol. iii).
- Earnings, main line and leased lines, &c. (M. for Stmtnt.) 61 (vol. i).
- Earnings and Working Expenses, Eastern and Western Division (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Expenditure on account of (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Expenditure on main line between Callander and Port Arthur, and Selkirk and Kamloops (M. for Stmtnt.) 100 (vol. i).
- Expenditure upon branch lines, &c., cost of equipment, &c. (M. for Stmtnts.*) 147 (vol. i).
- Extension to Quebec, papers, &c., 1677 (vol. ii); 2239 (vol. iii).
- Forty Mile Belt in B.C. (remarks) 1983 (vol. iii).
- Grades and Curves on line from foot of Rocky Mts., &c., &c. (M. for Stmtnt. and Plan*) 67 (vol. i).
- Grades and curves on line as far as constructed, exclusive of line from foot of Rocky Mts. to Kamloops (M. for Stmtnt.*) 145 (vol. i).
- Grades and Curves, number of (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- C. P. R., Grades and Curves, maximum and minimum (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).
- Govt. mortgage, changes in relation to (Ques.) 36 (vol. i).
- Govt. Sections in B.C., working of, by contractors (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).
- Homesteads within Ry. Belt (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
- Interest paid to Govt. by Co. on loans (Ques.) 350 (vol. i); 1677 (vol. ii); 1955 (vol. iii).
- Land area in the 48-mile belt accepted by Co., on Stmtnt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 782 (vol. ii).
- Land Grant accepted by Co., number of acres (Ques.) 568, 744 (vol. i).
- Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds, present position of (M. for Stmtnt.*) 100 (vol. i).
- Lands rejected by Co. outside Ry. Belt. (Ques.) 927 (vol. ii).
- Legislation respecting (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
- Levels, Grades, Tangents, &c., from summit of Rockies to Moody (Ques.) 888 (vol. ii).
- Location, &c., land set apart, granted, &c. (M. for map*) 46 (vol. i).
- Location of line in B.C., change of (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).
- North American Contracting Co., position of debt of \$600,000 (M. for Stmtnt.) 145 (vol. i).
- Passenger, Freight and Mixed Trains, running of (M. for Stmtnt.*) 67 (vol. i).
- Port Moody Wharf and Freight Shed (M. for copies of Repts., Plans, &c.) 295 (vol. i).
- Progress Estimates (Ques.) on adjmt. of House, 188; for Feb., 429, (vol. i).
- Proposals made by Co. (attention of Govt. called to) 746 (vol. i).
- Postal and Transport Service (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Rails for Govt. Section, B.C. (Ques.) 1914 (vol. iii).
- Relief of Co. by Govt. (Ques.) 350 (vol. i).
- Rep. of Mr. Van Horne, &c. (M. for copies) 208 (vol. i).
- Res., publication of, in *Mail* newspaper (remarks) 1712 (vol. ii).
- Returns ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmtnt., 482 (vol. i).
- Returns, enquiries for (remarks) 782, 1565 (vol. ii).
- Returns, presentation of (remarks) 3371 (vol. iv).
- Rolling Stock, Eastern Section, Western Division, on M. for Ret., 303 (vol. i).
- Rolling Stock, payment of Duties on, by Co. (Ques.) 888 (vol. ii).
- Roundhouse and buildings in Man. on private property (Ques.) 2030 (vol. iii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- C.P.R., Route, construction, rolling stock, extensions, cash subsidy, land grant bonds, &c., &c. (M. for Stmt.) 44 (vol. i).
- Section B., Engineers' Reps. on re-measurement, re-classification, &c., on M. for copies, 123 (vol. i).
- Section B., Judge Clark's Rep. on award to contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).
- Shareholders in Co., names and addresses, &c. (M. for Stmt.*) 533 (vol. i).
- Stock of \$10,000,000, pledged for a loan of \$4,950,000 (M. for Stmt.) 45 (vol. i).
- Tangents and Curves, number and aggregate length (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).
- Town Sites, sales of, transactions on joint account (M. for Stmt.*) 67 (vol. i).
- Western Terminus, route or routes from Port Moody to English Bay (M. for plan, &c.) 145 (vol. i).
- Canals, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
- Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2° 2439; in Com., 2534-2540 (vol. iii).
- Cape Breton Ry., construction of (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii); survey, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
- Carleton Branch Ry., purchase of, in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).
- Carlton, Evacuation of, Rep. (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Carpet Mats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
- Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 102 (vol. i).
- Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
- Census of Man. and N. W. T., &c., B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res., 74; on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 125; in Com. on B., 171; on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 214 (vol. i).
- Chains, iron or steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Chapleau, Sheriff, communications from *re* outbreak, in the N. W. T., 3426 (vol. iv).
- Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 895-897 (vol. ii).
- Charlinch Post Office, appointment or removal of Postmaster, &c. (M. for papers) 708 (vol. i).
- Chief Justice Meredith, resignation of, on M. for copy, 44 (vol. i).
- Chinese Commissioners' Rep., presentation of (remarks) 235 (vol. i).
- Chinese Commission, rooms rented and payment of Secretary (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
- Chinese Immigration, legislation respecting (Ques.) 505, 632 (vol. i).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 898-900, 902, 905, 907, 914, 917, 922, 924, 972 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 274-282 (vol. i); in Com. on B., 1097-1100

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- 1113-1117, 1125-1130, 1282; on M. for 3° 1293; (Amt.) 1294; neg. (Y. 58, N. 104) 1296; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823, 2397 (vol. iii).
- Clark, G. M. K., sums paid to, on M. for Ret., 698 (vol. i).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3397 (vol. iv).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibition, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Pope*) 461 (vol. i).
- Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1033 (vol. ii).
- Colonization Companies, modification of agreements (M. for copies of Pets., &c.) 92 (vol. i); (Ques.) 1678 (vol. ii); 2241 (vol. iii).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilly*) (remarks) 1671 (vol. ii); in Com., 2396, (vol. iii).
- Communication with Imp. Govt. *re* Troubles in N. W. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act, 1883, Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2936; (vol. iv); in Com., 2968-2970; on M. for Com. on Res., 2527 (vol. iii); in Com., 2529; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3435 (vol. iv).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilly*) on M. for 2°, 126 (vol. i); on Order for 3°, 2532 (vol. iii).
- Consolidation of the Statutes, on presentation of Rep. of Commissioners, 32 (vol. i).
- Cotton Yarns, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- County Court Judges (Man.) B. 162 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3435 (vol. iv).
- Court of Claims for Can. B. 93 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on 1°, 450 (vol. i).
- Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (vol. i).
- Criminal, Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).
- Crozier, Supt., Rep. of *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds, 3425 (vol. iv).
- Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii); in Com. on B., 3044. (vol. iv).
- Customs Collections in Algoma, on M. for Ret., 40 (vol. i).
- Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 924 (vol. ii).
- Customs Seizures, Fines exacted and disposition of same &c. (M. for Stmt.) 56 (vol. i).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means 844 (vol. ii).
- Damask of Cotton, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
- Dams at Lakefield and Young's Point (Ques.) 1130 (vol. ii).
- Death of Col. Williams (remarks) 3074 (vol. iv).
- Debates, Official Rep., on presentation of First Rep., 32, 34 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., 2168 (vol. iii); in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii); conc., 3371 (vol. iv).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Deptl. Clerks, delay in Payment of (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
- Deptl. Contingences, in Com. of Sup., 917, 922, 924 Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Res., 68; (Amt.) to appoint Sel. Com. to consider and report to House, 70; Amt. neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72; (Ques. of Order) 73; in Com. on B., 175 (vol. i).
- Despatches, Official, respecting engagements in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Disturbance in the N. W. (Ques.) 693, 714 (vol. i); 782 (vol. ii).
- Amt. to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 761; neg. (Y. 57, N. 122) 771 (vol. i).
- André, Father, letter from, in Jan., 1883. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Chapleau, Sheriff, communications from, *re* Outbreak. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Claims, &c., of Half-breeds in N.W.T. (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).
- Communication with Imp. Gov. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Crozier, Supt., Rep. of, *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Dewdney, Gov., communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Disposition of Insurgents by Gen. Middleton (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Dumas, Michel, appointment of, as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Dumont, Gabriel, ferry license granted to (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Duck Lake, Engagement at, on reading of telegrams, 790 (vol. ii).
- Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2^o, 2855; in Com., 2855-2857 (vol. iv).
- Free transport of bodies of volunteers killed (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).
- Govt. officials in the N.W., communications with (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Grandin, Bishop, communication from (Ques.) 3321, 3423 (vol. iv).
- Half-breed grievances, 2030-2040; (reply) 2051 (vol. iii).
- Houghton, Col., mission to N.W. in 1884, 3425 (vol. iv).
- Indemnity to members on active service, on prop. M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 812 (vol. ii).
- Information, further (Ques.) 745 (vol. i); 811, 813, 838, 889 (vol. ii).
- Isbester, appointment of, as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Land and Surveys of St. Laurent (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Langevin, Sir Hector, communications from Mr. Jackson, *re* Half-breed Claims (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Disturbance in the N. W. Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Man. Half-breeds, unenumerated, claims of (Ques.) 3428 (vol. iv).
- Memorials, &c., respecting grievances, answer to (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Mission of Hon. Mr. Royal, attention called to newspaper paragraphs, 889 (vol. ii).
- Montreal Garrison Artillery (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Mounted Police Officers, Reps. from, *re* Engagements (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Mounted Police Recruits (remarks) 1566 (vol. ii).
- North-West Council, Res. *re* Half-breed claims (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- On personal explanation of Mr. Ives (remarks) 1064 (vol. ii).
- Official despatches respecting Engagements (remarks) 2999 (vol. iv); (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- Payne and Applegarth, murder of (remarks) 859 (vol. ii).
- Pets., Res., &c., on Half-breeds and settlers' claims (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prince Albert Colonization Co.'s land, settlers' or squatters' improvements (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prince Albert and St. Laurent settlements, Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prisoners held for trial (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3441 (vol. iv).
- Qu'Appelle Half-breeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Question of Order, 3161 (vol. iv).
- *Resumé* of Events since 1878 (speech) 3075-3110; (Res.) in amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213 (vol. iv).
- Riel's proposal to accept money (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- River Lot Claims, settlement of, Mr. Pearce's letter respecting (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Schmidt, Louis, answer to letter of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Laurent, River lots, re-survey (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Stoney Indian rising, further information asked, 863 (vol. ii).
- St. Louis de Langevin, Pet. from settlers (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Surveys of river lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ques.) 3424; mode of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Taché, Archbishop, communication from, *re* Half-breeds (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Telegraphic communication west of Winnipeg (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).
- Troops, movements of (remarks) 838, 872, 887 (vol. ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Disturbance in the N. W. Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 ——— Volunteers, recognition of services of (Ques.) 2029, 2170 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3370 (vol. iv).
 ——— War Supplies, carriage of, by American Rys. (Ques.) 838 (vol. ii).
 Dewdney, Gov., communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Disallowance of Provincial Acts (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 52 (vol. i).
 Dom. and Provincial Franchises, despatch from Mr. Fielding (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
 Dom. Day, sitting of the House on (Ques.) 2773 (vol. iv).
 Dom. Drainage Co's. B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1008 (vol. ii).
 Dom. Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).
 Dom. Lands, alleged frauds and irregularities in the Dept. (Ques.) 1915, 2170 (vol. iii).
 Dom. Lands, Gabriel Dumont's lot on the Saskatchewan (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).
 Dom. Lands in B.C., timber dues (Ques.) 2240 (vol. iii).
 Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 307 (vol. i).
 Dom. Notes, issue and redemption of, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
 Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 939 (vol. ii).
 Dredges, Tugs and Scows, building of, on M. for Ret., 53 (vol. i).
 Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
 Duck Lake, engagement at (remarks) 790 (vol. ii).
 Dumas, Michel, appointment of as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Dumont, Gabriel, ferry license, granted to (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Dundas and Waterloo Road, on prop. Res. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 451 (vol. i).
 Duties, collection of unauthorized (remarks) 427 (vol. i).
 Eastern Extension Ry., repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).
 Earthenware and Stoneware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
 Easter, adjmt. for (Ques.) 713 (vol. i).
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Co.'s Agent (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii); Township Surveys, 2171 (vol. iii).
 Elections since General Election, 1878, date of certificates, date of receipt, issue of Speaker's Warrants, receipt, &c., &c. (M. for Stmt.) 210 (vol. i).
 Establishment of a Model Farm, in Com. of Supply, 3453 (vol. iv).
 Exchange Bank, Govt. advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 373 (vol. i).
 Excise Duties, conc. 3295 (vol. iv).
 Explosive Substances B. 95 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 893; in Com., 1167 (vol. ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Extract of Fluid Beef, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
 Extradition Arrangement, Cor. between Govt. of Can. and Ambassador at Washington (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 147 (vol. i).
 Extradition, demands for, and proceedings taken (M. Stmt.*) 67 (vol. i).
 Factory B. (Ques.) 29; B. 2, on M. to dischg. Order for 2°, 362 (vol. i).
 Factory Commission, Rep. of, distribution of (remarks) 455, 478 (vol. i).
 Finances of the Country (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (vol. iv).
 Financial Commissioner in Eng., in Com. of Sup., 896 (vol. ii).
 Financial Inspector, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).
 Fish, in Com. on Ways and Means, 859 (vol. ii).
 Fish taken in the Miramichi, on M. for Ret., 295 (vol. i).
 Five per ct. Consolid. Loan, retirement of, on M. for copies of O.C., 488 (vol. i).
 Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 221 (vol. i).
 France and Quebec, fortnightly line, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2937, 2939 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on 1°, 629 (vol. i); on Order for 2° being called (remarks) 1095; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1177-1192; in Com., "usufructuary" 1448, 1450, 1452, 1456, 1457; "person" (Indian) 1487, 1565; "farm," 1591 (vol. ii); on disqualifying revising barrister, 2086; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104-2111, 2161, 2163; "registration of voters," 2173, 2177, 2180, 2231, 2312; "revision of voters' lists," 2346; "qualifications in counties," 2395; "appeal," 2395 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2759; on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059 (vol. iv); on personal explanation of Mr. Mills, 2140 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1510, 1512 (vol. ii); 2144 (vol. iii).
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures, 2026, 2028 (vol. iii).
 French Half-breeds at St. Laurent, Claims of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Fort William, Ont., Indian Reserve, Road on (M. for copies of Cor.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Free transport of bodies of Volunteers killed in the N. W. (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).
 Fuel for settlers in the N. W. (M. for copies of Cor. &c.) 61 (vol. i).
 Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Act Amt. B. 119, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 837 (vol. ii); on M. for 2°, 2419 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1311 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2549 (vol. iii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Glamis, Post-office, enquiry respecting (Ques.) 1131 (vol. ii).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 851 (vol. ii).
- Gold Reserve, Govt. withdrawls, on M. for copies of Cor., 354 (vol. i).
- Gosselin, Eugène, record in the matter of, on M. for copy, 704 (vol. i).
- Govt. Agents in the N. W. T., Fees from Settlers (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Bonds, disappearance of, from vaults of Dept. (Ques.) 3371 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 451 (vol. i); (Ques.) 895; on M. to take in Wednesdays, 965; on M. to take in Mondays, 1336 (vol. ii); (remarks) 3293, 3371; on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) on prop. Res., 2462; in Com., 2464; on M. to conc. in Res., 2525 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Officials in the N. W., communications with, (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Gov. Genl.'s Sec's. Office, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Grandin, Bishop, communications with Govt. (Ques.) 3423 (vol. iv).
- G. T. R., Imperfect Ret. presented by Mr. Hickson (remarks) 861 (vol. ii).
- Guns used in fight with Poundmaker (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
- Half-breed Claims in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Commission, Claims recognized and rejected (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii); sittings of (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed grievances, 2030 - 2040; (reply) 2051 (vol. iii).
- Halfbreeds and Indian Reserves and Homesteads (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breeds and Settlers' claims, Pets. and Res. (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Half-breed (Man.) Minors, claims preferred and rejected (Ques.) 2169; temporarily absent (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii); unenumerated (Ques.) 1743, 3426 (vol. iv).
- Half-breed Plots on the Saskatchewan (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Scrip (Ques.) 1914 (vol. iii).
- Half-breed, Settlement of Claims (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Settlement, undisturbed occupation (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Halifax Steam Navigation Co., moneys paid by Govt. to (M. for copies of Reps., &c.) 210 (vol. i).
- Hamilton Provident and Loan Society B. 114 (*Mr. Kilvert*) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).
- Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148, on M. to conc. in Res., 2534 (vol. iii).
- Heating Public Buildings, cost of (M. for Stmtnt.) 90 (vol. i).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- High Commissioner, office of (M. for copies of Cor.) 44; Rep. and Despatches to Govt. (M. for copies) 56; position or salary of (M. for Rep.*) 210 (vol. i).
- Hoop Iron, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
- Homesteads within the Ry. Belt (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).
- Houghton, Col., Mission of, in 1884, to N. W., 3425 (vol. iv).
- House Furnishing Hardware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Hughes, D. J., Charges against, on M. for Ret., 99 (vol. i).
- Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s B. 69 (*Mr. Tyrwhitt*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1387 (vol. ii).
- Imitation precious Stones, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Supply, 2831-2834, 2836-2838 (vol. iv).
- Immigrants to the N. W. (M. for Stmtnt.) 45 (vol. i).
- Imperial Govt. and N.W. Troubles, Communication with (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Indemnity to Members, increase of, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).
- Indemnity to Members on active service in the N.W., on prop. M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 821 (vol. ii).
- Indians of Fort William Reserve, Cor. between and Indian Dept. (M. for copies*) 1442 (vol. ii).
- Indian Reserve, Victoria Arm, B.C. (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).
- Indian Troubles at Metlakatla, on M. for copies of Cor., 305 (vol. i).
- Industries of Canada, Commission respecting (M. for copy of Com., O.C., Cor., &c., also Rep., &c.) 56 (vol. i).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts, 2397 (vol. iii).
- Inland Revenue Dept., in Com. of Sup., 917 (vol. ii).
- Insolvent Debtors, distribution of Assets provision B. 4, (*Mr. Beaty*) on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1280 (vol. ii).
- Inspecting Engineers' Salaries, C.P.R., in Com. of Supply, 3417 (vol. iv).
- Inspection of Factories, Res. respecting, on Order for Com. (remarks) 606 (vol. i).
- Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 84 (vol. i).
- Insurgents in the N.W., disposition of by Genl. Middleton (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
- I. C. R. and Beaver Steamship Line, through rates of freight (M. for Cor.) 144 (vol. i).
- Cost of equipment (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Costs of working, &c., from 1879 to 1884 (M. for Stmtnt.) 202 (vol. i).
- Earnings and Working Expenses, monthly (Ques.) 76, 114; for Jan., 1885, 428 (vol. i); for March and April, 2029 (vol. iii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- I.C.R., Earnings and Working Expenses (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).
 ——— Equipment, valuation of (Ques.) 888 (vol. ii).
 ——— Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3300 (vol. iv).
 ——— Sale of Tickets on Chatham Branch (Ques.) 2238 (vol. iii).
 Internal Economy Commission, increased expenditure, in Com. of Sup., 3449 (vol. iv).
 International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
 Interior, Dept. of, receipts (M. for Stmt.) 54; Deptl. Rep. (remarks) 49 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 972 (vol. ii).
 Interior, Minister of, absence (remarks) 1131 (vol. ii).
 Iron, Bounties on manufactures of (M. for copies of O.C., &c.*) 100 (vol. i).
 Isbester J., appointment of, as farm instructor (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Judicial Reform in the N.W.T., Petitions, &c. (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii).
 Justice, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).
 Justices of the Peace, summary proceedings before (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).
 Jute cloth, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
 Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 986 (vol. ii).
 Kits served out to the Militia (Ques.) 1568 (vol. ii).
 Land Claims in N. W. T., duties of Mr. Russell (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Land Grants and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N. W.—(M. for copies of Cor.), 92-97 (vol. i).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 782 (vol. ii); 2440-2443; in Com. on Res., 2483-2491, 2494, 2497-2503, 2514-2517; on M. to conc. in Res., 2533 (vol. iii); on M. for 2°, 2770; in Com. on B., 2855; on M. for 3°, 2890; (Amt.) 2891; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; (Amts.) 2894 (vol. iv).
 Langevin, Sir Hector, communications from Mr. Jackson, *re* Half-breed Claims, 3426 (vol. iv).
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 503 (vol. i).
 Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communications with Government (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 991, 2801, 3448-3450 (vol. iv).
 Librarian of Parliament, office of (Ques.) 41 (vol. i).
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John*) on prop. Res., 1659; in Com., 1667-1670, (vol. ii). 2760 (vol. iv).
 License Act, 1883, decision of Supreme Court (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Licenses or Permits to cut Timber, &c., applications for and not granted (M. for Rets.*) 209 (vol. i).
 Lieut.-Govt. of N.B. (Ques.) 362 (vol. i).
 Lingan Mines, C.B., aiding civil power at, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Wood, Westmoreland*) on M. for 1°, 170 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, constitutionality of (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2402 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768 (vol. iv).
 Liquor License Act, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).
 Loan, recent, on M. for copy of prospectus, &c., 37 (vol. i).
 Local Govts., advances to (M. for Cor.) 45 (vol. i).
 Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N.W., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).
 Mail Robberies in Man. and N. W. T. (M. for copies of Cor.) 91 (vol. i).
 Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 2937, 2939, 2943, 2945 (vol. iv).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2778-2780, 2783; on M. to conc. in Res., 2824; in Com. on B., 3047-3049 (vol. iv).
 Man. Legislature, Session of 1884, Man. Central Ry. Co. (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii).
 Man. South-Western Colonization Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2497-2503, 2514-2517 (vol. iii).
 Man. Indian Agency, Management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).
 Manufacturing Industries of Canada, Rep. on (remarks) on absence of information respecting B.C., 595 (vol. i).
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 907 (vol. ii).
 Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 129; in Com., 215.
 Meeting of the House, irregular time (remarks) 2996 (vol. iv).
 Memorials, &c., respecting grievances in the N. W. T., Answers to (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Meredith, Chief Justice, resignation of, on M. for copy, 44 (vol. i).
 Metlakatla, Indian Troubles at, on M. for copies of Cor., 305 (vol. i).
 Middleton, Genl., instructions (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii); respecting insurgents (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 3045; in Com., 3046 (vol. iv).
 Militia Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 899 (vol. ii).
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 3412, 3452 (vol. iv).
 Minister of the Int., absence of (Ques.) 964 (vol. ii).
 Minister of Rys., office of (Ques.) 41 (vol. i).
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 1304 (vol. ii) 2234 (vol. iii); 3396, 3434; 3452-3457 (vol. iv).
 Mission of Hon. Mr. Royal, attention called to newspaper paragraphs, 889 (vol. ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Model Farm, Establishment of, in Com. of Sup., 2453 (vol. iv).
 Montreal Garrison Artillery, (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).
 Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (vol. ii).
 Musk, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
 Navigation in Can. Waters B. 132 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1278 (vol. ii); on M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 2399 (vol. iii).
 North Shore Ry., Use of by C.P.R. (Ques.) 1915 (vol. iii).
 North-West Council, Res. *re* Half-Breed Claims (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 North-West Council, Salaries, conc., 3396 (vol. iv).
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2483-2491, 2494 (vol. iii).
 North-West Mounted Police B. 140 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 3°, 2822 (vol. iv).
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res. (Stmnt. of Events) 2403-2412, 2415-2418 (vol. iii); on M. to conc. in Res., 2423-2425; on M. for 2° and in Com., 2770; on M. for 3°, 2820 (vol. iv).
 North-West Mounted Police, Commissioner's Rep. (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).
 North-West Mounted Police, increase of force (Ques.) 2169 (vol. ii).
 North-West Mounted Police, Officers Reps. of Engagements, 3425 (vol. iv).
 Mounted Police Recruits, North-West (remarks) 1566 (vol. ii).
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
 Ocean Mail Service, Annual Cost, &c. (M. for Stmnt.) 204 (vol. i).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2752; on M. to conc. in Res., 2754; on 1°, 2757; on M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 3375 (vol. iv).
 Ontario Boundary, proposals to Parlt. (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
 Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s bonds (M. for copy of prospectus, &c.) 145 (vol. i); Stockholders (M. for Stmnt.*) 1443.
 Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1225 (vol. ii).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., N.S., projected line (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 145 (vol. i).
 Papers in respect of the N.W. (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Patent Act Amt., 1882, B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1°, 234; on M. for 2°, 268 (vol. i).
 Patents issued to Settlers in Prince Albert (Ques.) 964 (vol. ii).
 Payne and Applegarth, murder of, by Indians in N.W., 859 (vol. ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Penitentiaries Branch (Justice) in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 986-938 (vol. ii).
 Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).
 Personal Explanations (Speech in [Local Legislature], 1837; (Dominion and Ontario Politics), 2093; (on insertion of remarks in Official Debates.) 2541, 2621 (vol. iii).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) and Rule read, 1891-1894 (vol. iii).
 Pickles and Sauces, in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (vol. ii).
 Plans and Surveys of St. Laurent Settlement, Receipt of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Plate Glass, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
 Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Nav. Co. B., on M. to refer back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Rys., &c., 713 (vol. i).
 Postmaster, Asst., of Ottawa, allowance to, conc., 3397 (vol. iv).
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii).
 Post Office Savings Bank, depositors in, on M. for Ret. 822 (vol. ii).
 Prince Albert Colon. Co.'s Township Surveys (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).
 Prince Albert Colon. Co.'s land, Settlers' or Squatters' improvements (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
 Prince Albert and St. Laurent Settlements, Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
 Printing and Printing Paper, in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2801 (vol. iv).
 Printing, &c., in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
 Printing Com., 2nd Rep., on M. to conc. in, 149 (vol. i).
 Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 171 (vol. i); article in *Hamilton Spectator re* Disturbance in the N.W., 813; article in *Toronto News, French Aggression, &c.*, 1679 (vol. ii); on personal explanation of Mr. Edgar, 1955 (vol. iii); *re* J. E. Brown's Cor., 3246; personal allusions, 3248 (vol. iv).
 Privy Council: in Com. of Sup., 899 (vol. ii).
 Proof of Entries and Books of Acct. B. 113 (*Mr. Chapleau*) 2398 (vol. iii).
 Provincial Acts, disallowance of (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 52 (vol. i).
 Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c., in Com. of Sup., 3434 (vol. iv).
 Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished Lord Lorne and party, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).
 Qu'Appelle Half-breeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
 Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co.'s Agreement' (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Railways, in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3413, 3415, 3418 (vol. iv).
- Ry. Lands in B.C., Claims of Canada upon (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Rys. outside of Man. and N.W.T., aid to (M. for copies of Cor.) 92 (vol. i).
- Rebellion in the N.W. See "Disturbance."
- Receipts of Department of Interior (M. for Stmt.) 54 (vol. i).
- Refund of duties to persons in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).
- Relief of Distressed in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).
- Repatriation of French Canadians, Cor., Reps., O. C., &c., relating to (M. for copies*) 533 (vol. i).
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3406 (vol. iv).
- Returns, enquiries for, 455, 715, 746 (vol. i); 895, 966, 1039, 1132, 1167, 1608 (vol. ii); 2392 (vol. iii).
- Returns, enquiries for, N.W. papers, 2676 (vol. iv).
- Returns, imperfect (remarks) 113, 504 (vol. i); 1206 (vol. ii).
- Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (vol. i).
- Resumé of Events in the N.W., in Com. on Ways and Means, 3075-3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105,) 3213 (vol. iv).
- Richelieu Ont., and Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on prop. Amt., 1210; in Com., 1349 (vol. ii).
- Rideau Canal, Land Damages in Township of Pittsburgh, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
- Riel's proposal to accept money (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Rites of religion refused prisoners in the N.W. (remarks) 2998 (vol. iv).
- River lots (N.W.) Claims, settlement of, *Mr. Pearce's* letter respecting (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Roache, M., and Pilotage Commission (Ques.) 3427 (vol. iv).
- Roundhouse at Selkirk erected on private property, Issue of Patent (Ques.) 2171 (vol. iii).
- Rubber, re-covered, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
- St. Clair Rancho Co., Rent paid, &c., (Ques.) 2240 (vol. iii).
- St. Laurent, Land and Surveys of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Laurent river lots, re-survey (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Louis de Langevin, petition from Settlers (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Peter and St. Paul: on M. for adjmt., 2889 (vol. iv).
- St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 81 (vol. i).
- St. Vincent De Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 986-988 (vol. ii).
- Salmon Fishing in Bathurst Harbor, regulations, &c., (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

- Salt Cake, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
- Saunders & Wood, Trial of, for Criminal Libel in N.W.T. (M. for copies*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Schmidt, Louis, answer to letter of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Schmidt, Louis, and others, of Prince Albert District, employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 1915 (vol. iii).
- Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name, 2321 (vol. iii).
- Sea Lots of P. E. I., Deptl. instructions, &c. (M. for copies) 61 (vol. i).
- Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 900 (vol. ii).
- Sessional Business (remarks) 211 (vol. i).
- Senate Expenses, extra, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).
- Settlement of claims of Man. half-breed Minors (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).
- Settlement of Settlers Claims at Prince Albert, &c. (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
- Settlers' and Half-breed claims, Prince Albert District, &c., incomplete Rets. (remarks) 1645 (vol. ii).
- Settlers' Claims, Prince Albert District (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
- Settlers in the Dom. during calendar year 1884 (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
- Settlers in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
- Select Standing Com., on M. for Sp. Com., 28 (vol. i).
- Sheep Scab, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
- Sheet Iron hollow ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
- Short Line Ry. between Oxford and New Glasgow, in Com. of Sup., 3413 (vol. iv).
- Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic Ports, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 193; Ret. with ref. to (Ques.) 289 (vol. i.); Govt. grants to (Ques.) 1678 (vol. ii); (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii); on Res., 2974-2978, 2988 (vol. iv).
- Simpson, G. A., Govt. Land Agent (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
- Sir James Douglas*, steamer, repairs, &c., on M. for copies of Cor., 832 (vol. ii).
- Sleeping Cars, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
- Small Savings, encouragement of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 90 (vol. i).
- Spirits taken out of bond (Ques.) 3371 (vol. iv).
- Standing Committees, non-meeting of, for organisation (remarks) 54, 67 (vol. i).
- Starr, J. E., Fishery Overseer of Port Williams, N. S., removal of (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Statutes, Consolidation of, on presentation of Rep. of Commissioners, 32 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 777 (vol. ii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. Mc. Lelan*) on prop. Res., 1279 (vol. ii); on 2^o and in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).
- Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 803 (vol. ii).
- Stoney Indian rising, further information, 863 (vol. ii).
- Subsidies to Rys. other than the C. P. R. (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 56 (vol. i).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res. 2974-2978, 2988-2990; in Com. on B., 3399; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts., 3403; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 43, N. 79), 3404 (vol. iv).

Superannuation Fund (M. for Stmt.) 56 (vol. i).

Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 271 (vol. i).

Superior Court Judges, Quebec, B. 161 (*Sir John*) on prop. Res., 3375 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice, 3411 (vol. iv).

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, care of) 1025; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1033; (Criminal Statistics) 1026; (Dominion Exhibition) 1026; (Mortuary Statistics) 1029 (vol. ii).

Canals—Income: Rideau (Land damages in Township of Pittsburgh) 3418 (vol. iv).

Charges of Management (Asst. Rec. Genl., Montreal) 895; (Auditor and Rec. Genl., St. John) 895; (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Genl., Winnipeg) 895; (Brokerage and Commission) 896; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 896; (Financial Inspector) 895; (Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes) 897; (Printing Dom. Notes) 897; (Printing, &c.) 897 (vol. ii).

Civil Govt. (Agriculture, Dept. of) 905, (contingencies) 922; (Customs Dept., contingencies) 924; (Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office) 898; (Inland Revenue Dept., Contingencies) 917; (Interior, Dept. of) 972; (Justice, Dept. of) 898, (Penitentiaries Branch) 914; (Marine, Dept. of) 907; (Militia, Dept. of) 899; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902; (Privy Council) 899; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 900 (vol. ii).

Collection of Revenues: Post Office (Allowance to Asst. Postmaster of Ottawa) conc., 3397 (vol. iv).

Immigration, 2831-2838 (vol. iv).

Legislation: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii); conc., 3371 (vol. iv); (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Com.) 3449; (increased Indemnity to Members) 3450; Miscellaneous (printing and printing paper, &c.) 2798 2801. Senate (extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).

Liquor License Act, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Can. and Antwerp) 2943; (Can. and Germany) 2945; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 2939 (vol. iv).

Militia (Aiding civil power at Lingan Mines, O.B.) 3452; (Barracks at London) 3412 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (American Mining Engineers' visit to N. S.) 3457 (vol. iv); (Disturbance in the N. W., Vote of \$700,000) 1304 (vol. ii), (Vote of \$1,000,000) 2234, conc., 2235 (vol. iii); (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453 (vol. iv); (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N. W. T.) 3454; (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (N. W. Council, salaries) conc., 3396; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c.) 3434; (Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished to Lord Lorne and party) 3452; (Refund of duties to persons in P. E. I.) 3455; (Relief of distressed in N. W. T.) 3455 (vol. iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 2945 (vol. iv).

Penitentiaries (Dorchester) 989; (Kingston) 986; (St. Vincent de Paul) 986-988 (vol. ii).

Pensions (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii).

Quarantine (Sheep scab) 3411 (vol. iv).

Railways—Capital: C. P. R. (Inspecting Engineers' salaries, &c.) 3417; Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415; I. C. R. (sleeping cars) 3418. Repairs, &c. (I. C. R.) 3300; (Eastern

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

Extension) 3301; Short Line Ry. between Oxford and New Glasgow, 3413 (vol. iv). *Incoms*: Cape Breton Ry. (Survey, &c.) 3418 (vol. iv).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on Order for 2°, 102; on M. for 2°, 157 (vol. i).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction Limitation B. 68, on M. to introd., 246 (vol. i).

Surveys and Plans of Battleford and Edmonton (Ques.) 2357 (vol. iii).

Surveys of River Lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ques.) 3424; Mode of (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).

Taché, Archbishop, Communication from, *re*-Half-breeds (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).

Tagging Metal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).

Tariff, The. *See* "Ways and Means."

Tariff Chagnes, Notice of, by Govt. (remarks) 714 (vol. i).

Telegraphic communication west of Winnipeg (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).

Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. 2935 (vol. iv).

Timber Licenses and Permits granted on lands outside disputed Territory (M. for Rets.*) 209 (vol. i).

Timber on Indian Lands, non-printing of Rets. as ordered by House (remarks) 56 (vol. i).

Towels, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).

Trade relations with U.S. (remarks) 3163 (vol. iv).

Treasury Board, constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1°, 630 (vol. i); in Com., 1670.

Trent Valley Canal, Plans and Estimates of cost, &c. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 144 (vol. i); Contracts (M. for copies) 823 (vol. ii).

Troops, Movements of (remarks) 838, 872, 887 (vol. ii). Umbrella or parasol ribs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).

Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ques.) 3424 (vol. iv).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).

Volunteer Corps organised in the N. W. in 1879 (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).

Volunteers in the N. W., Recognition of services of (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3370 (vol. iv).

Volunteers on active service, Increase of pay (Ques.) 2170 (vol. iii).

Volunteers of 1837-38, on Res. recognising services of, 38 (vol. i).

Vote of \$700,000 for expenses in the N. W., in Com. of Sup. 1304 (vol. ii); \$1,000,000 for same purpose, in Com. of Sup., 2234; \$1,700,000, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2559 (vol. iii).

War Supplies, carriage of, by American Rys. (Ques.) 838 (vol. ii).

Blake, Hon. E.—Continued.

Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses. on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901, (vol. iv).

Washington Treaty, Transport Regulations, Papers, &c. (Ques.) 3249 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: conclusion of Deb. (remarks) 662; on M. for Com. (Res.) Disturbance in the N. W., 756-761; neg. (Y. 57, N. 122) 771; in Com., 772-775; (buckram) 807; (carpet mats) 856; (chains, iron and steel) 849; (cotton yarns) 808; (cutlery) 844; (damask of cotton) 858; (duck) 808; (earthenware and stoneware) 847; (extract of fluid beef) 857; (fish) 859; (glucose syrup) 851; (hoop iron) 807; (house furnishing hardware) 849; (imitation precious stones) 846; (jute cloth) 806; (musk) 806; (pickles and sauces) 843; (plate glass) 856; (rubber, re-covered) 807; (salt cake) 806; (sheet iron hollow ware) 857; (steel) 803; (tagging metal) 806; (towels) 858; (umbrella or parasol ribs, &c.) 858; (winceys) 840 vol. ii; (whiskey) 3220, vol. iv; (white shellac) 806; (woollen fabrics) 841, (vol. ii); on Res. granting \$1,700,000 for N. W. Troubles, 2559 (vol. iii); (Res.) *Resumé* of Events in the N. W. T. 3075-3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213; Excise Duties, on cons., 3295 (vol. iv).

Weights and Measures Inspection Acts. Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 832, 834-836; in Com., 1676 (vol. ii).

Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 216 (vol. i).

Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports, on M. for Ret., 139 (vol. i).

Whiskey, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3230 (vol. iv).

White Shellac, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).

Winceys, in Com. on Ways and Means, 840 (vol. ii).

Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co. Incorp. B. 82 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 428 (vol. i).

Woollen Fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 841 (iv).

Woolen Rags, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783, 785, 792; Legislation respecting (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).

Writ for Levis (Ques.) 633 (remarks) 661 (vol. i).

Blondeau, Mr. C. B., Kamouraska.

Agricultural Ins. Co. of Can., incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1386 (vol. ii).

Caron, Clovis, Salary and expenses as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 290; (M. for copies of Rep.*) 532 (vol. i).

Gauvreau, Jules, salary and expenses as Fishery Overseer (Ques.) 290; (M. for copies of Rep.*) 532.

Gregory, J. U., Rep. of enquiry made by, *re* Fisheries (M. for copies*) 532 (vol. i).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*), in Com., 2977 (vol. iv).

Bossé, Mr. J. G., Centre Quebec.

Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 283 (vol. i).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497 (vol. i).

Bossé, Mr. J. G.—Continued.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3282-3284 (vol. iv).

Bourassa, Mr. F., St. John's, Q.

Militiamen of 1812, Pensions to, names and residences (M. for Stmt.) 101 (vol. i).

Bourbeau, Mr. D. O., Drummond and Athabaska.

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 99, 1°) 605 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*), in Com. (Amt.) 955, 962; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1047; in Com., 1058, 1059 (vol. ii).

Bowell, Hon. M., North Hastings.

Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
Administration of Justice N. W. T., in Com. of Sup. 3433 (vol. iv).

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (B. 143, 1°*) 2356 (vol. iii).

Analysts, Public, Remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2544, 2547 (vol. iii).

Asbestos, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).

Auditor Genl.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).

Axle Grease, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).

Bank of B. C. B. 205 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2396 (vol. iii).

Barrels containing Petroleum or its products, in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (vol. ii).

Beet-root Sugar, importation of (Ans.) 744 (vol. i).

Bonded Machinery in use (Ans.) 3321 (vol. iv).

Borax, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).

Bounty to Fishermen, Payment of, in Guysboro', N.S. (Ans.) 2751 (vol. iv).

Brosseau & Lisabelle, Customs Brokers, frauds, &c., by (Ans.) 1387 (vol. ii).

Buckram, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).

Campbellton and Gaspé, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).

Can. and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942-2944; conc., 2596, (vol. iv).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 955, 967 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Advances to Co. by Govt. (Ans.) 1306 (vol. ii).

———— Floating Debt of Co. (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).

———— Interest payments by Co. (Ans.) 1955 (vol. iii).

———— Length of gaps on (explanation) 838 (vol. iii).

———— Rolling Stock, payment of Duties on by Co., 889 (vol. ii).

———— Sums paid or advanced to Co. as Interest or Subsidy (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).

Canals, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3303, 3307, 3311 (vol. iv).

Canned Goods (B. 142 1°*) 2345 (vol. iii).

Carleton Branch Ry., Purchase of, in Com. of Sup., 3416 (vol. iv).

Chains, Iron or Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 896, 897 (vol. ii); conc., 2763 (vol. iv).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 901, 904, 915, 916, 921, 923, 927, 957, 977 (vol. ii); 3408, 3410, 3411, 3433 (vol. iv).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1114–1117, 1119, 1120, 1124, 1125; on Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) to M. for 3^o (Ques. of Order) 1299 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 975, 977 (ii).
- Clearing vessels without Harbor Master's certificate (Ans.) 862 (vol. ii).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3233–3241, 3393 (vol. iv).
- Colored Labels for Fruit, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
- Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) 2^o m. (remarks) 1671 (vol. ii); in Com., 2336 (vol. iii).
- Commutation of Stamp Duty, in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2529 (vol. iii).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2433, 2438; on Order for 3^o, 2433 (vol. iii); M. to recom. and in Com., 2768 (vol. iv).
- Cotton Bed-quilts, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- Cotton Yarns, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- Customs Appraiser at Summerside, P.E.I. (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).
- Customs and Excise Duties (B. 157) 1^o, 3520; 2^o*, 3434; in Com., and 3^o*, 3435 (vol. iv).
- Customs Dept., in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).
- Customs Dept., French Canadian employés in (Ans.) 1914 (vol. iii).
- Customs Detectives or Police in N.S. (Ans.) 889 (vol. ii).
- Customs, in Com. of Supply, 3233–3241, 3393 (vol. iv).
- Customs Seizures at Winnipeg, on M. for Stmt., 293 (vol. i).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (vol. ii).
- Damask of Cotton, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
- Debates, Official Rep. (M. for Sel. Com.) 28 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Debt of Canada, Floating and Unfunded (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Supply, 916, 921, 923, 915, 927 (vol. ii).
- Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3358 (vol. iv).
- Disturbance in the N.W.T., Expenses (B. 149, 1^o*) 2559 (vol. iii); 2^o m., 2855 (vol. iv).
- Further Intelligence, 812 (vol. ii).
- On Question of Order, 3161 (vol. iv).
- Drawbacks on manufactured Exports, on M. for Ret., 139 (vol. i).
- Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- Duties, collection of unauthorised (remarks) 427 (vol. i).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- Duty on Grain, abolition of, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 54 (vol. i).
- Earthenware and Stoneware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 848 (vol. ii).
- Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).
- Estimates. See "Message."
- Excise Duties, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3294; conc., 3470 (vol. iv).
- Excise Revenue for May, 1884, and May, 1885 (Ans.) 2531 (vol. iii).
- Expenses of Elections under Can. Temp. Act, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (vol. iv).
- Exports of Canadian produce (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).
- Extract of Fluid Beef, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
- Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 901, 915 (vol. ii).
- Financial Commissioner in England, in Com. of Sup., 896 (vol. ii).
- Fishery Clauses, termination of (Ans.) 3249 (vol. iv).
- Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3391; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).
- Fish, in Com. on Ways and Means, 859 (vol. ii).
- Five per cent. Loan Sinking Fund (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- France and Quebec fortnightly line, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2936, 3041 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, 1435, 1465, 1619 (vol. ii); 1920 (vol. iii); in Com., "actual value," 1596–1607; on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1497 (vol. ii); 1758, 1799, 2189 (vol. iii); "occupant," 1483; (corrections) 1419, 1491; on M. to adja. deb., 1430; "tenant," 1478–1480; on M. that Com. rise, 1497 (vol. ii); on personal explanation of Mr. Blake, 2542; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1995; "in counties," 2061; "revision of voters' lists," 2348; "appeal," 2361; "general provisions," 2344 (remarks) 2015 (vol. iii).
- Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2025 (vol. iii).
- Foot Grease, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
- French Canadians in Customs Dept. (Ans.) 2171 (iii).
- Gas Coke, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (vol. ii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1315 (vol. ii).
- Geneva Gin and Brandy, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224, 3229.
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3348 (vol. iv).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 840–862, 855 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Bonds, disappearance of, from Vaults, 3371 (iv).
- Govt. Loans (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Loan (B. 145) prop. Res., 2461–2463; in Com., 2463 (M. to conc. in Res.) 2523.
- Govt. Notes in circulation (Ans.) 2465 (vol. iii).
- Grant of \$1,700,000 for N.W. Expenses, in Com. on Ways and Means, 2532, 2559 (vol. iii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- G.T.R., Importation of Rails (Ans.) 1566 (vol. ii).
 Hoop Iron, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (vol. ii).
 House Furnishing Hardware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 848 (vol. ii).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2818, 2839, 2853 (vol. iv).
 Imports for Consumption, on M. for Stmt., 30 (vol. i).
 Importation of Prison Manufs. (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 Indemnity to Members, increased, 3450 (vol. iv).
 Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3410 (vol. iv).
 Insurance, Superintendence of, in Com. of Sup., 2957; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
 Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3403 (vol. iv).
 Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
 Jute Cloth, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2765, 2796, 3448-3450 (vol. iv).
 Library, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
 Life-boats and Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2949 (iv).
 Liverpool, or London, and St. John, N.B. or Halifax, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).
 Loans contracted by Govt. (Ans.) 1305, 1744 (vol. ii); 1914, 2530 (vol. iii).
 Loans for the Public Service, prop. Res., 2392 (vol. iii).
 Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N.W., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).
 McManus, C., widow of, gratuity to, conc., 3374 (vol. iv).
 Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions, in Com. of Sup., 2936-2944, 2957, 2953, 3041 (vol. iv).
 Manitoba Claims Settlement (B. 155) prop. Res., 2420 (vol. iii); M. for Com. on Res., 2775 (vol. iv); in Com., 2789, 2791-2795; in Com. on Res., 2823, 2924 (vol. iv); 2° m. and in Com., 3047; 3° m., 3075 (vol. iv).
 Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
 Message from His Ex., Estimates, The (presented) 289 (vol. i).
 ——— Supplementary Estimates, 1884-85 (presented) 2820 (vol. iv).
 ——— Further Suppl. Estimates for 1885-86 (presented) 3423 (vol. iv).
 ——— Supplementary Estimates for 1885-86 (presented) 3359 (vol. iv).
 ——— Grant of \$1,000,000 for expenditure in the N. W., (presented) 2234 (vol. iii).
 ——— Vote to Genl. Middleton (presented) 3470 (iv).
 Military Branch and District Staff, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).
 Militia, in Com. of Sup., 2903.
 Mineral Waters, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. iii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 2234, 3245, 3358 (vol. iii); 3387, 3388, 3391, 3392, 3396, 3420, 3434, 3452, 3454-3456, 3470 (vol. iv).
 Mouldings and Picture Frames, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
 Mounted Police, N. W., in Com. of Sup., 3421 (vol. iv).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303, 3307 (vol. iv).
 Musk, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
 N. B. and P. E. I. to Great Britain. Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).
 Newfoundland and Dom., Trade relations between (Ans.) 3042 (vol. i).
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2946, 2949 (vol. iv).
 Order Paper, on omission from, of a question (remarks) 2774 (vol. iv).
 Partridge, Prairie Fowls, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
 Peachy, J. W., Superannuation of (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 3374, 3411 (vol. iv).
 Pitch Pine, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).
 Plate Glass, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
 Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C. B., Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).
 Port Mulgrave, N.S., as a sub-port, on M. for papers, &c., 446 (vol. i).
 Postmaster Genl.'s Dept., in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).
 Post Office and Finance Dept., computing interest, in Com. of Sup., 927 (vol. ii).
 Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (Ans.) 2465 (iii);
 Printing Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3392 (vol. iv).
 Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, 3163 (vol. iv).
 Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c., conc., 3434 (vol. iv).
 Public Debt of Can., amount of (Ans.) 927 (vol. ii); 2465 (vol. iii).
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2917, 3420 (vol. iv).
 Pumice and Pumice Stone, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).
 Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished Lord Lorne and party, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).
 Quercitron or Oak Bark, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).
 Ques. of Order, in Com. on Ways and Means, 852 (ii).
 Railways, in Com. of Sup., 3416 (vol. iv).
 Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).
 Receipts and Expenditures, Consolidated Fund (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).
 Red Liquor, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
 Refund of Bank Imposts, in Com. of Sup., 3387; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).
 Refund of Duties to persons in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 3455; conc., 3470 (vol. iv).
 Relief of Distressed in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).
 Removal of prisoners, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.

- Return, on enquiries for (remarks) 211 (i) ; 2854 (iv).
 Ross, N.N., of Quebec, name and salary of successor to (Ans.) 862 (vol. ii).
 Rubber, re-covered, in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (ii).
 St. Croix Cotton Mills, payment of Duties (Ans.) 632 (i).
 Salt Cake, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (vol. ii).
 Senate Expenses, extra, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).
 Seizures by Customs Dept. at Montreal (Ans.) 1387 (ii).
 Sessional Clerks, extra, in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
 Sheet Iron Hollow Ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
 Silver and German Silver, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
 Spirits and Tobacco, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3212-3216 (vol. iv).
 Spirits taken out of bond (Ans.) 3371 (vol. iv).
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 803-805, 808, 810 (ii).
 Subsidies to Man. (prop. Res.) 2889 (vol. iv).
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3219-3222 (iv).

SUPPLY :

- Administration of Justice*, 3411, 3433 (vol. iv).
Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303, 3307; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3311 (vol. iv).
Charges of Management, conc., 2763 (vol. iv); (Commutation of Stamp Duty, &c.) 897; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 896; (Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes) 897 (vol. ii).
Civil Govt. (Auditor Genl.'s Office) 901; (Civil Service Examiners) 975, 977; (Customs, Dept. of) 901, (contingencies) 916, 921, 923; (Finance and Treasury Board) 901, (contingencies) 915 (vol. ii); (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 3410; (Interior, Dept. of) 3408 (vol. iv); (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904; Deptl. Contingencies (Post Office and Finance Depts., computing interest) 927 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues: Customs, 3223-3241, 3303 (vol. iv).
Geological Survey, 3348 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2818, 2839, 2853 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 2765; (Election Expenses) 3451; (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450; (Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2796. Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796; printing, paper, &c.) 2798, 2801, 2806. Senate (Extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Campbellton and Gaspé) 2942; (Can. and Antwerp) 2942-2944, conc., 2958; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2936, 2942, 3041; (Liverpool or London and St. John, N.B., or Halifax) 2942; (New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island to Great Britain) 3457; (Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C.B.) 2942 (vol. iv).
Militia (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2903 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 3245; (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3358 (vol. iv); (Disturbance in the N. W., Vote of \$1,000,000) 2234 (vol. iii); (Expenses of Election under Can. Temp. Act) 3388; (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3391, conc., 3396; (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N. W. T.) 3454; (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c.) conc., 3434; (Printing Commission) 3392; (Purcell & Ryan, payment to, for supplies furnished Lord Lorne and party) 3452; (Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary) 3420; (Refund of Bank Imposts) 3387, conc., 3396; (Refund of Duties to persons in P. E. I.) 3455, conc., 3470; (Relief of Distressed in N. W. T.) 3454 (vol. iv).
North-West Mounted Police, 3421 (vol. iv).
Ocean and River Service (Examination of Masters and Mates) 2946; (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2949 (vol. iv).

Bowell, Hon. M.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Penitentiaries*: Kingston (Gratuity to widow of C. McManus) conc., 3374; (Removal of prisoners) 3411 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Consol. Fund (Telegraphs) 3420. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 2917 (vol. iv).
Railways—Capital: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3416 (vol. iv).
Superintendence of Insurance, 2957; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
 Supply (B. 163) 1^o*, 2^o*, 3^o*, 3470 (vol. iv).
 Tagging Metal, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
 Tariff, The. See "Ways and Means."
 Tar Pine, in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (vol. ii).
 Towels, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan (B. 150, 1^o) 2751 (vol. iv); M. for Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii); 2^o m., 2934; in Com., 2935 (vol. iv).
 Trade and Navigation Rets. (presented) 28 (vol. i).
 Trade Relations with U. S. (remarks) 3163 (vol. iv).
 Transportation Charges, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (vol. iv).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3311 (vol. iv).
 Umbrella or Parasol ribs, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
 Vote of \$1,000,000 for the N. W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 2234 (vol. iii).
 Washington Treaty, Transport Regulations, papers, &c. (Ans.) 3249 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: in Com., 772-776; (asbestos) 857; (axle grease) 857; (barrels containing petroleum, &c.) 843; (borax) 808; (buckram) 807; (chains, iron or steel) 849; (colored labels for fruit) 857; (cotton bed quilts) 857; (cotton yarns) 808; (cutlery) 844; (damask of cotton) 858; (duck) 808; (earthenware and stoneware) 848; (extract of fluid beef) 857; (fish) 859; (foot grease) 806; (gas coke) 783; (Geneva gin and brandy) 3224, 3229; (glucose syrup) 849-852, 855; (hoop iron) 807; (house furnishing hardware) 848; (jute cloth) 806; (mineral water) 808; (mouldings and picture frames) 846; (musk) 806; (partridge, prairie fowl, &c.) 853; (pine tar) 810; (pitch pine) 810; (plate glass) 856; (pumice and pumice stone) 810; (quercitron or oak bark) 810; (red liquor) 803; (rubber, re-covered) 807; (salt cake) 806; (sheet iron hollow ware) 857; (silver and German silver) 808 (vol. ii); (spirits and tobacco) 3212, 3216, 3225 (vol. iv); (steel) 803-805; (steel, in sheets) 808; (steel, No. 20 gauge) 808; (steel railway bars or rails) 810 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3219-3222 (vol. iv); (tagging metal) 806; (towels) 857 (ii); (transportation charges) 3224 (vol. iv); (umbrella or parasol ribs, &c.) 858 (vol. ii); (whiskey) 3225 (vol. iv); (white shellac) 806; (woollen fabrics) 800, 841; (woollen rags), 783, 786, 792 (vol. ii); conc., 3520, Excise Duties, in Com., 3294; conc., 3470 (vol. iv); (Res.) granting \$1,700,000 for N. W. Expenses, 2532, 2559 (vol. iii).

Bowell, Hon. M.—*Continued.*

- Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).
 Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports, on. M for Ret., 138 (vol. i).
 Whiskey, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225 (vol. iv).
 White Shellac, in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
 Woollen Fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 800, (ii).
 Woollen Rags, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783, 786, 792; legislation respecting (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).

Bryson, Mr. J., Pontiac.

- Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1215 (vol. ii).

Burns, Mr. K. F. Gloucester.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. "qualifications in cities and towns," 1809 (vol. iii).
 Way and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 595-599 (vol. i).

Burpee, Mr. C., Sunbury.

- Administration of Justice in N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3^o, 3429 (vol. iv).
 Bounty to Fishing Vessels (M. for Stmt.) 98 (vol. i).
 Can. and Jamaica, Confederation of (M. for copies of Cor.) withdn., 505 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to conc. in Amt. (Amt.) 1047 neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050 (vol. ii).
 Charlottetown Public Buildings, construction of (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).
 Coal entered ex-warehouse, free, or for exportation (M. for Stmt.) 100 (vol. i).
 Drawback on Shipbuilding Materials (M. for Ret.) 100 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian), 1522 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1810, 1987, 1991, 2001; "manhood suffrage," 1959; "qualifications in counties," 2004, 2058, (Amt.) 2060, 2073, 2079; "who shall not vote" (Indians) (Amt.), 2120; "registration of voters," 2251 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1502 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3058; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063 (vol. iv).
 I. C. R. Casualties to Trains, &c. (M. for Ret.) 100 (i).
 ——— Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmt.*) 101 (vol. i).
 ——— Rolling Stock, Purchase and Building of (M. for Ret.*) 101 (vol. i).
 Lughrin, Charles H., and Sec. of State, Cor between, re Can. Temp. Act (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1004 (vol. ii).
 St. Stephen's, N.B., Post Office, receipts, &c. (M. for Stmt.*) 1100 (vol. ii).

Burpee, Mr. C.—*Continued.*

- Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, in Com. on Res., 2986; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts. 3403 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys., B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2986; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts, 3403 (vol. iv).
 Trade Relations with foreign Countries (Ques.) 78; with Jamaica, 429 (vol. i).

Cameron, Mr. D. M., West Middlesex.

- A. B. and C. Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).
 ——— Officers and men, pay and allowances (M. for Ret.*) 313 (vol. i).
 Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2905 (vol. iv).
 Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36 (*Mr. Orton*) on Res., 119 (vol. i).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1107, 1111-1114, 1117-1119, 1121, 1122, 1126; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3^o, 1292 (vol. ii).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 979, 982 (ii).
 Depl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).
 Doutre, J., services re Halifax Commission, 3392 (iv).
 Drill pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2911 (vol. iv).
 Duty on Grain, Abolition of (M. for copies of Cor.) 54 (vol. i).
 Fisheries protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).
 Fishery Commission, Increased remuneration to Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3391 (vol. iv).
 Flour, corn and cornmeal imported and exported (M. for Ret.) 56 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1373-1379 (vol. ii); in Com., "woman suffrage," 1440; "person" (Indian) 1493; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1699-1707, 1890, 1895-1900, 1994, (Amt.) 1999, 2002; "manhood suffrage," 1973; "registration of voters," 2193-2197, 2263; "qualifications in counties," 2061, (Amt.) 2071, 2073, 2077, 2084, 2085, 2395; "who shall not vote," 2102, (Indians) 2149-2152, (Amt.) 2274, (Amt.) 2285, 2289, 2291; "appeal," 2395; on M. for consideration of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066 (vol. iv); on M. that Com. rise, 2209 (vol. iii).
 G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure (M. for Ret.) 816 (vol. ii).
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 2451 (vol. iv).
 Liquor License Act, administration of, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).
 Military Branch, &c., Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).
 Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 2906, 2909 (vol. iv).
 Morgan, J. H., Appointment as Forestry Commissioner (M. for O. C., &c.*) 147 (vol. i).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).
 Private Banks and Brokers, legislation respecting (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).

Cameron, Mr. D. M.—Continued.

Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 979, 982 (vol. ii); (Militia, Dept. of, contingencies) 2913 (vol. iv).

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3310 (vol. iv).

Legislation: H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3451 (vol. iv).

Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).

Militia (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2914; (Ammunition) 2905; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2906-2909; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2911; (Royal Military College) 2913; (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2903 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (Fishery Commission, Increased remuneration to Counsel) 3391; (Doutre, J., Services on Halifax Commission) 3392 (vol. iv).

Subsidies to Ry. Co.'s, names of officers (M. for Ret.*) 312 (vol. i).

Ways and Means—in Com. (re-covered rubber) 807 (vol. ii).

Cameron, Mr. Hector, North Victoria.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); on M. for 2°, 949; in Com., 954, 956, 957, 961, 962 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2644, 2650, 2652, 2654, 2655, 2660, 2673; (Amt.) 2674 (vol. iv).

Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, &c., on M. for Papers, 931 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Resolutions, &c., in Com., 2746, 2748 (vol. iv).

Dom. Drainage Co.'s Bill 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).

Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for resuming adjd. deb. for 2°, 941 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1393; (correction) 1397; "tenant," 1477; "registration of voters," 2180, 2230, 2233 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1424; on M. that Com. rise, 1435; on Ques. of Order, 1435 (vol. ii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310, 1313, 1315, 1316 (vol. ii).

G. T. B. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure, on M. for Ret., 817 (vol. ii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2491, 2493 (vol. iii).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497, 499 (vol. i).

North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2491, 2493 (vol. iii).

Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1219 (vol. ii).

Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 82, 1°*) 349; 2° m., 428; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 428; (B. 91, 1°*) 428.

Cameron, Mr. Hugh, Inverness.

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1057 (vol. ii).

Cameron, Mr. Hugh—Continued.

Cape Breton Island, claims of, under terms of Confederation (prop. Res.) 607-615; withdn., 615 (vol. i).

Eastern Extension Ry., N.S., Earnings and Working Expenses (Ques.) 148; (M. for Stmt.)* 313 (vol. i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage" (correction *re* Indians) 1419; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1629-1632, 1836 (vol. ii); "in counties," 2395; "registration of voters," 2278, 2283 (vol. iii).

Great American and European Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret., 79 (vol. i).

McIsaac's Pond, Inverness, N.S., as a harbor of refuge (Ques.) 36; Engineers' Reps. respecting (M. for copies) 60 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., as a sub-port, on M. for papers, &c., 445 (vol. i).

Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1015 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY :

Railways—Capital: Eastern Extension Ry., 3384 (vol. iv).

Telegraph System in Cape Breton, extension of (Ques.) 78 (vol. i).

Cameron, Mr., M. C., West Huron.

Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2962 (vol. iv).

Bell and Kavanagh, Land Claims (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 479 (vol. i).

Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825, 2827 (vol. iv).

Boots for the Toronto Militia Corps (Ques.) 1744 (iii).

Business of the House, on M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1745 (vol. iii).

Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 901, 913, 918, 921, 925 (ii).

Claims of unenumerated Half-breed Minors, Man. (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).

Cox Divorce (B. 138, 1°*) 1473 (vol. ii).

C. P. R., Change of Arrangements with Govt. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).

—— Postal and Transport Service (Ques.) 1744 (iii).

—— Res. respecting further Loan (Speech) 2630; (Amt.) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; on M. to rec. Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 2858 (vol. iv).

—— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 108 (vol. i).

Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3356 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N. W., communication with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 1744; Half-breed grievances (*Mr. Blake*) 2045-2051 (vol. iii); on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3154-3160, 3163-3175 (vol. iv).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921 (vol. iv).

Elections Acts Amt. (B. 14, 1°) 41 (vol. i).

Emerson, Town of, Govt. aid to (Ques.) 148; (M. for copies of Claims, &c.*) 448 (vol. i).

Evidence, Law of, in Criminal Cases (B. 6, 1°*) 29; 2° m., 176; 2° on a div. and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496-498 (vol. i).

Cameron, Mr. M. C.—Continued.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1138-1143; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1394, 1438; "owner," 1472; "tenant" (Amt.) 1475, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indian) 1502, 1527, 1580; "farm," 1591, 1592; "farmers' sons" (Amt.) 1591; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1692-1699 (vol. ii), 1924-1931; "in counties," 2074; "registration of voters," 2216-2220, (Amt.) 2227, 2241, 2274-2277, 2281-2284, (Amt.) 2286, 2300, 2302-2305, 2313, 2317, 2319; "revision of voters' lists," 2321, 2326-2329, 2332, 2345-2348; "general provisions," 2344, 2345, 2351-2354; "officers and duties," 2356, 2389; "appeal," 2360-2366; "offences," 2390 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1421, 1437, 1531; on taking up items consecutively, 1471; (Ques. of Order) 1494 (vol. ii), 1919 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3060; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3067, neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Business, on, M. to take in Thursdays, 452 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2920 (vol. iv).
- High Commissioner, in Com. of Sup., 925 (vol. ii).
- Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).
- Indians, Man. and N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3319, 3339 (vol. iv).
- Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 918, 921 (ii).
- I. C. R. Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1066, 1073, 1092; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1325; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) 1329 (vol. ii).
- International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2508-2511, 2521 (vol. iii).
- Land Sales or Settlement in the N.W. south of 24-mile Belt (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases, compellable witness (B. 6, 1°*) 29; 2° m., 176; 2° on a div. and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496-498 (vol. i).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2797 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parliament B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1666 (vol. ii).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
- License Commissioners, Board of, appointments by Govt. under Act of 1883, receipts and expenditures, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 46 (vol. i).
- Liquor License Act, administration of, conc. 3398 (iv).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, litigation in Supreme Court (M. for copies of O.C., Factum of Govt. and Provs., Notes of Shorthand Reporters, Rep. of Court, &c., &c.) 45 (vol. i).
- Liquor License Act, 1883 (prop. Res.) 928, 1211; conc. in Res. asked, 1226; M. to conc. in Res., 1281 (ii).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2400 (vol. iii); in Com., 2894; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2959 (iv).

Cameron, Mr. M. C.—Continued.

- Loans contracted by Govt. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
- Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (vol. iii).
- Man., Claim for a subsidy (Ques.) 188 (vol. i).
- Man. Half-breed minors, temporarily absent, and claims of unenumerated (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).
- Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., Land Grants to, in Com. on Res., 2508-2511 (vol. iii).
- Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 130 (vol. i).
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3356 (vol. iv).
- Ontario Law Reports, in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).
- Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, re Timber Regulations in B. C., 2240 (vol. iii).
- Proof of Entries in Books of Acct. B. 113 (*Mr. Chappleau*) 2397 (vol. iii).
- Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2920, 2921 (vol. iv).
- Rys. and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 913 (ii).
- Rebellion. See "Disturbance."
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 292 (vol. i).
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. (B. 45, 1°*) 147; 2° m., 362, 490 (vol. i).
- Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404; neg. (Y. 35, N. 77) 3408 (vol. iv).
- Returns, non-production of (remarks) 427 (vol. i).
- Settlement of Claims of Man. Half-breed minors (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).
- Sessional Clerks, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Govt.*:—Deptl. Contingencies (High Commissioner) 925; (Inland Revenue) 918, 921; (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 901; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).
- Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) 3319, 3329 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: H. of C. (Coms., extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2796; Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796, 2797 (vol. iv).
- Liquor License Act*, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3356; (Ont. Law Reps.) 3351 (vol. iv).
- Public Works—Income*: Dredging, 2921; Harbors and Rivers, (Ont.) 2920 (vol. iv).
- Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 2828; in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).
- Squatters in Township 3, Ranges 23 and 24 west (M. for Ret.) 231 (vol. i).
- Timber Licenses or Permits to cut (Amt.) to M. for Ret., 30 (vol. i).
- Ways and Means*—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in the N.W., 3154-3160, 3163-3175 (vol. iv).

Campbell, Mr. C. J., Victoria, N.S.

- Argyle Highlanders, payment of Arrears due (Ques.) 888; (M. for Ret.*) 1444 (vol. ii).
- Bird Island Lighthouse, N. S., Management of (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
- Volunteers disbanded in Military District No. 9 (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Campbell, Mr. R., South Renfrew.

- Franchise B. 108 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (remarks) 2385 (vol. iii).
Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3471 (vol. iv).

Carling, Hon. J., London.

- Assistant Postmaster at Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3393 (vol. iv).
Brandon, Postmaster at, Salary and allowances (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).
Calgary and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ans.) 351 (vol. i).
Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii); conc., 2764 (vol. iv).
Charlch Post Office, appointment or removal of Postmaster, &c., on M. for papers, 708 (vol. i).
C.P.R. Postal and Transport Service (Ans.) 1744 (ii).
Depositors in Post Office Savings Banks, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. i).
Glamis Post Office, enquiry respecting (Ans.) 1131 (ii).
G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, on M. for Ret., 818 (vol. ii).
Le Fonds Post Office, establishment of (Ans.) 816 (ii).
Letter Postage, reduction of (Ans.) 33; on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 292 (vol. i).
Mail Bags, furnishing of (Ans.) 964 (vol. ii).
Mail Service between Antigonish and Sherbrooke (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).
Mail Service on the Canada Southern Ry., on M. for Ret., 120 (vol. i).
Mails between Shiloh and Fergus (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).
Maitland, Postmaster at, removal of (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).
Medicine Hat and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ans.) 351 (vol. i).
Militia Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract (B. 151) prop. Res., 2420; M. for Com. on Res., 2555; in Com., 2557 (vol. iii); M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2751; on M. to conc. in Res., 2756; 1°* of B., 2757 (vol. iv).
Postal Privileges, Extension to Local Govts. (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii); conc., 2764 (vol. iv).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 76 (vol. i).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3308-3310, 3393; conc., 3398 (vol. iv).
Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (Ans.) 2359, 2559 (vol. iii).
Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res., (*Mr. Chapleau*) 271 (vol. i).
U. S. and Victoria, B. C., Mail Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 2936 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902 (vol. ii), conc., 2764 (vol. iv).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3308-3300; (Allowance to Asst. Postmaster at Ottawa) 3393; conc., 3398 (vol. iv).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (U.S. and Vic., B.C.) 2936 (vol. iv).
Militia (Barracks at London) 3412 (vol. iv).

Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A., Quebec County.

- A. B. and C. Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).
Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (M. to conc. in Rep. of Com. on Res.) 2957; 1°* of B., 2958; in Com., 2961, 2963, 2967; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 3001, 3427 (vol. iv).
Administration of the N. W. T. prop. Res., 2531 (iii); in Com. on Res., 2926, 2929, 2932 (vol. iv).
Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2903-2906 (vol. iv).
Argyle Highlanders, payment of Arrears due (Ans.) 888 (vol. ii).
Artillery Association, Dom., in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).
Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).
Barrack Huts, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).
Batoche, Battle of, telegram from Genl. Middleton giving details (read) 1822; second despatch, 1835 (iii).
Batoche, capture of, rumored indignities committed by Volunteers, 2999, (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
Bergin, Surgeon Genl., Services of (Ans.) 1914 (vol. iii).
Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. (B. 131) 2° m. and in Com., 2824-2826 (vol. iv).
Big Bear, release of Prisoners by (tel. read) 2750 (iv).
Blais, Achille, funeral expenses of (Ans.) 2169 (vol. ii).
Boots for the Toronto Militia (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).
Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).
Census in Man. and N. W. T. (Ans.) 149 (vol. i).
Census of the N. W. T., &c. (Res.) 74 (vol. i).
Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 898; conc., 914 (vol. ii). 2913 (vol. iv).
Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1127 (vol. ii).
Clarke's Crossing, arrival of Troops at (telegrams read) 1205 (vol. ii).
Clothing and Great Coats, in Com. of Sup., 2908 (vol. iv).
Copyright, Law of, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Edgar*) 712 (vol. i).
Corpsndts., Dismissal of, from Camp (Ans.) 1608 (ii).
C. P. R., Port Moody and Savona's Ferry, extension of time (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (vol. i).
Death of Col. Williams (remarks) and telegram read from Genl. Middleton, 3073 (vol. iv).
Despatches, Official, respecting engagements in the N.W. (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii), 2999 (vol. iv).
Disturbance in the N. W., arrival of troops at Clarke's Crossing (telegrams read) 1205 (vol. ii).
—— Battle of Batoche, telegram from Genl. Middleton giving details (read) 1822; 2nd despatch, 1835 (iii).
—— Batoche, capture of, rumored indignities committed by Volunteers, 2999 (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
—— Carriage of War Supplies by Am. Rys., 839 (ii).
—— Col. Ouimet's absence from duty 1167, 1205 (ii).
—— Col. Otter's march to Battleford 1386 (vol. ii).
—— Col. Scott's Battalion (Ans.) 1064 (vol. ii).
—— Cost of Expedition (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii).
—— Despatch from Genl. Middleton announcing capture of Poundmaker and other Indians, 2139 (vol. iii).

Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—Continued.

- Disturbance in the N. W., Dismissal of Correspondents from Camp (Ans.) 1608 (ii).
 ——— Disposition of Insurgents by Genl. Middleton (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 ——— Duck Lake, Engagement at, despatch of Troops (Ans.) 790 (vol. ii).
 ——— Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 2855; in Com., 2856–2858 (vol. iv).
 ——— Free transport of bodies of Volunteers killed (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).
 ——— Funeral expenses of Blais (Ans.) 2169 (vol. ii).
 ——— Further intelligence (Ans.) 811, 813 (vol. ii).
 ——— Indians at Touchwood (tel. read) 1566 (ii).
 ——— Instructions issued to Genl. Middleton respecting Insurgents (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 ——— Houghton, Col., Mission of (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Montreal Garrison Artillery (Ans.) 1566 (ii).
 ——— Official despatches respecting Engagements (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii); 2999 (vol. iv).
 ——— Personal explanations, 966 968 (vol. ii).
 ——— Pillage of houses of Half-breeds by Volunteers (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 ——— Release of Prisoners by Big Bear (telegram read) 2750 (iv).
 ——— Rescue of Mrs. Delaney, Gowanlock, and other prisoners, telegram from Genl. Middleton (read) 2357 (vol. iii).
 ——— Riel, capture of, telegram from Genl. Middleton (read) 1895 (vol. iii).
 ——— Skirmish with Poundmaker (Ans.) 1646 (vol. ii).
 ——— Troops, movements of, from N. S. (Ans.) 838. 872; tel. from Col. Amyot, 1328 (vol. ii).
 ——— Victoria Rifles, Montreal (Ans.) 1983 (vol. iii).
 ——— Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3459 (Res.) 3463 (vol. iv).
 Dominion Rifle Association, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com of Sup., 2910 (vol. iv).
 Duck Lake, Engagement at, despatch of Troops (Ans.) 790 (vol. ii).
 Eastern Extension Ry., N.S., Earnings and Working Expenses (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
 Elgin Station, L'Islet, Erection of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
 Employment of Prisoners outside of Gaols B. 87 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 1063; 2° m., 1658 (ii).
 Equipment of the 90th Battalion (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).
 Expedition to the N. W., Cost of (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii).
 Expense (N. W. T.) B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2° 2855; in Com., 2856–2858 (vol. iv).
 Flannel Shirts for Militia, Contract (Ans.) 1306 (ii).
 General Middleton's Instructions (Ans.) 1306 (vol. ii).
 Grant, G., Militia Dept., Superan. of (Ans.) 2531 (iii).
 Houghton, Col., Mission of, to N. W. (Ans.) 3425 (iv).
 Improved Rifled Ordnance, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).
 Indians at Touchwood (tel. read) 1566 (vol. ii).
 Instructions issued to Genl. Middleton respecting insurgents (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 Insurgents, Disposition of, by Genl. Middleton (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).

Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—Continued.

- Justices of the Peace, Summary proceedings before B. (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).
 Kits served out to the Militia (Ans.) 1568 (vol. ii).
 Laurie, Maj. Genl., Mission of, to the N. W. (Ans.) 2997 (vol. iv).
 Lavis's patent Pole and Militia Tents (Ans.) 2029 (iii).
 Man. Legislature, Session of 1884, Man. Central Ry. Co. (Ans.) 862 (vol. ii).
 Martin, John, continuation of Pension to Widow of, on M. for copies of Pet., 201 (vol. i).
 Medals for Volunteers who served in the N. W. (Ans.) 2274 (vol. iii).
 Middleton, Genl., despatches from, 1822–1835 (vol. ii); 1895, 2139, 2357, 2750 (vol. iii).
 Military Branch, &c., Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2889 2903 (vol. iv).
 Military Col. Graduates in the Militia (Ans.) 1040 (ii).
 Military Magazine at St. John, N.B., Disposal of, on M. for Ret. 606 (vol. i).
 Military Organisations in Man. and N. W. T. (Ans.) 863 (vol. ii).
 Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
 Military Storehouse, Quebec, Lease (Ans.) 1039 (ii).
 Militia Act, 1853, Amt. (B. 152, 1°) 2853; 2° m., 3045; in Com., 3046 (vol. iv).
 Militia and Defence, Annual Rep. (presented) 40 (vol. i).
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 898, 914 (vol. ii); 2913 (vol. iv).
 Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 2235, 2434.
 Montreal Garrison Artillery (Ans.) 1566 (vol. ii).
 Mounted Infantry, Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 2412–2414, 2418 (vol. iii).
 Oter's, Col., march to Battleford (remarks) 1386 (vol. ii).
 Ouimet's, Col., absence from duty (remarks) 1167, 1205 (vol. ii).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 266 (vol. i).
 Pensions, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).
 Personal Explanation, 966; (remarks) 963 (vol. ii).
 Pillage of houses of Half-breeds by Volunteers (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 Poundmaker and other Indians, capture of, despatch from Genl. Middleton (read) 2139 (vol. iii).
 Powder Magazines at Fort Howe, St. John, N.B. (Ans.) 247 (vol. i).
 Protestant Volunteers in the 65th Battalion (remarks) on newspaper paragraph, 2998; telegram from Col. Ouimet (read) 3094 (vol. iv).
 Rebellion. See "Disturbance."
 Rescue of Mrs. Delaney, Gowanlock and other prisoners, telegram from Genl. Middleton (read) 2357 (iii).
 Riel, capture of, tel. from Genl. Middleton (read) 1895 (vol. iii).
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2913; conc., 2932 (vol. iv).

Caron, Hon. J. P. R. A.—Continued.

Scott's Col. Battalion (Ans.) 1064 (vol. ii).
 Settlers in the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
 Skirmish with Poundmaker (Ans.) 1646 (vol. ii).
 Summary proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 2420 (iii); 2° m., 2827 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt. (Militia, Dept. of) 898; (contingencies) 914 (vol. ii); 2913 (vol. iv).
Militia (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2914; (Ammunition) 2903-2906; (Barracks at London) 3412; (Barrack Huts, B.C.) 3412; (Brigade Majors' Salaries, &c.) 2903; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2906, 2908-2910; (Dom. Artillery Association) 2913; (Dom. Rifle Association) 2913; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2910; (Improved Rifled Ordnance) 2915; (Military Properties, care of) 2916; (Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg) 3411; (Royal Military College) 2913, conc., 2922; (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2889, 2903 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous: Disturbance in the N.W. (Vote of \$700,000) 1304 (vol. ii); (Vote of \$1,000,000) 2235, 2434 (vol. iii).
Pensions (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii).
 Supreme Court of N. B., causes entered, &c., on M. for number, 294 (vol. i).
 Transfer of Batteries (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).
 Troops, movements of (Ans.) 838, 872; telegram from Col. Amyot, 1328 (vol. ii).
 Veterans of War of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).
 Veterans of 1812, extension of Pensions to Widows of, (Ans.) 36 (vol. i).
 Victoria Rifles, Montreal (Ans.) 1983 (vol. iii).
 Volunteers killed, Free Transport of bodies (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).
 Volunteers in the N. W. and Intoxicating Liquors (Ans.) 1131 (vol. ii).
 Volunteer Corps in the N.W., organization of, in 1879 (Ans.) 1474 (vol. ii).
 Vote of \$1,000,000 for N.W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 2434, 2235 (vol. iv).
 Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3459, (Res.) 3463 (vol. iv).
 Williams, Col., Death of (remarks, and tel. read) 3073 (iv).
 War Supplies, carriage of, by American Rys., 839 (vol. ii).
 Waterproof Blankets for Volunteers, purchase of (Ans.) 2171 (vol. iii).
Ways and Means—Disturbance in the N. W. (Res. granting \$1,700,000) in Com., 2532 (vol. iii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J., Huron, South Riding.

A. B. and C. Batteries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2914 (iv).
 Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).
 Address, on The, 24 (vol. i).
 Administration of Justice, in Com. of Sup., 3411, 3433, 3448 (vol. iv).
 Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3428 (vol. iv).
 Advances to Provinces B. 7 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. to introd., 32 (vol. i).
 Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 906, 921 (vol. ii).
 Air Brakes, application of, on I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3299 (vol. iv).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

Allan Line, payments to, for assisted passages (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
 Allowance to Assistant Postmaster at Ottawa, in Com. of Sup., 3392; conc., 3397 (vol. iv).
 American Gold, substitution of, for Sovereigns (Ques.) 505 (vol. i).
 Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2904, 2906 (vol. iv).
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1023 (vol. ii).
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1023, 1027, 1034 (vol. ii) 3452; conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
 Axle Grease, in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (vol. ii).
 Baillairgé, G. F., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv).
 Bank Advances to Govt. (M. for Rets. of amounts) 37; (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
 Bank of B. C. B. 105 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1°, 631 (i).
 Bolton, Staff Commander and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Aud. Genl., &c., 138 (i).
 Budget, The (Ques.) 76, 149; (reply) 333 (vol. i).
 Can. and Antwerp Steamship subvention, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
 Can. and Germany Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 65 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1°, 235 (vol. i).
 C. P. R. Advances to Co. by Govt. (Ques.) 1305 (vol. ii).
 — Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on Res. (remarks on adjmt. of deb.) 2643; in Com., 2724, 2729, 2730, 2738; on Amt. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2859 (vol. iv).
 — Engineers' Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3417.
 — Expenditure to complete Govt. construction (Ques.) 1130 (vol. ii).
 — Loan, \$30,000,000 payments on account of (Ques.) 1130 (vol. ii).
 — Publication of prop. Res. in *Mail* newspaper (remarks) 1712 (vol. ii).
 — Rets. ordered by House since date of contract, on M. for Stmt., 483 (vol. i).
 — Section B, Judge Clarke's Report on award to contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).
 — Subsidy to Co., in Com. of Sup., 3296 (vol. iv).
 Canals, in Com. of Sup., 3301, 3303, 3433 (vol. iv).
 Capital Account, Expenditure on (M. for Stmt.) 45 (i).
 Catholic population of Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 363 (i).
 Census, Quinquennial, of Man. and N.W.T., &c., B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) on 1°, 46; in Com. on Res., 76; in Com. on B., 171; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 212; neg. (Y. 62, N. 120) 215 (vol. i).
 Census, The, Fourth and Fifth vols., issue of (Ques.) 48, 455 (vol. i).
 Census of 1881, Absentees from Canada during (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).
 Charges of Management, in Com. of Sup., 2763 (vol. iv).
 Chinese Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3387; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).
 Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res., 3023 (vol. iv).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 906, 908, 910, 912, 914, 916, 921, 969 (vol. ii); 2764, 3408, 3411, 3448; conc., 2764, 3433 (vol. iv).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 276, 280 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res., 892; in Com., 1097, 1100, 1104, 1114; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) to recom., 1286 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2396 (vol. iii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973 (vol. ii).
- Clark, G. M., sums paid to, apart from salary as Judge (Ques.) 235; (M. for Ret.) 697 (vol. i).
- Clothing and Great Coats (Militia) in Com. of Sup., 2906 (vol. iv).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3232–3237, 3241, 3242, 3397 (vol. iv).
- Collins, J. E., sums paid to, for services, on M. for Ret., 699 (vol. i).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibitions B. 126 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. to conc. in Res., 1064 (vol. ii).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2430, 2433, 2436 (vol. iii).
- Consolid. Receipts and Expend. (M. for Ret.*) 30 (vol. i)
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act, 1883, Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2970 (vol. iv).
- Cornwall Canal, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).
- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154, in Com., 3043 (vol. iv).
- Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- Customs and Excise Receipts for June, 3073 (vol. iv).
- Customs Collections in Algoma, on M. for Ret., 40 (i).
- Customs, Dept. of (contingencies) in Com. of Sup., 925 (vol. ii); 3233–3237 (vol. iv).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (vol. ii).
- Debates, Official Rep. of, delay in distributing daily edition to newspapers (remarks) 595 (vol. i); omission from (remarks) on adjmt. of Hse., 3249; on M. to conc. in 4th Rep. of Com., 3459; in Com. of Sup., 3383 (vol. iv).
- Deposits in Banks, Govt. (M. for Stmt.) 29 (vol. i).
- Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3353 (iv).
- Dep. Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26, on Amt. (*Mr. Royal*) 72 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Assistance to families of Militiamen (remarks) 894 (vol. ii).
- Dismissal of correspondents from camp (Ques.) 1608 (vol. ii).
- Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2857 (iv).
- Further information asked, 886 (vol. i).
- On adjmt. of deb. (remarks) 3160, 3212 (iv).
- On Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 765 (vol. i).
- Half-breed grievances (*Mr. Blake*) 2042–2044 (vol. iii).
- Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3463 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands, Rev. for 7 months, 1884–85 (Ques.) 290.

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Sales of, for 1884–85 (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).
- Sales for 1884–85 (Ques.) 3072 (vol. iv).
- Sales and receipts, on account of (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).
- Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 989 (vol. ii).
- Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).
- Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3300 (vol. iv).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to (prop. Res.) 295, 363; (reply) 390; neg. (Y. 59, N. 118) 394 (vol. i).
- Excise, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- Excise Revenue for May, 1884, and May, 1885 (Ques.) 2531 (vol. iii).
- Excise Revenue for 6 months, 1884–85 (Ques.) 290 (i).
- Expenditure on Capital Account (M. for Stmt.) 45 (i).
- Expense, N.W.T., B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2857 (vol. iv).
- Exports and Imports, distinguishing products of Canada (M. for Ret.*) 30 (vol. i).
- Exports of Canadian produce (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).
- Extra Clerks, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2795 (vol. iv).
- Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Factories, operatives in (M. for Rets., &c.) 37 (vol. i).
- Factory Rep., printing and distribution of (remarks) 211 (vol. i).
- Fish breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 910 (vol. ii).
- Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3389 (vol. iv).
- Fishery Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- Finance and Treasury Board, in Com. of Sup., 915 (ii).
- Five per ct. Consolid. Loan, retirement of (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 484 (vol. i).
- Five per cent Loan, Sinking Fund (Ques.) 2465 (iii).
- Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 222 (vol. i).
- Flour, increase of Duty on (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).
- Foot Grease, in Com. on Ways and Means 806 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 1134; (Amt.) 1137, neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) 1166; on M. for Com. (remarks) 1385; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1459; "tenant," 1479; "person" (Indian) 1573 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1817, 1915–1918, 1988, 1992, 1995; "in counties," 2068, 2071, 2073, 2079, 2082, (Amt.) 2085; "registration of voters," 2220–2223, 2232, 2279, 2281, 2285, 2288, 2297, 2299, 2300; "revision of voters' lists," 2326, 2338, 2340, 2349; "general provisions," 2344, 2355; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2382; (remarks) 2146 (vol. iii) 3063 (vol. iv); (Ms. that Com. rise) 2207, 2137 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1509, 1514 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798; appeal from Chair to House, 1923; (Ques. of Order) 1969 (vol. iii); reading extracts, 1462; on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to House, 1511, 1619 (vol. ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2028 (vol. ii); 2274, 2281 (vol. iii).
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. 119 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2419 (vol. iii).
- Gas Coke, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (vol. ii).
- Geneva Gin and Brandy, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (vol. iv).
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3347 (vol. iv).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849-852, 854, 855 (vol. ii).
- Gold Reserve, Govt. (M. for copies of Cor.) 351 (vol. i).
- Govt. Deposits in Banks (M. for Stmt.) 29 (vol. i).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 453 (vol. i); Saturdays, 1824 (vol. iii); Conduct of, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3444 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) on prop. Res., 2461-2463; on M. to conc. in Res., 2524 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
- Harbors and Rivers (N.B.) conc., 2920; (Ont.) in Com. of Sup., 2919, 2921; conc., 3433 (vol. iv).
- Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
- Histoire Genealogique des Familles Françaises, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).
- Hoop Iron, in Com. on Ways and Means, 897 (vol. ii).
- Hospitals, Marine, in Com. of Sup., 2957 (vol. iv).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Huron and Superior, Lakes, Surveys of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2809-2816, 2836, 2839-2843 (vol. iv).
- Printing and Advertising (M. to ref. charges to Public Accounts Com.) 292 (vol. i).
- Imports for Consumption (M. for Stmt.) 30 (vol. i).
- Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).
- Indian Affairs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 916 (vol. ii); 3410 (vol. iv).
- Indian and Colonial Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1034 (vol. ii); suppl., 3452 (vol. iv).
- Indians, in Com. of Sup., 3242, 3343, 3392; conc., 3373 (vol. iv).
- Infectious and Contagious diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065, 1069, 1091; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, 1331 (vol. ii).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2526 (vol. iii).
- Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 85 (vol. i).
- Inspection of Staples, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).
- Inspectors or Clerks of Works, persons employed as (M. for Stmt.) 139 (vol. i).
- Insurance Act, 1879, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 127 (vol. i).
- I.C.R. Receipts and Expenses (Ques.) 1744, 1914 (iii).
- Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3299 (vol. iv).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 969 (vol. ii), 3408; conc., 2764, 3433 (vol. iv).
- International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 256 (vol. i).
- Justice, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 985.
- Keewatin, Govt. of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).
- Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (vol. iv).
- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2505-2508 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 2892 (vol. iv).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 991, 992 (vol. ii); 2795, 2798, 3448, 3451 (vol. iv).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798 (vol. iv).
- Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
- Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, in Com. of Sup., 2950, 2952, 3252 (vol. iv).
- Liquor License Act, putting in force of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2400 (vol. iii).
- Loan, recent (Ms. for copies of Prospectus, Advertisements, &c.) 37 (vol. i).
- Loans contracted by Govt. (Ques.) 1744, 1914 (vol. iii).
- Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N.W., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).
- McManus, gratuity to widow of, in Com. of Sup., 3350; conc. 3374 (vol. iv).
- Mail Subsidies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2945, 3457; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
- Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2824; on M. for Com. on Res., 2776 in Com., 2789-2791, 2795, (vol. iv).
- Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 990 (vol. ii).
- Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., in Com. on Res., 2505-2508 (vol. iii).
- Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 906-908 (vol. ii).
- Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).
- Military properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
- Militia Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- Militia, in Com. of Sup., 2904, 2906, 2913-2916, 3411, 3412 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 3244, 3245, 3351, 3353, 3387-3389, 3453, 3454; conc., 3396, 3434 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous Printing, paper, &c., in Com. of Sup. 3392 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous works (I.C.R.) in Com. of Sup., 3296; suppl., 3383 (vol. iv).
- Model Farm, Establishment, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
- Money borrowed by Govt. in Canada (Ques.) 743 (i).
- Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (vol. ii).
- Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (iv).
- Murray Canal, Repairs, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3303 (iv).
- Nav. of River St. Lawrence B. 159 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 3470 (vol. iv).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- N.B. and P.E.I. to Great Britain, Steamships subvention, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).
 New Militia Pensions, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
 North Saskatchewan River improvements, on M. for copies of Repts., &c., 696 (vol. i).
 N. W. Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2770 (vol. iv).
 N. W. Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 3243; suppl., 3392, 3421, (vol. iv).
 N. W. T., Govt. of the, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2946, 2950 (iv).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract, on M. for Com. on Res. (*Mr. Carling*) 2556; in Com., 2557 (vol. iii).
 Operatives in Factories (M. for Rets., Stmnts.) 37 (i).
 Optional Subjects, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3413 (vol. iv).
Parliamentary Companion, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).
 Pembina Branch, C.P.R., in Com. of Sup., 3417 (vol. iv).
 Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 985, 989, 990 (vol. ii), 3350; conc., 3374 (vol. iv).
 Pensions, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
 Plate Glass, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
 Port Arthur Harbor, construction of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 2764 (iv).
 Post Office and Finance Depts., computing interest, in Com. of Sup., 927 (vol. ii).
 Printing and Advertising, Ret. respecting (remarks) 28 (vol. i).
 Printing Com., on M. to conc. in 2nd Rep., 149 (vol. i).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on article in *Toronto News*: French aggression, &c. (remarks) 1680 (vol. ii).
 Privy Council, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).
 Prorogation (Ques.) 3473 (vol. iv).
 Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c., in Com. of Sup., 3421; conc., 3434 (vol. iv).
 Public Accounts and Auditor Genl.'s Rep. (M. for ref. to Standing Com. on Public Accounts) 76 (vol. i).
 Public Buildings, Ottawa and N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
 Public Debt of Canada, amount of (Ques.) 927 (vol. ii).
 Public Expenditure (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2868-2877; neg. (Y. 42, N. 79) 2889 (vol. iv).
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2916, 2919-2921; conc., 3433 (vol. iv).
 Railways and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).
 Railways, in Com. of Sup., 3296, 3299, 3300, 3383, 3413, 3417, 3418 (vol. iv).
 Receipts and Expenditures, Consolidated Fund (Ques.) 1677 (vol. ii).
 Recognition of Volunteers' Services in the N.W. B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3379; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 3384 (vol. iv).
 Red Liquor, in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (vol. ii).

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Returns, enquiries for, 363, 714 (vol. i); 832, 1064, 1608 (vol. ii); 1913, 2393 (iii); incomplete Ret., 1209 (ii).
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 3245, 3388 (vol. iv).
 Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s B. 61, (*Mr. Desjardins*) on prop. Amt. (remarks) 1210; in Com., 1351 (vol. ii).
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2913 (vol. iv).
 ——— Number and names of graduates, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 313 (vol. i).
 St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 81 (vol. i).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 985, 989 (vol. ii).
 Savings Bank (Post Office or otherwise) Depositors in (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Scientific Institutions, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).
 Senate extra Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).
 Settlers in the Dom. during calendar year 1884 (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
 Settlers in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 113 (vol. i).
 Sleeping cars, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
 Small Savings, encouragement of, on M. for Ret., 91 (vol. i).
 Spirits and Tobacco, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225 (vol. iv).
 Spirits taken out of bond (remarks) 3371 (vol. iv).
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 803, 805, 808 (vol. ii).
 Stipendiary Magistrates, N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3470 (vol. iv).
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3215, 3219 (vol. iv).
 Superintendence of Insurance, in Com. of Sup., 2957; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
 Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 273 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res., 889 (vol. ii).
 Superior Court Judges, Quebec, B. 161 (*Sir John*) on prop. Res., 3376 (vol. iv).
 SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice, 985 (vol. ii), 3433; (Stipendiary Magistrates, N. W. T.) 3448 (vol. iv).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, care of) 1023 (vol. ii); (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv); (Indian and Colonial Exhibitions) 1034 (vol. i); suppl. 3452, (vol. iv); (Mortuary Statistics) 1027 (vol. ii).
Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Cornwall) 3301; (Murray) 3303; (Welland) 3302; (Williamsburg) 3301. *Income*: (Welland) 3418; (Rideau, Land damages) conc., 3433 (vol. iv).
Charges of Management, 2763 (vol. iv).
Civil Government (Administration of Justice) 3411 (vol. iv); (Agriculture, Dept. of) 906, (contingencies) 921; (Civil Service Examiners) 973; (Customs, contingencies) 925; (Finance and Treasury Board, contingencies) 915; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 910 (vol. ii); (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 3410 (vol. iv), (contingencies) 916; (Interior, Dept. of) 969 (vol. ii), 3408, conc., 2764, 3433 (vol. iv); (Marine, Dept. of) 906-908 (vol. ii); (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 2764 (vol. iv); (Post Office and Finance Depts., contingencies, computing interest) 927;

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- (Privy Council, contingencies) 914; (Public Works, Dept. of) 912 (vol. ii), suppl., 3448 (vol. iv); (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 914 (vol. ii); (Optional Subjects) 3411 (vol. iv).
- Collection of Revenues* (Customs) 3232-3237; (Culling Timber) 3241; (Excise) 3241; (Inspection of Staples) 3242; (Post Office, allowance to Asst. Postmaster at Ottawa) 3392, conc., 3397; (Weights and Measures and Gas) 3241 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands—Capital*: Surveys (Examination of Survey Rets.) 3344. *Income* (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3344 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries* (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953; (Fishery Protection Steamers) 2956 (vol. iv).
- Geological Survey*, 3317 (vol. iv).
- Immigration*, 2809, 2816, 2836, 2839-2843 (vol. iv).
- Indians* (Grant to supplmnt. Fund) 3242; (Man. and N. W. T.) 3343, conc., 3373; (Assistance to Institutions) 3392 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii); (Committees, Extra Clerks, &c.) 2795; (increased Indemnity to Members) 3451. *Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2798 (vol. iv); (Printing, paper, &c.) 992 (vol. ii). *Senate* (Extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service* (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, construction) 2952; (Salaries, &c.) 2950, 3250 (vol. iv).
- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp) 2943, conc., 2958; (Can. and Germany) 2945; (N.B. and P.E.I. to Great Britain, &c.) 3457 (vol. iv).
- Marine Hospitals*, 2957 (vol. iv).
- Militia* (A, B and C Batteries, &c.) 2914; (Ammunition) 2904, 2906; (Barracks at London) 3412; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2906; (Military Properties, care of) 2916; (Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg) 3411; (Royal Mil. Coll.) 2913 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Chinese Commission) 3337, conc., 3393 (vol. iv); (Dept. Speaker's Salary) 3351, 3353 (vol. iv); (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453; (Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies) 3244; (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3389; (Govt. of Keewatin) 3244; (Govt. of the N.W.T.) 3244; (*Histoire Genealogique des Familles Francaises*) 3456; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3245; (Liquor License Act, putting in force) 3244; (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N.W.T.) 3454; ("Parliamentary Companion") 3387; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor, &c.) 3421, conc., 3434; (Returns, preparation of) 3245, 3388 (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 3244 (vol. iv); (Vote of \$1,000,000 for N.W. Troubles) 2235 (vol. iii).
- N. W. Mounted Police*, 3243; suppl., 3392, 3421 (vol. iv).
- Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 2946; (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2946; (Water and River Police) 2950 (vol. iv).
- Pensions* (new Militia) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Penitentiaries* (Dorchester) 989; (Kingston) 985 (vol. ii), (gratuity to widow of C. McManus) 3350, conc., 3374 (vol. iv); (Manitoba) 990; (St. Vincent de Paul) 985-989 (vol. ii), (payment to G. F. Baillaireg6) 3350 (vol. iv).
- Public Works—Capital*: B. C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 2916; Ottawa (additional buildings) 2916; Port Arthur (construction of Harbor) 2916 (vol. iv).
- Public Works—Income*: Buildings (N.W.T.) 2919. Harbors and Rivers, 2919; (Ont.) 2921, conc., 3433; (N.B.) 2920.
- Railways—Capital*: C. P. R., 3383; (Engineers' Salaries, &c. 3417; (Subsidy) 3296; (Pembina Branch) 3417. *Eastern Extension* (repairs, &c.) 3300. I. C. R. (applying air brakes), 3299; (miscellaneous works) 3296; suppl. 3283; (repairs, &c.) 3299; (sleeping cars) 3418. *Short Line Ry.* (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).
- Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observatories) 2956. *Superintendence of Insurance*, 2957, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
- Survey Rets., Examination of*, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (iv)

Cartwright, Sir R. J.—Continued.

- Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii).
- Towels, in Com. on Ways and Means, 853 (vol. ii).
- Trade Relations with U. S. (Ques.) 3163 (vol. iv).
- Transfer of Batteries (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1°, 631 (vol. i).
- Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 2676 (vol. iv).
- Vote of \$1,000,000 for N.W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 2235 (vol. iv).
- Voyageurs to Egypt, number, names, residence, &c., of officers and men (M. for Ret.*) 210 (vol. i).
- Water and River Police, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means—Budget Speech* (reply to) 333; *The Tariff* (remarks) conclusion of Deb., 662; Disturbance in the N. W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com., 765-768 (vol. i); in Com. (cutlery) 844; (axle grease) 857; (duck) 808; (foot grease) 806; (gas coke) 783 (vol. ii); (Geneva gin and brandy) 3224 (vol. iv); (glucose syrup) 849, 852, 854, 855; (hoop iron) 807; (plate glass) 856; (red liquor) 808 (vol. ii); (spirits and tobacco) 3225 (vol. iv); (steel) 803, 805, 808 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3215, 3219 (vol. iv); (towels) 858 (vol. ii); (whiskey) 3225-3229 (vol. iv); (winceys) 840; (woollen fabrics) 795, 840; (woollen rags) 783, 787 (vol. ii); (Excise duties) 3295 (vol. iv).
- Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).
- Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3302, 3433 (vol. iv).
- Whiskey, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225-3229 (iv).
- Williamsburg Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).
- Winceys, in Com. on Ways and Means, 840 (vol. ii).
- Woollen fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 795, 840 (vol. ii).
- Woollen rags, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783, 787 (ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E., West Elgin.

- Administration of Justice in the N.W. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3429 (vol. iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2469-2474 (vol. iii).
- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2480-2483 (vol. iii).
- Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (vol. ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1024, 1030, 1032 (vol. ii).
- Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36 (*Mr. Orton*) on Res., 119 (vol. i).
- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com. 48 (vol. i).
- Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of, on M. for copies, 358 (vol. i).
- Canada Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; in Com., 1054-1055;

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2648, 2652, 2667 (vol. iv).
- Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, &c., on M. for Papers, 929, 933 (vol. ii).
- Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 284 (vol. i).
- C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further loan (remarks) on adjmt. of deb., 2643; in Com., 2725, 2727, 2729, 2733, 2736; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 2862; neg. (Y. 55, N. 91) 2863 (vol. iv).
- Port Arthur and Winnipeg, construction between, sums paid (M. for Stmnts.) 123 (vol. i).
- Section B. Arbitration, Evidence taken (Ques.) 112 (vol. i).
- Section B, Award of damages to contractors, validity of, case submitted to Counsel, &c. (M. for copy) 131 (vol. i).
- Section B, case submitted by Govt and contractors to Arbitrators, Evidence taken, &c. (M. for copies) 206 (vol. i).
- Section B, claim of contractors on which award of \$395,600 was based (M. for copy) 134 (vol. i).
- Section B, Engineers' Reps. on re-measurement and re-classification, &c. (M. for copies) 121 (vol. i).
- Section B, Judge Clarke's Rep. on Award to contractors (Ques.) 78; (M. for copy) 132, 134 (vol. i).
- Section B, opinion of Counsel as to binding character of Award (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).
- Section B, payment of Award of \$395,600 to contractors (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).
- Timber dues to Govt. by Co. (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).
- Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amts. to M. for Ret., 100, 110 (vol. i).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 969, 972, 984 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 274, 278, 280 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res., 899; on M. for 2°, 1097; in Com., 1097-1105, 1110-1117, 1123, 1127-1130; on M. for 3°, 1286; (Amt.) 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1283 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service B. (Ques.) 28 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 984 (vol. ii).
- Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).
- Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3237 (vol. iv).
- Debates, Official Rep. of, First Rep. (remarks) 34 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Third Rep., 3360 (vol. iv).
- Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) for Special Com. to report to House, 71 (vol. i).
- Deputy Speaker, on M. to appoint Malachy Daly, Esq., 72 (vol. i); Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3354, 3357 (vol. iv).
- Disturbance in the N.W., on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 768 (vol. i).
- Stoney Indian rising (remarks) 863 (vol. ii).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for resmgng. adj. deb. for 2°, 943 (ii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1263-1266; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1401-1408, 1459; "usufructuary," 1452, 1458; "owner," 1470; "tenant," 1477; "person" (Indian) 1496, 1528-1530, 1578, (Chinese) 1532, 1590; "farm," 1592; "actual value," 1596, 1604; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1739-1743 (vol. ii), 1828; (Indians) 1837 (Amt.) 1845; "manhood suffrage," 1956-1959, 1988; "qualifications in counties," 2052, 2061; (Amts.) 2064, 2070, 2079, 2080, 2394; on disqualifying barristers, 2086; "who shall not vote," 2086, 2093; "registration of voters," 2254-2258, 2270, 2272, 2282, 2283, (Amt.) 2288, 2290, 2308-2310; "revision of voters' lists," 2321, 2323, 2325, 2333, 2343; "general provisions," 2344, 2347, 2350; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2383-2385 (vol. iii); scarcity of copies of B. (remarks) 1131; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1422, 1497 (vol. ii), 2208 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1436, unparliamentary language, 1466; (Ques. of Order) 1619 (vol. ii), 1825 (vol. iii); taking up items consecutively (remarks) 1471 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798 (vol. iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1309-1316; (Ques. of Order) 1317 (vol. ii).
- Gosselin, Eugène, record in the matter of, on M. for copy, 703 (vol. i).
- G. T. R. mail trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 817 (vol. ii).
- Hughes, D. J., Charges against, on M. for Ret., 99 (i).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1068, 1072, 1087 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1326; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332 (vol. ii).
- Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2528 (vol. iii).
- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 969, 972 (vol. ii).
- International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2807 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1664; in Com., 1663 (vol. ii).
- Miscellaneous, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3354, 3357 (iv).
- Morgan, H. J., payment for "Annual Register," in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).
- Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (vol. ii).
- O'Malley, Lieut.-Col., Charges against (M. for copy of Rep. of Maj. Genl., 45 (vol. i).
- Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1892 (vol. iii).
- Port Moody, B.C., Dock, Tenders for repair of (Ques.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Pringle, H. H., of Cobourg, employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 743 (vol. i).

Casey, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2807 (vol. iv).
- Railways in the Co. of Grey, refund of Bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for copy of memorial, 60 (vol. i).
- Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. Municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 576 (vol. i).
- Returns, incomplete, *re* N. W. Troubles (remarks) 1209 (vol. ii).
- Returns, non-production of (remarks) 289, 427, 455 (i).
- Ridgetown as a port of entry, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 532 (vol. i).
- Riel, Louis, employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 743 (i).
- Short Line Ry., Plans and Reps. (Ques.) 567 (vol. i).
- St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 880 (vol. ii).
- Stoney Indian rising in the N.W. (remarks) 863.

SUPPLY :

- Civil Government* (Civil Service Examiners) 984; (Interior, Dept. of) 969, 972 (vol. ii).
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1024; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032; (Mortuary Statistics) 1030 (vol. ii); Customs, 3227 (vol. iv).
- Legislation* : Miscellaneous (printing and printing paper, &c.) 2798, 2802, 2807 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3351, 3354, 3357; (payment to H. J. Morgan, for "Annual Register") 3351 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. (remarks) 539, 599–605, 633–641; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) Disturbance in the N.W.T., 768 (vol. i); in Com. (woollen rags) 788; (woollen fabrics) 797 (ii).
- Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com., 1675 (ii).
- Woollen rags, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783, 797 (vol. ii).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B., L'Islet.

- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 47 (vol. i).
- Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers, 935 (vol. ii).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2654 (vol. iv).
- Cape St. Ignace, Station at (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).
- Court of Claims for Can. B. 93 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on 1^o, 450 (vol. i).
- C. P. R. Short Line Ry. from Montreal to the Atlantic, on M. for Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c., 38 (vol. i).
- DeChene, Capt. A. M., enquiry respecting (M. for copies of complaint*) 30 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N. W., on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 770 (vol. i).
- Col. Onimet's absence from Duty (remarks) 1167, 1205 (vol. ii).
- Distinctive rewards for Bravery (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).
- Elgin Station, L'Islet, erection of (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).
- Employment of Prisoners without the walls of Gaols B. 87 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 1658 (vol. ii).

Casgrain, Mr. P. B.—Continued.

- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on proposed Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 369 (vol. i).
- Fabre, Mr., agent in Paris, Rep. of (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1384; "woman suffrage," 1395; "usufructuary," 1447; "person" (Indian) 1516, 1519, 1536; (Chinese) 1588; "farm," 1591; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1690–1692 (vol. ii); (Amt.) 1791; "who shall not vote," 2099 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1423; on Ques. of Order, unparliamentary language, 1466; Appeal from Chair to House, 1511 (vol. ii).
- Gold, Reserve, Govt., withdrawals, on M. for copies of Cor., 355 (vol. i).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 451 (vol. i).
- Inspection of Banks, legislation respecting (Ques.) 51; (prop. Res.) 81 (vol. i).
- Lieut. Gov. of Quebec, Oath of Office (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).
- Lower Traverse Lighthouse, Supply of wood to, M. for Ret.*) 30 (vol. i).
- Man. Indian Agency, management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).
- Post Office at village of Montmagny (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).
- Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 198 (vol. i).
- Returns, enquiry for, 363 (vol. i).
- Short Line Ry. to the sea coast, survey by Mr. Wicksteed, C. E. (M. for copy of Rep.) 52; Plans, Reps. &c. (Ques.) 246, 429, 479 (vol. i).
- Stationery used in H. of C., expense of (Ques.) 290 (i).
- St. Patrick's Day, on M. (*Mr. Curran*) for adjmt., 594 (i).
- Superior Court of Quebec, Chief Justice (Ques.) 129 (i).
- SUPPLY :

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Archives, care of) 1024; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1035; (Mortuary Statistics) 1028 (vol. ii).
- Miscellaneous* (Relief of Distress in N.W.T.) 3455 (vol. iv).
- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction, limitation B. 68 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. to introd., 246 (i).
- Translation of *Debates and Votes and Proceedings*, (remarks) 594 (vol. i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on Res. (*Mr. Blake*). (Disturbance in the N. W.) in Amt. to Com., 770 (i).

Catudal, Mr. M., Napierville.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1441 (vol. ii).
- French Canadians in Customs Dept. (Ques.) 2171 (iii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067, 1069, 1089; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328 (vol. ii).
- Waterproof Blankets for Volunteers, purchase of (Ques.) 2171 (vol. iii).

Chairman, Mr.

- [For Rulings, &c., see "Order," "Privilege" and "Procedure" under SUBJECTS.]

Chapleau, Hon. J. A., Terrebonne.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467, 2470 (vol. iii).
- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122, 2° m., 2476; in Com., 2479-2483 (vol. iii).
- B. C. Penitentiary, suspension of Rules, on M. for copies of Cor., 824 (vol. ii).
- Canadian Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers, 933 (vol. ii).
- C. P. R., on Resolutions respecting further Loan (speech) 2565-2586; in Com., 2731, 2732 (vol. iv).
- Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 212; on presentation of (remarks) 235 (vol. i).
- Commission, rooms rented and payment of Secretary (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
- Immigration, legislation respecting (Ans.) 505, 632 (vol. i).
- Restriction (B. 124, 1°) 1037 (vol. ii); withdn., 3023 (vol. iv).
- Restriction (B. 156) prop. Res., 3002; in Com., on Res. and 1°* of B., 3023; 2° and in Com., 3050; Order for 3° dschgd., 3075 (vol. iv).
- Interpreter, prop. Res., 2421 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3024 (vol. iv).
- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 900, 914, 973-976, 983-985 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. (B. 31, 1°) 101; prop. Res. and in Com., 273-277, 279, 282 (vol. i); M. to conc. in Res., 889; 2° m., 1095; in Com., 1097-1106, 1109-1122, 1126-1130; 3° m., 1281; on Order for 3° (M. to recom) 1281; in Com., 1282 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 1823; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2396 (iii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973-976, 983-985 (vol. ii).
- Criminal Laws of Canada, 1869-1871, publication in French (Ans.) 246 (vol. i).
- Dept. of Sec. of State Acts Amt. (B. 102, 1°) 629 (vol. i).
- Deptl. Contingencies (Sec. of State) in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).
- Duties on Hay, Cor. between Canada and U.S., on M. for copies, 444 (vol. i).
- Fabre, M., agent in Paris, Rep. of (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1171-1177; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590; on Ques. of Order, reading extracts, 1461 (vol. ii).
- G. T. R., imperfect Rets. presented by Mr. Hickson (remarks) 862 (vol. ii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2834, 2839, 2842 (vol. iv).
- Imperial Federation, Cor. between High Commissioner and Govt. (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases Affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1090, 1092 (vol. ii).
- Jones, W. H., Sec. of State's Dept., superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds to Rys, in Man. and N. W., on M. for Ret., 95 (vol. i).

Chapleau, Hon. J. A.—Continued.

- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497, 499, 502 (vol. i).
- Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2797, 2804 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1663; in Com., 1668 (vol. ii).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2797 (vol. iv).
- Message from His Ex., Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 234 (vol. i).
- Offences Against the Person B. 123, 2° m., 2767 (vol. iv).
- Official Reporters of the *Debates*, employment of, during recess (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).
- Penitentiaries, in Com. of Sup., 957 (vol. ii).
- Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1892-1894 (iii).
- Proofs of Entries in Books of Accounts (B. 113, 1°*) 964 (vol. ii); 2° m., 2397, 2465 (vol. iii).
- Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2804 (vol. iv).
- Returns, Imperfect (remarks) 67, 534 (vol. i); 862 (ii).
- Returns, non-production of (remarks) 211, 504 (vol. i); 1206 (vol. ii).
- St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 987 (vol. ii).
- Sec. of State, Dept. of, Act. Amt. (B. 102, 1°) 629; 2° m., 894 (vol. ii).
- Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 900 (vol. ii).
- Sec. of State's Rep. (presented) 127 (vol. i).
- Sunday Excursions prohibition B. 19 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2°, 264 (vol. i).
- Superintendents of Letter Carriers (prop. Res.) 218; in Com., 270 (vol. i); (M. to conc. in Res.) 889 (ii).
- SUPPLY:
- Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 973-976, 983-985; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 900, (contingencies) 914 (vol. ii).
- Immigration* 2834, 2839, 3812 (vol. iv).
- Legislation*: Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2797; (Printing and printing paper, &c.), 2804 (vol. iv).
- Penitentiaries* (St. Vincent de Paul) 987 (vol. ii).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 1671 (vol. ii).
- Writ for Lévis County, issue of (Ans.) 633; (remarks) 661 (vol. i).

Charlton, Mr. J., North Norfolk.

- Agricultural, Timber, Pasture and Mineral Lands and Town sites (M. for Ret.*) 209 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to M. for 3°, 1061 (ii).
- C. P. R., Amounts due Contractors, &c., non-payment of, by Co. (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
- Debt, floating and unsecured (Ques.) 219 (vol. i); 1677 (vol. ii).
- Laborers' Wages, payment of, on construction (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).
- Loan (Ques.) 29 (vol. i); payment of interest on, 1131 (vol. ii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- C.P.R., Interest, payment of by Co. (Ques.) 1677 (ii).
 — Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2676–2688; in Com., 2731; on M. to conc. in Res., 2860; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2561 (vol. iv).
 — Sums paid or advanced to Co. as Interest or Subsidy (Ques.) 1677 (vol. ii).
 — Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 103 (vol. i).
 Canned Goods B. 142 (Mr. Costigan) on M. for 2°, 2439 (vol. iii).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (Mr. Chapleau) on Amt. (Mr. Mitchell) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1283 (vol. ii).
 Coal Lands, Sales and Leases (M. for Stmt.)* 209 (i).
 Cruelty to Animals, prevention (B. 47, 1°*) 147 (i).
 Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 2476 (vol. iii); on M. for 3°, 3043 (iv).
 Debates, Official Rep., on First Rep. (remarks) 34 (vol. i).
 Debt of Can., Floating and Unfunded (Ques.) 2465 (iii).
 Disturbance in the N. W., Engagement at Duck Lake, despatch of Troops (remarks) 791; cost of Expedition (Ques.) 1678 (vol. ii).
 Dredging, conc., 2923 (vol. iv).
 Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2°, 1158–1160; in Com. “woman suffrage,” 1390, 1439; “person” (Indian) 1503, 1523; (Chinese) 1587; “qualifications in cities and towns,” 1608, (Amt.) 1623 (vol. ii), 1770–1773; (Indians) 1850, 1864–1871; “manhood suffrage,” 1947–1952; “registration of voters,” 2279, 2282, 2286, 2287, (Amt.) 2288, 2289, 2306–2308, (Amt.) 2317; “revision of voters’ lists,” 2340, 2350; “general provisions,” 2344, (Amt.) 2344; “appeal,” 2363; “officers and duties” (Indians) 2377; “offences,” 2390 (vol. iii); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3053, neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053 (vol. iv); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1436, 1500, 1529 (vol. ii); (personal explanation) 1872; (Ques. of Order) 1920 (vol. iii).
 Franchise B. Pets. (remarks) 1856 (vol. iii); on personal explanation of Mr. Sproule, 2772 (vol. iv).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (Mr. Costigan) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1308, 1312 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Loans (Ques.) 2465 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Notes in circulation (Ques.) 2465 (vol. iii).
 Grazing Land Leases, geographical position, &c. (M. for Ret.)* 209 (vol. i).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2813 (vol. iv).
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (Mr. Casgrain) 84 (vol. i).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (Mr. Pope) in Com., 1079 (vol. ii).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (Sir Hector Jangevin) on prop. Res., 2449–2452 (vol. iii); on Amt. (Mr. Blake) to M. for 3°, 2893 (vol. iv).
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2798 (vol. iv).
 Letter Postage, reduction of (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 291 (vol. i).
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2798 (iv).
 Licenses or Permits to cut Timber, &c., applications for, and not granted (M. for Ret.)* 209 (vol. i).
 Loans obtained by Govt. from Banks, &c. (Ques.) 1305 (vol. ii).
 Loan of £4,000,000 recently effected (Ques.) 2998 (iv).
 Loans to Govt., Temporary (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 Man. Indian Agency, management of (M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission) 61; withdn., 67 (i).
 National Policy pamphlet (M. for copy*) 124 (vol. i).
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. to conc. in Res., 2426 (iii).
 Observance of the Lord’s Day (B. 19, 1°*) 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (vol. i).
 Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
 Offences against the Person B. 123 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2°, 2767; in Com. (Amt.) 2767; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767 (vol. iv).
 Order Paper, omission from, of a question (remarks) 2774; (explanation) 2854 (vol. iv).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1891 (vol. iii).
 Pensions, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
 Post Office Savings Banks Deposits (Ques.) 2359, 2465 2559 (vol. iii).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on article in Toronto News (Ques. of Order) 1680 (vol. ii).
 Protestant Volunteers in the 65th Battalion, remarks on newspaper paragraph, 2998 (vol. iv).
 Public Debt of Canada (Ques.) 29, 76 (vol. i); 927 (vol. ii); 2465 (vol. iii).
 Public Expenditure, on Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. for Com. of Sup., 2883–2889 (vol. iv).
 Public Works, conc., 2923 (vol. iv).
 Receipts and Expenditures, Consolidated Fund (Ques.) 1677 (vol. ii).
 Reciprocal Trade Relations between U.S. and Canada (M. for Ret.)* 1444 (vol. ii).
 Returns, enquiries for 1038, 1608 (vol. ii); 1955 (vol. iii); 2676, 3000 (vol. iv).
 Seduction and like Offences (B. 27, 1°) 76; 2° m., 619 (i).
 Sunday Excursions, prohibition (B. 19, 1°*) 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (vol. i).
 SUPPLY :
 Immigration, 2813 (vol. iv).
 Legislation, : Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796, 2798 (vol. iv).
 Ocean and River Service (Lifeboats, Stations, &c.) 2946 (vol. iv).
 Pensions (Veterans of 1812) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
 Public Works—Income : Dredging, conc., 2923 (vol. iv).

Charlton, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Temporary Loans to Govt. by Banks (Ques.) 350 (i).
 Timber Licenses and Permits granted on Lands outside of disputed Territory (M. for Ret.*) 209 (vol. i).
 — in the N.W. (M. for Ret.), 30, 121 (vol. i).
 — issued since Jan., 1882, in N.W.T., &c. (Ques.) 863 (vol. ii).
 — or Berths in B.C., total applications, date, names and addresses, &c., (M. for Ret.*) 210 (vol. i).
 Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 2676 (vol. iv).
 Veterans of War of 1812, conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
 Volunteers in the 65th Battalion, Protestant (remarks) 2998 (vol. iv).
 Washington Treaty, termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2902 (vol. iv).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 463-478 (vol. i); in Com. (woollen fabrics) 796 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).
 Woollen Fabrics, in Com. on Ways and Means, 796 (vol. ii).

Cochrane, Mr. E., East Northumberland.

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) to M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 3368 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Canals—Capital (*Murray*) 3307 (vol. iv).
 Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 873 (vol. ii).

Cockburn, Mr. A. P., North Ontario.

- C. P. R. Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 484 (vol. i).
 — Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for Stmt., 112 (vol. i).
 Forests, protection of, J. H. Morgan's Rep. (M. for copies) 202 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1258; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1438 (vol. ii).
 Indian Advancement Act of 1884, application of (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).
 Morgan, J. H., services as Forestry Commissioner (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).
 Murray Canal Route, Cor. and Pets. (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1217 (vol. ii).
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1279 (vol. ii).
 Trent Valley Canal, occupation of building by Govt. employés (Ms. for copies of Cor., &c.) 56, 202 (vol. i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 715-719 (vol. i).

Colby, Mr. C. C., Stanstead.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 963 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2663 (vol. iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1087 (vol. ii).

Colby, Mr. C. C.—Continued.

- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 269 (vol. i).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 623 (vol. i).
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1350 (vol. ii).
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic ports, in Com. on Res., 2982-2987; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3277-3281 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2982-2987; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3277-3281 (vol. iv).

Cook, Mr. H. H., East Simcoe.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590 (vol. ii); "registration of voters," 2213-2216 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1308 (vol. ii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1085-1090 (vol. ii).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 627 (vol. i).
 Privilege, Ques. of, re Col. Amyot and movement of Troops (remarks) 1336 (vol. ii).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting (M. for copy) 569; (reply) 592 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1280 (vol. ii).

Costigan, Hon. J., Victoria, N. B.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. (B. 143) in Com., 2751 (vol. iv).
 Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 955 (vol. ii).
 Canned Goods (B. 142, 1°*) 2345; in Com., 2767 (iv).
 Canned Goods, Law respecting (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1122 (vol. ii).
 Consolid. Inland Revenue Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 146), 2° m., 2935; in Com., 2968-2971; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3433 (vol. iv).
 Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. (B. 154) 2° m. and in Com., 3043 (vol. iv).
 Culling Timber, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3234 (vol. iv).
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 916-921 (vol. ii).
 Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3355, 3357 (iv).
 Disturbance in the N.W., Dumont, Gabriel, Ferry license granted to (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Excise, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
 Excise Revenue for 6 months, 1884-1885 (Ans.) 290 (i).
 Fish Inspector in the City of St. John (Ans.) 2997 (iv).

Costigan, Hon. J.—Continued.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. that Com. rise, 1502 (vol. ii); in Com., "qualifications of voters in cities and towns," 1990; "revision of voters' lists," 2343 (vol. iii).
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Act Amt. B. 119 (prop. Res.) 837 (vol. ii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (prop. Res.) 1306; in Com., 1307-1312, 1315, 1319 (vol. ii).
- Inland Revenue Collector at Summerside, P.E.I. (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).
- Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901, 916-921 (vol. ii); Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).
- Inspection of Staples, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 255 (vol. i).
- Kinnee, D., increase of salary, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).
- License Commissioners in Essex (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).
- License Inspectors, pay of, under Act of 1883 (Ans.) 1568 (vol. ii).
- Liquor License Act, conc., 3398; in Com. of Sup. 3421 (vol. iv).
- Returns, non-production of (remarks) 428 (vol. i).
- Scott Act, prosecutions under (Ans.) 41 (vol. i).
- Spirits taken out of Bond (Stmnt.) 3395 (vol. iv).
- Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 15 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2977 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY :

- Canals—Income* : Welland (land damages) conc., 3433 (vol. iv).
- Civil Government* (Inland Revenue, Dept. of) 901, contingencies, 916-921 (vol. ii).
- Collection of Revenues* (Adulteration of Food) 3242; (Culling Timber) 3241; (Customs) 3234; (Excise) 3241; (Inspection of Staples) 3241; (Weights and Measures and Gas) 3241, 3457 (vol. iv).
- Liquor License Act*, conc., 3398; (administration of) 3421 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3355, 3357 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—in Com. (whiskey) 3226, 3231 (iv).
- Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).
- Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. (B. 118) prop. Res., 832-837; 1°* of B., 837; in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).
- Welland Canal, land damages, conc., 3433 (vol. iv).

Coughlin, Mr. T., North Middlesex.

- Carriers by Land (B. 5, 1°*) 29; 2° m., 102 (vol. i).

Coursol, Mr. C. J., East Montreal.

- Disturbance in the N. W., criticisms of Press as to cause, and slur on French Members commanding Battalions, 888 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1248; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1389 (vol. ii).
- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 169 (vol. i).

Curran, Mr. J. J., Centre Montreal.

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3431 (vol. iv).

Curran, Mr. J. J.—Continued.

- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Special Com., 48 (vol. i).
- Can. Co-operative Sup. Association (B. 81, 1°*) 349 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2664 (vol. iv).
- Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2° (Amt.) 6 m. h., 284; neg. (Y. 64, N. 74) 289 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., on Res., 275 (vol. i); in Com., 1125 (vol. ii).
- Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3356 (iv).
- Disturbance in the N. W., Victoria Rifles, Montreal (Ques.) 1983 (vol. iii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1408; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1623-1626 (vol. ii).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2811, 2831 (vol. iv).
- Insolvent Debtors' Assets Distribution (B. 4, 1°*) 29 (i).
- Martin, John, continuation of Pension to Widow of (M. for copies of Pets.)* 201 (vol. i).
- Nav. of River St. Lawrence B. 159 (*Mr. McLellan*) on Order for 2°, 3436 (vol. iv).
- Privilege, Ques. of, veracity questioned (remarks) 725 (vol. i).
- Royal Canadian Insurance Co.'s Capital Stock Reduction (B. 43, 1°*) 125 (vol. i).
- St. Patrick's Day (M. for adjmt.) 593 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY :**
- Immigration*, 2811, 2831 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Deputy Speaker's Salary) 3356 (vol. iv).
- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 161 (vol. i).
- Supreme Court, contested cases before, and judgments (M. for Ret.) 210 (vol. i).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 521-527 (vol. i).

Daly, Mr. M. B., Halifax (DEPUTY SPEAKER).

- Sable Island, telegraphic communication with (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
- Subsidies to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) on M. to conc. in Amts., 3402 (vol. iv).
- [For Rulings see "Order," "Privilege" and "Procedure," under SUBJECTS.]

Davies, Mr. L. H., Queen's, P.E.I.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467, 2468, 2471, 2474, 2541 (vol. iii).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Townshend*) 1051; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061; on Amt. (*Mr. Macdonald, King's*) 1062 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2656 (vol. iv).
- C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2692, 2702; in Com., 2739, 2741, 2744, 2745; on M. to conc. in Res., 2863 (iv).
- Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2534, 2536-2540 (vol. iii).
- Cape Tormentine Ry., connection (Ques.) 2997 (iv).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 288 (vol. i).
 Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 907-911, 913, 914, 916, 918, 922-924 (vol. ii).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 276, 281 (vol. i); on M. for 3° of B., 1296; (Amt.) 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) (vol. ii) 1301.
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2431, 2434-2437; on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2770 (vol. iv).
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 150 (vol. i).
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 914, 916, 918, 922-924 (vol. ii).
 Dom. Buildings in Charlottetown, construction of (Ques.) 1039 (vol. ii).
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 384 (vol. i).
 Explosive Substances B. 95 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 1167 (vol. ii).
 Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).
 Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 222 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1153-1156; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1418, 1458; "tenant," 1476, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indians) 1576 (Chinese) 1583; "farm," 1592; "farmers' sons," 1594; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1638-1643 (vol. ii), 1824-1828, 1939-1945; "manhood suffrage," 1987, 1991, 1992, 1996; "qualifications in counties," 2054, 2058, 2066-2069, 2071, (Amt.) 2072-2074, 2077; "who shall not vote," 2090, 2096 (Indians) 2157-2160, (Amt.) 2160; "registration of voters," 2210, (Amt.) 2211, 2229, 2230, (Amt.) 2234, 2269, 2271-2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2281, 2286, 2287, 2289, 2291, (Amt.) 2292, 2301, 2313, 2316, (Amt.) 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2326, 2329, 2331, 2347; "general provisions," 2353; "appeal," 2361; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2378, 2389 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1496, 1497, 1501, 1527, 1529 (vol. ii), 2137, 2208 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1435-1436, 1437; reading extracts, 1462, 1465 (vol. ii), 1921 (vol. iii); irregularity of procedure 1470; (explanation) 1658 (vol. ii); ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1800 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 1307; in Com., 1308, 1315, 1319, 1320 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2548-2551 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 453 (vol. i).
 Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2522 (vol. iii).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2835, 2845-2849, 2852 (iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases Affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067, 1090, 1093; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, 1331; on M. for 3° (Amt. neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334 (vol. ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- I. C. R., Freight and Passenger Earnings, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Judges in N. B., appointment for year's circuit (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497 (vol. i).
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2804, 2805 (vol. iv).
 Library of Parl. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1664 (vol. ii).
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) in Com. on Res., 2556 (vol. iii); on M. to conc. in Res., 2756 (vol. iv).
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 907-911 (vol. ii).
 Offences against the Person (assault and battery) Act Amt. B. 42 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 218 (vol. i).
 Piers and Wharves in P.E.I., expenditure on maintenance and construction (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 P.E.I. Ry., Cape Traverse Branch, payment of laborers on (M. for copies of Pets., &c.) 143 (vol. i).
 ——— Freight and Passenger Earnings, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2804 (iv).
 Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 913 (vol. ii).
 Reciprocity with the U.S. (Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup.) 995-1001; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1023, (vol. ii).
 Refund of Duties to merchants and fishermen in P.E.I., Commissioner's Rep. (M. for copy) 831 (vol. ii).
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co's B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1348, 1351 (vol. ii).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Government: Deptl. Contingencies (Agriculture) 922, (Customs) 916, 924, (Inland Revenue) 918, 919, (Privy Council) 914, (Sec. of State) 914; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 911; (Marine, Dept. of) 907-911, (contingencies) 923; (Public Works, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).
Immigration, 2835, 2845-2849, 2852 (vol. iv).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796; (Printing and Printing Paper, &c.) 2804-2805 (vol. iv).
 Statutes of Can., Revision of, Commissioners' Rep., on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 781 (vol. ii).
 Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 162 (vol. i).
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii).
 Trade Relations between Canada and the U. S. (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).
 Treaty Negotiations by Sir Ambrose Shea (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2897 (vol. iv).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 545-555 (vol. i).
 Weights and Measures Inspection Acts, Amt. (B. 118) (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 837 (vol. ii).

Davies, Mr. L. H.—Continued.

- Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 216 (vol. i).
Wharves on P. E. I., Grant for construction (Ques.) 351 (vol. i).

Dawson, Mr. S. J., Algoma.

- C. P. R., Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2718-2720 (vol. iv).
Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 3409 (vol. iv).
Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).
Customs Collections in Algoma (M. for Ret.) 39 (i).
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3368 (vol. iv).
Disturbance in the N. W., on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. on Ways and Means, 769 (vol. i).
Troops, Transport of (remarks) 887, 1380 (vol. ii).
Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1160; in Com. "woman suffrage," 1408; "owner," 1473; "person" (Indian) 1486, 1491, 1492, 1521, 1569 (explanation) 1503 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1775; "manhood suffrage," 1979; (Indians) 2006-2008, 2012; "in counties" 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2122, 2149; "registration of voters," 2248-2268, 2298; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2369, 2387 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2758 (vol. iv); (Ques. of Order) 2143 (vol. iii).
Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2816 (vol. iv).
Indians, in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3392 (vol. iv).
Keewatin, Govt. of, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).
Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 3048 (vol. iv).
Ocean and River Service, in Com. of Sup., 2947 (vol. iv).
Ontario's Boundaries (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3438 (vol. iv).
Ont., Westerly Boundary of, shorthand notes of argument before P. C., on M. for copies, 440 (vol. i).
Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr White, Renfrew*) 1218 (vol. ii).
Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2917 (vol. iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 247 (vol. i); article in Port Arthur *Herald* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 587 (vol. i).
Representation in Parl. of the N. W. T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3408 (vol. iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Co.'s (B. 52, 1°*) 170 (vol. i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Dept. of Interior) 3409 (vol. iv).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2816 (vol. iv).
Indians (Assistance to institutions) 3392 (vol. iv).

Dawson, Mr. S. J.—Continued.

- Indian Affairs* (Grant to supplement Fund) 3243 (vol. iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, constr.) 2952 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Govt. of Keewatin) 3244; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3245 (vol. iv).
Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2947 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Capital: Port Arthur (construction of harbor) 2917 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. 769 (vol. i); in Com. (steel) 810 (vol. ii).

De St. Georges, Mr. J. E. A., Portneuf.

- Customs Department, French Canadian employés (Ques.) 1914 (vol. iii).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1533 (vol. ii).
Indian Lands sold in the Viger Agency (M. for Stmt.)* 1443 (vol. ii).
Lebel, Antoine, Indian Agent, acting without sureties (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).
Pointe aux Trembles, construction of Wharf (M. for copies of Cor.) 234 (vol. i).
Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 195 (vol. i).
Supervisor of Cullers, accounts due to (M. for Ret.)* 1443 (vol. ii).

Desaulniers, Mr. A. L., Maskinongé.

- Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 153 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2995 (vol. iv).

Desjardins, Mr. A., Hochelaga.

- Copyright, Law of, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Edgar*) 711 (i).
Debates, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).
Disturbance in the N.W., treatment of natives by the Volunteers, 2998 (vol. iv).
Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).
Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1451, 1455 (vol. ii).
International Coal Co.'s (B. 51, 1°*) 170 (vol. i).
Liquor License Act, 1883, Supreme Court Judgment (Ques.) 29 (vol. i).
Mail Subsidies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).
Model Farm, Establishment of, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (vol. iv).
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 587 (vol. i).
Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s incorp. Act Amt. (B. 61, 1°*) 188 (vol. i); notice of prop. Amt., 1210; in Com., 1348 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY:

- Legislation*: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii); (*Election Expenses*) 3452 (vol. iv); (*Salaries*) 991 (vol. ii).
Miscellaneous (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453 (vol. iv).
(Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies) 3244 (vol. iv).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (France and Quebec fortnightly line) 2938, 2942 (vol. iv).

Dickinson, Mr. M. K., Russell.

- Dom. Drainage Co. incorp. (B. 28, 1°*) 88 (vol. i); M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 729-733 (vol. i).

Dodd, Mr. M., Cape Breton.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Mr. Trow's pair with Mr. Williams (remarks) 1470 (vol. ii).
 Life-saving Apparatus in C.B. (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on personal explanation of Mr. Edgar, 1955 (vol. iii).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2977 (vol. iv).

Dundas, Mr. J. R., South Victoria, Ont.

- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1309 (vol. ii).
 G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 818 (vol. ii).
Ways and Means—In Com., 776 (vol. i); (woollen fabrics) 796 (vol. ii).

Dupont, Mr. F., Bagot.

- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. to adjn. deb., 3432 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1234 (vol. ii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070 (vol. ii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D., West Ontario.

- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2962, 2965 (vol. iv).
 Cape Breton Ry., construction (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).
 Colonization Co.'s, modification of agreements (Ques.) 2241 (vol. iii).
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2434 (vol. iii).
 Copyright, Law of (prop. Res., 708-711 (vol. i)).
 C. P. R., Ability of Co. to fulfil engagements under prop. Res. (Ques.) 2238 (vol. iii).
 ——— Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for 2°, 3024-3026 (vol. iv).
 ——— Connection with Quebec (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).
 ——— Curves, Grades and Tangents (Ques.) 2239 (iii).
 ——— Eastern Section, quantities, classifications, and prices, Engineers' Estimates (M. for copies) 299 (i).
 ——— Eastern Section, Western Division (M. for copies of Estimates, &c.) 302 (vol. i).
 ——— Location in B.C., Change of (Ques.) 2239 (iii).
 ——— Progress Estimates, Eastern Section (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).
 ——— Rolling Stock on Eastern Section, Change in Western Division (M. for Ret.) 302 (vol. i).
 ——— Section B., Award of \$34,179.17, credits in Public Accounts (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).
 ——— Trestles and Bridges, number of (M. for Stmtnt.) 100, 105 (vol. i).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

- Civil Govt., in Com. of Sup., 913 (vol. ii).
 Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3353 (vol. iv).
 Disturbance in the N.W., Col. Otter's march to Battleford (remarks) 1386 (vol. i).
 ——— Civil Service Volunteers (remarks) 3043 (iv).
 ——— Poundmaker, Surrender of prisoners by (Ques.) 2065 (vol. iii).
 ——— Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of Confidence, on M. to adjn. deb., 3212 (vol. iv).
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1007 (vol. ii).
 Dom. Lands in B. C., Timber dues (Ques.) 2240 (vol. iii).
 Evangelical Lutheran Church of Can. B. 60 (*Mr. Mc Carthy*) in Com., 693 (vol. i).
 Evans Divorce (B. 106, 1° on a div.) 672; 2° agreed to (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i).
 Export Duty on Oak, Pine and Spruce Logs (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Federation of the Empire, proposals for (Ques.) 51 (i).
 Fisheries Protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).
 Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1197-1200; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1399; "owner," 1473; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1553, (Chinese) 1582, 1584 (vol. ii); "farm," 2393; "qualifications in counties," "manhood suffrage" 1968-1970, 1993, 2001, (Amt.) 2003, (Indian) 2022, 2053, 2066, 2080, 2394; "registration of voters," 2282, 2289, 2305, 2312, 2316-2319; "revision of voters' lists," 2330, 2331, 2334, 2337 (vol. iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on Amt. (*Mr. McIntyre*) to M. for 3°, 3057 (vol. iv); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799; (personal explanation) 1872 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1510; appeal from Chair to House, 1510 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2025, 2274, 2319 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1320 (vol. ii).
 Imperial Federation, Cor. between High Commissioner and Govt. (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).
 Insolvency, attention of Govt. called to Rep. of Com., 1095 (vol. ii).
 ——— Legislation (Ques.) 1038 (vol. ii).
 Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, Loan Co.'s, &c. (B. 127, 1°) 1094 (vol. ii).
 Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, &c., Act Amt. (B. 66, 1°) 235 (vol. i).
 I. C. R., Sale of Tickets on Chatham Branch (Ques.) 2238 (vol. iii).
 Land Grants to Rys. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2518, 2521, 2533 (vol. iii).
 Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. and the C. P. R. (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1893 (vol. iii).

Edgar, Mr. J. D.—Continued.

Privilege, Ques. of, article in *Toronto News* (Ques. of Order) 1680 (vol. ii); paragraph in *Ottawa Citizen* (personal explanation) 1955; Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures, 2103 (vol. iii).

Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Stmbt. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (iii).

Rys. and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3353 (iv).

Returns, enquiry for (remarks) 1039 (vol. ii).

St. Clair Rancho Co., rent paid, &c. (Ques.) 2240 (iii).

St. Croix Cotton Mills, payment of Duties (Ques.) 632 (i).

Short Line Ry. to the Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).

Fisheries (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3353 (vol. iv).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2995 (vol. iv).

Fairbank, Mr. J. H., East Lambton.

Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com. on Res., 2930; in Com. on B., 2965; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 2967 (vol. iv).

Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on Amt. to prop. Res., 253 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1057; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2653, 2669 (vol. iv).

C.P.R., Res. respecting further Loan, in Com., 2734.

— Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmnt., 484 (vol. i).

Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2536, 2538 (vol. iii).

Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Jamieson*) to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 948 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) "qualifications in cities and towns," 1779, 1784 (vol. iii); "actual value," 1605; "person (Indian) 1519, 1531; "woman suffrage," 1415; on M. for 2°, 1226 (vol. ii); "qualifications, &c." "manhood suffrage" 1971-1973, 1993, 1997; "qualifications in counties," 2082; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2152; "revision of voters' lists," 2338, 2342, 2348 (vol. iii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068 (vol. iv).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070, 1081; on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 1333 (vol. ii).

Land Grants to Rys. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).

Life-boats and Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2949 (iv).

Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).

Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2789 (vol. iv).

Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in (Ms. for Rets.) 819, 823 (vol. ii).

Fairbank, Mr. J. H.—Continued.

Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 591 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2949 (iv).

Volunteers, Recognition of Services in the N. W. B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3379 (iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 793 (vol. ii).

Farrow, Mr. T., East Huron.

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2468 (vol. iii).

Census in Man. and N. W. T., &c. (Ques.) 149 (vol. i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1121 (vol. ii).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).

Divorce Court, creation of a (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).

Dynamite, Legislation respecting (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).

Fishery Commission, remuneration of Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (vol. iv).

Fort Francis Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3385 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "tenant," 1482 (vol. ii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2552 (vol. iii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 454 (vol. i).

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2844 (vol. iv).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2513, 2521 (vol. iii).

Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2895 (iv).

Man. and North-Western Railway Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (vol. iii).

Man. and South-Western Col. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2513 (vol. iii).

Members Indemnity Act Amt. (B. 116, 1°*) 813 (vol. ii).

Parliamentary Companion, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals (Fort Francis, amount due Hugh Sutherland) 3385 (iv).

Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 985 (vol. ii).

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3310 (vol. iv).

Immigration, 2844 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3388; (*Parliamentary Companion*) 3387 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 801 (vol. ii).

Ferguson, Mr. J., Welland.

Agricultural Fertilizers, Sale and Inspection of (B. 122) prop. Res., 936 (vol. ii).

Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junc. Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt (B. 38, 1°*) 125 (vol. i).

International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 255 (vol. i).

Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, re Timber Regulations in B.C., 2240 (vol. iii).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303 (vol. iv).

Immigration, 2833 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 786; (woollen fabrics) 794 (vol. ii).

Ferguson, Mr. C. F., North Leeds and Grenville.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 962, 1057, on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2654 (vol. iv).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "actual value," 1601 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2203 (iii).
Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii).
Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2489, 2491-2493 (vol. iii).
Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).

Fisher, Mr. S. A., Brome.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467-2470 (vol. iii).
Agricultural Fertilizers, Sale and Inspection of, B. 122 (*Mr. Ferguson, Welland*) on prop. Res., 938 (vol. ii); on M. for 2°, 2477; in Com., 2478-2482 (vol. iii).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1032, 1034, 1035 (vol. ii).
Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on prop. Res. (Amt.) 242; agreed to (Y. 105, N. 74) 253 (vol. i).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, voting on the (M. for Stmt.) 121 (vol. i).
Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Pub. Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); in Com., 955, 956, 959, 960, 962, 963 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2646, 2649, 2653, 2661 (vol. iv).
Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) to M. for 3°, 1299 (vol. ii).
Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032, 1034 (ii).
Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3393 (vol. iv).
Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 947 (ii).
Fisheries Protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 703 (vol. i).
Fishery Commission, remuneration of Counsel, in Com. of Sup., 3391 (vol. iv).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1254-1258; "usufructuary," 1455; "tenant," 1479, 1482; "person" (Indian) 1504, 1538; "actual value," 1595, 1599, 1602, 1604, (Amt.) 1595; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1647-1654 (vol. ii), 1804, 1994, 1996, 2080; "manhood suffrage," 1967; "who shall not vote," 2098, (Indians) 2116-2119; "registration of voters," 2211, 2294 (vol. iii); consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3070, neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3071 (vol. iv); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1425, 1434 (vol. ii).
House of Commons, Commissioners' Rep. re Staff (Ques.) 2750 (vol. iv).
Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2831, 2833, 2837, 2839, 2841, 2842, 2850 (vol. iv).
Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067, 1071, 1081, 1090; on M. for 3°, 1321 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) 1323; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) 1326 (vol. ii).

Fisher, Mr. S. A.—Continued.

- Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2401 (vol. iii).
Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).
Reciprocity with the U. S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1021 (vol. ii).
Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3284 (vol. iv).
Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3284 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032, 1034; (compiling Agricultural and other Statistics in Man. and N. W. T.) 1035 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 3393 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2831, 2835, 2837, 2839, 2841, 2842, 2850 (vol. iv).
Liquor License Act (administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3391 (vol. iv).

Fleming, Mr. J., Peel.

- Bonuses granted to Rys., Memorials, &c., respecting (M. for copies*) 1443 (vol. ii).
Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1146-1149; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1410; "usufructuary," 1457; "owner," 1473; "tenant" (Amt.) 1476, 1477, 1479; "person" (Indian) 1545; on M. that Com. rise, 1531 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1994, (Amt) 1997; "in counties," 2062, 2080; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2164; "registration of voters," 2197-2199, 2298; "revision of voters' lists," 2341 (vol. iii).
Indian Lands unsold in Township of Toronto (M. for List*) 147 (vol. i).
Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1325 (vol. ii).
Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 186 (vol. i).
Port Credit Harbor, Repairs to (Ques.) 188 (vol. i).
Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).

Forbes, Mr. J. F., Queen's, N.S.

- Allan Steamship Co. and claim of Govt. re *Newfield* and *Moravian* (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).
Automatic Buoys, Liverpool Harbor (Ques.) 479 (vol. i); 1914 (iii).
Brooklyn, N.S., Breakwater, Wharfage Collections (Ques.) 478 (vol. i).
Coffin's Island Lighthouse protection (Ques.) 1915 (iii).
Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii).
Customs Detectives or Police in N. S. (Ques.) 889 (ii).
Fish-ladders in La Have River, N.S. (Ques.) 2239 (iii).
Flour and Cornmeal, increase of duty (Ques.) 148 (i).
Free Fishing to American Fishermen (Ques.) 3321 (iv).
Grant, Alpin, position under Govt. (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).
Hardware and Ry. Supplies, purchase of, by Dept. of Rys. and Canals (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).

Forbes, Mr. J. F.—Continued.

- Hardware and Supplies furnished Dept. Marine and Fisheries at Halifax (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Liverpool Harbor, Automatic Buoys (Ques.) 479 (vol. i); 1914 (vol. iii).
 Marine Stores, purchase in Halifax (Ques.) 1914 (iii).
 Milliard, Mr., Fines imposed, collection (Ques.) 1211 (ii).
 Railway Supplies, purchase in Halifax (Ques.) 1915 (iii).
 Rogers' Fish-ladders, purchase or use (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
 Rogers, W. H., Fishery Inspector for N. S., breach of Sawdust Law (M. for Ret.*) 147 (vol. i).
 Sawdust in La Have River, N. S. (Ques.) 2239 (vol. iii).
 Shingle Shavings in the Mersey River (Ques.) 1039 (ii).
 Somerville Breakwater, repair of (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Customs, Dépt. of) 902 (vol. ii).
 White Point Breakwater, repair of (Ques.) 52 (i).

Fortin, Mr. P., Gaspé.

- Fishery Bounties, number and amount of Claims paid, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 56 (vol. i).

Foster, Mr. G. E., King's, N.B.

- Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on Amt. to prop. Res., 243-247 (vol. i).
 C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2702-2708 (vol. iv).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Pets. respecting (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Can. Tem. Act, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 960-963, 1046; on Amt. (*Mr. Townshend*) 1051; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. for 3°, 1053; in Com., 1058 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2646, 2650, 2660, 2670 (iv).
 Cavalry and Infantry Schools, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (vol. iv).
 Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).
 Civil Service Acts Amt., B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. to conc. in Res., 891; in Com. on B., 1112, 1114 (vol. ii).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 978 (vol. ii).
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 919 (vol. ii).
 Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act, to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 944 (ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1156-1158; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1558 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1819, 1822-2001; "in counties," 2055, 2057; "who shall not vote," 2089, 2098 (vol. iii); Ques. of Order, 1619 (vol. ii), 1825 (vol. iii); (remarks) 1715 (vol. ii), 2164 (vol. iii).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Boards of Commissioners under (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, Amt. (B. 58, 1°) 170; 2° m., 620 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. 2896 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 978; (Inland Revenue, contingencies) 919 (vol. ii).
Liquor License Act, conc., 3398 (vol. iv).
Militia (Cavalry and Infantry School Corps) 2915 (vol. iv).
Railways—Capital: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415 (iv).

Foster, Mr. G. E.—Continued.

- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) to M. for 2°, 165 (vol. i).
 Supreme Court of N. B., causes entered for Argument (M. for number, &c.) 294 (vol. i).
 Volunteers in the N. W. and Intoxicating Liquors (Ques.) 1131 (vol. ii).
 Prohibitory Liquor Law of the N. W. T., relaxation of provisions (M. for Cor.) 101 (vol. i).
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 706 (i).
 Scott Act Pets. (M. to orase name) 2320 (vol. iii).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3274-3276, (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 535-545 (vol. i); in Com. (woollen fabrics) 800 (vol. ii).

Gault, Mr. M. H., West Montreal.

- C. P. R. Employés Relief Ass. incorp. (B. 75, 1°*) 313 (vol. i).
 Canned Goods, Law respecting (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1120-1124 (vol. ii).
 Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).
 Disturbance in the N. W., Arms, description of (Ques.) 814; Troops ready to start (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. "person" (Chinese) 1582; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1638 (vol. ii).
 Government yards in Montreal (Ques.) 57 (vol. i).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1071 (vol. ii).
 Postmaster Genl, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of, personal paragraph in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 49 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Customs, Dept. of) 901; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).
Miscellaneous (Disturbance in the N. W., vote of \$700,000) 1305 (vol. ii).
 Vote of \$700,000 for N. W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 1305 (vol. ii).
Ways and Means—in Com. (umbrella and parasol ribs, &c.) 858 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com. on B., 1673 (vol. ii).

Gigault, Mr. G. A., Rouville.

- Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes Act Amt. (B. 46, 1°) 147 (vol. i).
 Bureau of Agriculture, Establishment (Ques.) 76 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 112, 1°) 743 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1062 (vol. ii).
 Criminal Laws of Canada, 1869-1871, publication in French (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).

Gigault, Mr. G. A.—Continued.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 1245-1248 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1789 (vol. iii).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 3400 (vol. iv).

Gillmor, Mr. A. H., Charlotte.

Arts, Agricul. and Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1033 (ii).
Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2^o, 893 (vol. ii).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1058 (vol. ii).

Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3416 (vol. iv).

Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1033 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2^o, 1226-1269; "person" (Indians) 1534, (Chinese) 1585; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1707-1709 (vol. ii), 1807, 1984, 1990, 1997; "in counties," 2054, 2060, 2072, 2074; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2114-2116; "registration of voters," 2258 (vol. iii), on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059; on consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38 N. 87) 3069 (vol. iv); on M. that Com. rise, 1437 (vol. ii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1317 (vol. ii).

I. C. R. Free Passes during 1834 (M. for Ret.) 234 (i).

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2840, 2843 (vol. iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951, 2952 (vol. iv).

Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract, B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).

Rand's Micmac Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3421 (iv).

St. Stephen's, N.B., public buildings, construction of, (Ques.) 1148 (vol. i).

Settlers in the Maritime Provs. (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2978; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3281 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Colonial Exhibitions) 1033 (ii).

Immigration, 2840, 2843 (vol. iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog Alarms, construction) 2952; (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary) 3421 (vol. iv).

Public Works—Consld. Fund: Telegraphs, 3420 (vol. iv).

Railways—Capital: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3416 (iv).

Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 648-656 (vol. i).

Weirs in the County of Charlotte, N.B., Licenses, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 1444 (vol. ii).

Girouard, Mr. D., Jacques Cartier.

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2668 (vol. iv).

Consld. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2432-2436 (vol. iii).

Disturbance in the N. W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3128-3154 (vol. iv);

Girouard, Mr. D.—Continued.

Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 309 (i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1446; "tenant," 1480 (vol. ii).

Histoires Genealogique des Familles Francaises, 3456 (vol. iv).

La Banque du Peuple (B. 53, 1^o*) 170 (vol. i).

Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 3449 (vol. iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 171 (vol. i); paragraph in *Globe* (personal explanation) 3393 (vol. iv); paragraph in *Montreal Times* (personal explanation) 3161 (vol. iv).

Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3407 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3267 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: H. of C. (increased expenses under Internal Econ. Commissioners' Rep.) 3449 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (Histories Genealogique des Familles Francaises) 3456 (vol. iv).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2^o, 157 (vol. i).

Ways and Means—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) *re* Disturbance in N.W., 3128-3154 (vol. iv).

Glen, Mr. F. F., South Ontario.

Ways and Means—in Com. (duck) 809; (hoop iron) 807; (steel) 808 (vol. ii).

Gordon, Mr. D. W., Vancouver Island.

Alaska and B. C. Boundary line (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 705 (vol. i).

Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3022 (vol. iv).

Indian Affairs in B. C., Cor. between Govt. of Can. and B. C., on M. for copies, 870 (vol. ii).

Indian Troubles at Metlakatla, on M. for copies of Cor., 304 (vol. i).

Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, *re* Timber Regulations in B.C., 2239 (vol. iii).

Railway Belt on Vancouver Island (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).

Guay, Mr., Levis.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1633 (vol. ii).

St. Romuald d'Etchemin, Station at (Ques.) 1567 (ii).

Gunn, Mr. A., Kingston.

License Inspectors, pay of, under Act of 1883 (Ques.) 1568 (vol. ii).

Ways and Means—in Com. (glucose syrup) 850-852 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3218 (vol. iv).

Hackett, Mr. E., Prince, P.E.I.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., (Ques. of Order) 1431; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1654-1657 (vol. ii); "who shall not vote," 2095 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3^o, 3054-3056 (vol. iv).

Hackett, Mr. E.—Continued.

- P. E. I. Ry., Cape Traverse Branch, payment of Laborers (M. for copies of Pets., &c.) 142 (vol. i).
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1001 (vol. ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 687-692 (vol. i).
 Winter Crossing from P.E.I., on M. for copies of Cor., 63 (vol. i).

Haggart, Mr. J. G., South Lanark.

- Dom. Drainage Co.'s (B. 28, 1°*) 88; 2° m., 1007 (ii).
 SUPPLY:
Legislation: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) conc., 3372 (iv).

Hall, Mr. R. N., Sherbrooke.

- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2434, 2438 (vol. iii).
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com. (Amts.) 150 (i).
 Fort Macleod Ranch and Tel. Co.'s B. 80 (M. to conc. in Sen. Amts.) 2357 (vol. iii).
 Geological Survey of the Dom., Management of (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).
 Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1348 (vol. iii).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2979-2982, 2987; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3274 (vol. iv).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Dominion Exhibition) 1026 (ii).

Hay, Mr. R., Centre Toronto.

- Patent Act., 1872, Amt. (B. 89, 1°*) 362 (vol. i).

Hesson, Mr. S. R., North Perth.

- Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36. (*Mr. Orton*) on Res. 117 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1047 (vol. ii).
 C. P. R. Res. respecting further Loan (remarks on adjmt. of deb.) 2643; in Com., 2742, 2750 (vol. iv).
 — Rets ordered by House since date of Contract (M. for Stmt.) 481, 483 (vol. i).
 — Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for Stmt., 111 (vol. i).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1130; (remarks) 1209, (vol. ii).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 977, 982 (ii).
Debates, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in First Rep. (remarks) 35 (vol. i).
 Dep. Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3355, 3358 (iv).
 Fisheries' Act, extension of, to the N.W. (Ques.) 51 (i).
 Fisheries protection in the N.W. (M. for copies of Cor.) 700 (vol. i).

Hesson, Mr. S. R.—Continued.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "farmers' sons," 1595; "actual value," 1599, 1605 (vol. ii), (explanation) 1752; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1987; "in counties," 2059, 2081, 2082, 2084, 2085; "who shall not vote," (Indians) 2133; "registration of voters," 2246, 2283, 2295, 2305, (explanation) 2185, (correction) 2214; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1497 (vol. ii); 2208 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1494 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2028 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2552 (vol. iii).
 Gold Reserve, Govt., withdrawals, on M. for copies of Cor., 353 (vol. i).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2835, 2836, 2853 (vol. iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1072 (vol. ii).
 Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 918 (vol. ii).
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 83 (vol. i).
 Lands in Ry. Belt, in B. C. and Homestead Act (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).
 Letter Postage reduction (Ques.) 33; on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 291 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, administration of, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).
 N. W. Central Ry., Land grant to, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3382 (vol. iv).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).
 Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2809 (iv).
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1351 (vol. ii).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 977, 982; (Inland Revenue, Dept. of, contingencies) 918 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2835, 2836, 2853 (vol. iv).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (printing and printing paper, &c.) 2809 (vol. iv).
Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Deputy Speaker's Salary) 3355, 3358 (vol. iv).
 Towels, in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 747-756 (vol. i); in Com. (towels) 858 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).

Hickey, Mr. C. E., Dundas.

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) M. to adja. deb. on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3431 (vol. iv).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com. (Amts.) 955, 956, 959, 963, 1055; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1051 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2645, 2650, 2653 (vol. iv).

Hickey, Mr. C. E.—*Continued.*

Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2437 (vol. iii).

Debates, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr Tassé*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 3369; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 3370 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "actual value," 1600 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1887-1890, 1989; "revision of voters' lists," 2330; "registration of voters" (Amt.) 2279 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1461 (vol. ii).

Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1029 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Mortuary Statistics) 1029 (ii).
Immigration, 2852 (vol. iv).

Pensions (Veterans of War of 1812) 993; conc., 1812 (vol. ii) 2766 (vol. iv).

Volunteers of 1837-38 (Res. recognising services) 37 (vol. i).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1676 (vol. ii).

Hilliard, Mr. G., *West Peterborough.*

Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 702 (vol. i).

Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1224 (vol. ii).

Holton, Mr. E., *Chateauguay.*

A. B. and C. Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).

Cherrier, Geo. E., Indian Agent at Caughnawaga, dismissal of (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

County Court Judges' Salaries (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).

Exchange Bank of Canada, Govt. Claim against (Ques.) 89; on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 368 (vol. i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (M. that Com. rise) 1430 (vol. ii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070 (vol. iv).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).

Heney, John, Govt. property occupied by (Ques.) 3426 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Civil Government (Interior, Dept. of) 3408 (vol. iv).

Geological Survey, 3346 (vol. iv).

Militia (A. B. and C. Batteries, &c.) 2914 (vol. iv).

Public Works—Consolid. Fund: Quebec, 3385 (vol. iv).

Homer, Mr. J. A. R., *New Westminster.*

Alaska and B.C. boundary line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 705 (vol. i).

C.P.R., Port Moody and Savona's Ferry, extension of time (Ques.) 146 (vol. i).

Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3022 (vol. iv).

—— Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1582 (vol. ii).

Innes, Mr. J., *South Wellington.*

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1736-1739 (ii); "registration of voters" (Amt.) 2279 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065 (vol. iv).

Mails between Shiloh and Fergus (Ques.) 1211 (vol. ii).
Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2982 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).

Irvine, Mr. D., *Carleton, N.B.*

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 960, 1055 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 2674 (iv).

Duties on Hay, Cor. between Canada and U. S. (M. for copies) 443 (vol. i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1544 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1814-1817; "who shall not vote," 2097 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1425 (vol. ii).

Obstructions in Rivers, Cor. between Canada and U. S. (M. for copies) 443; withdn, 445 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 784, 786, 792; (woollen fabrics) 800 (vol. ii).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1672 (vol. ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Public Buildings, Inspector of (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).

Ives, Mr. W. B., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on 1°, 449; on Ques. to fix day for 2°, 713 (vol. i); on M. for 2° (Amt.) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109) 954; in Com., 956; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. for 3°, 1053; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan (speech) 2622-2630 (vol. iv).

Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 284 (vol. i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 280 (vol. i).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973 (vol. i).

Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2432-2435, (Amt.) 2438; on Order for 3°, 2532 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768; (Amt.) 2768 (vol. iv).

Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., out in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) in Com., 150 (vol. i).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3233, 3234 (vol. iv).

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Res., 72 (vol. i).

Ives, Mr. W. B.—Continued.

- Disturbance in the N. W., Engagement at Duck Lake, despatch of Troops (Ques.) 790; (remarks) 815; (personal explanation) par. in *Toronto Globe*, 1063 (ii).
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1008; on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 372 (vol. i).
 Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act, to M. for rsmng adjd. deb. for 2°, 940 (ii).
 Fort Macleod Ranch and Telegraph Co.'s (B. 80, 1°*) 349 (vol. 1).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1986-1988; (Ques. of Order) 1794, 2242 (vol. iii).
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 83 (vol. i).
 Library of Parl. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2760 (vol. iv).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2960 (vol. iv).
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for Repts., &c., 697 (vol. i).

SUPPLY :

- Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 973 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 3233, 3234 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2833 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 788 (vol. ii).

Jackson, Mr. J., South Norfolk.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) to M. for 3°, 1061 (ii).
 Divorce Cases, Evidence in (remarks) 428 (vol. i).
 Dredges, Tugs and Scows, building (M. for Ret.) 53 (i).
 Dummy Lighthouse Fog-horn (M. for copies of Cor.) 293 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1342; "person" (Indian) 1538; "qualifications in cities and towns" 171°-1715 (vol. ii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1312 (vol. ii).
 Life-saving Service at Port Rowan (M. for copies of Cor.) 142 (vol. i).
 Long Point Fishing Grounds (Ques.) 289 (vol. i).
 Mail Bags, furnishing of (Ques.) 964 (vol. ii).
 Port Rowan as a Harbor of Refuge, construction of (M. for Ret.) 297 (vol. i).
 Ports Stanley and Burwell harbors of refuge, on M. for Ret. 62 (vol. i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 662-666 (vol. i).
 Weights and Measures Inspection Act Amt. B. 118, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Costigan*) 837: in Com., 1672 (ii).

Jamieson, Mr. J., North Lanark.

- Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) to prop. Res., 252 (vol. i).

Jamieson, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 92, 1°) 448; (Ques. to fix day for 2°) 713; M. to make B. 2nd Order of Public Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); 2° m., 949; 2° agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; in Com., 955-964; consent of Govt. asked for 3°, 1040; 3° m., 1045; in Com., 1047; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) 1053; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1060; on Amt. (*Mr. Gigault*) 1062 (vol. ii); Ques. to fix day for consdn. of Sen. Amts., 2529 (vol. iii); M. to disagree with Sen. Amts., 2644; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; (Amt.) 2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 108) 2651; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 75, N. 90) 2552; (Amts.) 2653, 2655, 2657 (iv).
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. to resume adjd. deb. for 2° (Amt.) to substitute Can. Temp. Act, 940; agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (vol. ii).
 Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Beaty*) M. to pass to Pub. Bills and Orders, 1045 (ii).

Jenkins, Mr. J. T., Queen's, P.E.I.

- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2482 (vol. iii).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1056 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2655 (vol. iv).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1127 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1344 (vol. ii); in Com. "manhood suffrage," 1981 (vol. iii); on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3053; agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062 (vol. iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1080 (vol. ii).
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1019 (vol. ii).
Lansdowne, Steamer, and communication with P.E.I. (Ques.) 927 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1674 (vol. ii).
 Winter Crossing from P.E.I., on M. for Cor., 65 (i).

Kaulbach, Mr. C. E., Lunenburg.

- Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 701 (vol. i).
 Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, re N. S. Volunteers, 1094 (vol. ii); (explanation) vote on Sen. Amts. to Can. Temp. Act, 3073 (vol. iv).
 Rogers' Patent Fish-ladder, Cor. and Repts., on M. for copies, 871 (vol. ii).
 Wharves and Docks in navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 216 (vol. i).

Kilvert, Mr. F. E., Hamilton.

- Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 77, 1°*) 313 (vol. i).
 Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 114) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).
 Hatzfeld Divorce (B. 107, 1° on a div.) 672, 694; 2° agreed to (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i).
 Share and Loan Capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 114, 1°*) 783 (vol. ii).

King, Mr. G. G., Queen's, N. B.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1261-1263; in Com. "person" (Indian) 1524 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1806; "who shall not vote" (Indian) 2164; "registration of voters," 2266, 2285, (Amt.) 2285 (vol. iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration, 2833 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 561-566 (vol. i).

Kinney, Mr. J. R., Yarmouth.

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1313 (vol. ii).

Windsor Branch Ry., O.C., Agreements, &c., respecting (M. for copies*) 533 (vol. i).

Kirk, Mr. J. A., Guysborough.

Bounty to Fishermen, payment of, in Guysborough, N.S. (Ques.) 2751 (vol. iv).

Buildings in N.S., in Com. of Sup., 2917 (vol. iv).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, certificates, Liquor sold under, in N.S. (M for Ret.*) 147 (vol. i).

Coal, purchase of, for Public Buildings, quantity and value (M. for Stmt.*) 313 (vol. i).

Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921 (vol. iv).

Fish-breeding, in Com. of Sup., 2954 (vol. iv).

Fishery Bounty, distribution, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).

Fishery Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1259-1261 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1834; "in counties," 2067, 2072, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (vol. iii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1308, 1312 (vol. ii).

Harbors and Rivers, N.S., in Com. of Sup., 3419 (iv).

Harbors in Guysboro' Co., re-survey of (Ques) 51 (i).

Indians and Half-breeds, Education of, in Man. and the N.W.T. (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Indian Schools in the N.W. and Man. (Ques.) 568 (i).

Laurie, Maj. Gen., mission of, to the N.W. (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2950, 2952 (vol. iv).

Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3422 (vol. iv).

Military Col. Graduates in the Militia (Ques.) 1040 (ii).

New Harbor and Indian Harbor, N.S., Breakwaters, Engineers' Reps. (M. for copies, &c*) 147 (vol. i).

N. S. Claims for a Subsidy (Ques.) 189 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave and East Bay, Steamship subvention in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).

Port Mulgrave and Guysborough, Canso and Arichat, communication between (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave, N.S., as a sub-port (M. for Papers, &c.) 445; (reply) 448 (vol. i).

Returns, enquiries for, 490, 504, 534 (vol. i).

Kirk, Mr. J. A.—Continued.

Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1011 (vol. ii).

St. Francis Lake, road dyke, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).

Rimouski, steamer, subsidy to (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).

Subsidy to N.S., increase of (Ques.) 567.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 153 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 3293; on M. to conc. in Amts. (Amt.) 3400; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Canals—Income: Miscellaneous (road dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3418 (vol. iv).

Fisheries (Distribution of Bounties) 2956; (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2954; (Fishery protection Steamers) 2956 (vol. iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, Salaries, &c., 2950, 2952 (vol. iv).

Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3422 (vol. iv).

Public Works—Consolid. Fund: Harbors and Rivers (N. S.) 3419. *Income*: Buildings (N.S.) 2917; Dredging, 2921. (iv).

Vacancy in a Judicial District, N.S. (Ques.) 2750 (iv).

Kirkpatrick, Hon. G. A., Frontenac.

[See SPEAKER, MR.]

Kranz, Mr. H., North Waterloo.

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2474 (vol. iii).

Brewers and Distillers, compensation to (prop. Res.) 236 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, memorials, &c., respecting (M. for copies*) 448 (vol. i).

Private Bills, reception of (M. to extend time) 88 (i).

Landerkin, Mr. G., South Grey.

Analysts, Public, Remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2542-2546 (vol. ii).

British Medical Acts, Ret. respecting (remarks) 939 (ii).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1108 (vol. ii).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 973 (vol. ii).

Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1353-1360; "tenant," 1482; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1539; "actual value," 1602 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns" (Indians) 1845-1849, 1985, 1997, (Amt.) 2000, 2021; "qualifications in counties," 2074; "registration of voters," 2267, 2301; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2385; (personal explanation) 2025, 2027 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1432; on M. to adjn. deb., 1433 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798 (vol. iii).

Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures, on personal explanation of Mr. McNeill, 2172; (letter read) 2496 (vol. iii).

Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3348 (vol. iv).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 1333 (vol. ii).

Landerkin, Mr. G.—Continued.

- Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 917, 919 (ii).
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1669 (vol. ii).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, application for and licenses granted, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 46 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3421 (vol. iv).
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 906 (vol. ii).
Parliamentary Companion, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (ii).
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 902 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (*Mr. Sproule*) remarks, 89 (vol. i).
 Rys. centreing in Ottawa, bounties granted to (M. for Ret.) 86 (vol. i).
 Rys. in the County of Grey, refund of bonuses to County Council, &c. (M. for copy of memorial) 58 (vol. i).
 Returns, enquiry for, 455 (vol. i), 1205 (vol. ii).
 Superintendent of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 272 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Customs, Dept. of) 901; (Civil Service Board of Examiners) 973; (Inland Revenue, Dept. of, contingencies, 917, 919; (Marine, Dept. of) 906; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
Geological Survey, 3348 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (increased Indemnity to Members) 3450 (iv).
Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3421 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (*Parliamentary Companion*) 3387.
 Trutch, J. W., employment of, by Govt. (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 801 (ii).

Landry, Mr. P. A., Kent, N.B.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 962, 1059 (vol. ii).
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com. 2436 (vol. iii).
Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3370 (vol. iv).
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 946 (ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1449; "person" (Indians) 1554; (Chinese) 1584, 1588 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1812; "in counties," 2057; "who shall not vote," 2100; (explanation) 2195; "registration of voters," 2230, 2232, 2260 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) to M. for 3°, 3058 (vol. iv); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1465 (vol. ii).
 Foot and Carriage Bridge on the St. John River (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Richibucto and Kingston Ports, Customs business (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3276 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res. 3276 (iv).

Landry, Mr. P. A.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (N. B. and P. E. I. to Great Britain, &c.) 3457 (vol. iv).
 Winter crossing from P. E. I., on M. for copies of Cor., 65 (vol. i).

Landry, Mr. P., Montmagny.

- Bolduc, Capt., Resignation of (M. for Ret.) 29 (vol. i).
 C. P. R. Short Line Ry. (M. for copies of O. C., instructions given, Reports, &c., of Engineers) 33 (vol. i).
 Disturbance in the N. W., criticisms of Press as to cause, and slur upon French members commanding Battalions, 887 (vol. ii).
 Drill Shed at Quebec, tenders for construction of (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1635, 1637 (ii).
 Immigration Office (Ques.) employés names, &c. (M. for Stmt.) 30 (vol. iv).
 Library and Mr. Bourinot's work (remarks) 40 (i).
 Plante, J. B., Claim of (M. for copies*) 147 (vol. i).
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic ports, in Com., on Res., 2978, 2982, 2995; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3273.
 Short Line Ry., Second Rep. of Mr. Light (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
 Short Line Ry. Survey from St. Charles (Ques.) 350 (i).
 Subsidies to Rys. further B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2978, 2982, 2995; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3273 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2939 (vol. iv).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction (B. 3, 1°) 28; Order for 2° read, 102; 2° m., 151; (reply) 167; 2° neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (vol. i).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction, limitation (B. 68) M. to introd., 246; 1°, 270 (vol. i).
 Supreme Court, Judgments rendered by, since establishment (M. for copies*) 533 (vol. i).

Langelier, Mr. F., Mégantic.

- Administration of the N. W. in Com. on Res., (*Mr. Caron*) 2928, 2934 (vol. iv).
 Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2477 (vol. iii).
 Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1025 (vol. ii).
 Bolduc, Capt., Resignation of, on M. for Ret., 29 (vol. i).
 Bras St. Nicholas, deepening of (M. for copies of Pet.*) 312 (vol. i).
 Brosseau & Lisabelle, Customs Brokers, frauds, &c., by (Ques.) 1387 (vol. ii).
 Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).
 Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 3043 (vol. iv).

Langelier, Mr. F.—Continued.

Disturbance in the N. W., funeral expenses of Achille Blais (Ques.) 2169; pillage of houses of half-breeds by Volunteers (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii), 2990 (vol. iv).
Fog-horns and letter-box fronts, tenders for (M. for copies of advertisements, &c.*) 313 (vol. i).
France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2937-2942 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1364-1373; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1388; "usufructuary" 1444, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1452, 1454, 1455, 1457; "tenant," 1475, (Amt.) 1476, 1480; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1632-1638 (vol. ii), 1984, 1996, 1903-1908; "in counties," 2064, 2067, 2070, 2394; "registration of voters," 2185-2190, (Amt.) 2228; "revision of voters' lists," 2331, 2333, 2342; "appeal," 2365; "officers and duties," 2388; "offences," 2390 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3^o (Amt.) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066 (vol. iv).

Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2816-2818, 2831, 2834, 2837, 2838, 2892 (vol. iv).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1071 (vol. ii).

I. C. R., Cost of working, &c., from 1879 to 1884, on Amt. (*Mr. Pope*) to M. for Stmt., 202 (vol. i).

Lavis's patent pole and Militia tents (Ques.) 2029 (iii).

Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1028 (vol. ii).

Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. for Com on Res., 2556; in Com., 2557 (vol. iii); on M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2754 (vol. iv).

Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 2853 (vol. iv).

Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 193 (vol. i).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 987 (vol. ii).

Seizures by Customs Dept. at Montreal (Ques.) 1387 (ii).

School of Cavalry at Quebec (M. for Papers, &c.) 88 (i).

Simard, Joseph, Rep. recommending payment to Geo. Lavoie (M. for copies*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2982, 2986; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3259; (Amt.) 3266; neg. (Y. 39, N. 107) 3289; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 3292 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, care of) 1025; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032; (Mortuary Statistics) 1028 (ii).
Immigration, 2816-2818, 2831, 2834, 2837, 2838, 2892 (vol. iv).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 2942 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Vote of \$700,000 for N. W. Troubles) 1304 (vol. ii); (Vote of \$1,000,000) 2236 (vol. iii).
Militia (Ammunition) 2903 (vol. iv).

Langelier, Mr. F.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 2946 (vol. iv).

Penitentiaries (St. Vincent de Paul) 987 (vol. ii).

Quarantine, 2853 (vol. iv).

Quebec, advances on account of Provincial Subsidy (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).

Vote of \$700,000 and \$1,000,000 for N. W. Troubles, in Com. of Sup., 1304 (vol. ii), 2236 (vol. iii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector, Three Rivers.

Adulteration of Food, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) remuneration to Analysts, prop. Res., 2497 (vol. iii).

Agent and contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv).

Alaska and B. C. boundary line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 705 (vol. i).

Amherst and P.E.I. Ry. incorp. B., on M. to introduce, 349 (vol. i).

Ascension Day, adjmt. for (M.) 1822 (vol. iii).

Baillairge, G. F., in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv).

Bank of B. C. (B. 105, 1^o) 631; 2^o m., 894 (vol. ii).

Bankrupt Estates and Official Assignees, on M. for Ret., 304 (vol. i).

Bankruptcy and Insolvency, Petitions respecting (M. to ref. to Sel. Com.) 125 (vol. i).

Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater, Extension of (Ans.) 77 (i).

Bolduc, Capt., Resignation of, on M. for Ret., 29 (vol. i);

Bridges, Booms, &c., on navigable waters, Act Amt. (B. 101, 1^o) 606 (vol. i); 2^o m., 893 (vol. ii).

Can. Agricultural Insurance Co., receipts and expenditures of liquidators, &c., on M. for Stmt., 303 (i).

Can. Southern Ry. Co. and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co. B. 9 (*Mr. Bergin*) in Com., 245 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for 1^o, 448 (i); in Com., 955, 960-964, 1046 (ii).

Can. Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers, 931 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Extension to Canadian ports on the Atlantic, Vernon Smith's Rep., on M. for copies, 294 (vol. i).

— Land grant accepted by Co., number of acres (Stmt.) 862 (vol. ii).

— North Shore Ry., subsidy to, on M. for copies of Cor., 43 (vol. i).

— Short Line Ry., on M. for O. C., instructions given, Reports, &c., of Engineers, 33, 39 (vol. i).

Cape St. Ignace, Station at (Ans.) 246 (vol. i).

Cape Tormentine Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2917 (iv).

Cascumpec Harbor Improvements (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).

Charlottetown Public Buildings, construction of (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).

Chenevert, J. A., employment of, in Public Works Dept. (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).

Church Point and Trout Cove Piers, Engineers' Rep., on M. for copy, 54 (vol. i).

Chinese Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3387, 3421; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).

Langevin, Hon Sir Hector—Continued.

- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1102, 1104, 1118, 1128 (vol. ii).
- Court of Claims for Canada (B. 93, 1°) 449 (vol. i); prop. Res., 777 (vol. ii); M. to dschg. Order, 2439 (iii).
- Collins, J. E., sums paid to, for services, on M. for Ret., 700 (vol. i).
- Commercial Relations between France and Canada, on M. for copies of Cor., 831 (vol. ii).
- Commercial Treaty with Jamaica (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).
- Consolid. Ry. Act., 1879, Amt. B. 111 (*Mr. Mulock*) on 1°, 743 (vol. i).
- Cornwall Public Buildings (Ans.) 2997 (vol. iv).
- Coste, Louis and Eugène, employment of (Ans.) 1131 (vol. ii).
- County Court Judges, Man. (B. 162) prop. Res., 3395 (iv).
- Customs and Excise Receipts for June (Ans.) 3073 (iv).
- Debates, Official Rep., on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 3361; in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees, on M. to appoint Malachy Daly, Esq., 72 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N. W., Jackson, Mr., communications from, *re* Half-breed Claims (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Murder of Payne and Applegarth and rising of Stoney Indians, 859 (vol. ii).
- on adjmt. (remarks) 3160, 3212 (vol. iv).
- Prisoners held for trial (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3441 (vol. iv).
- Stoney Indian rising (Stmnt.) 886 (vol. ii).
- Telegraphic communication west of Winnipeg (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).
- Dredges, Tugs and Scows, building of, on M. for Ret., 53; (remarks) 56 (vol. i).
- Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921; conc., 2923 (vol. iv).
- Dry Docks, encouragement of construction (B. 108, 1°) 693 (vol. i); 2° m., 894 (vol. ii).
- Dundas and Waterloo Road (B. 120) prop. Res. and M. for Com., 451 (vol. i); Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 892 (vol. ii); M. to dschg. Order, 2396 (vol. iii).
- Dundas Public Buildings, erection of (Ans.) 290 (i).
- Easter, adjmt. for (M.) 888 (vol. ii).
- Esquimalt Graving Dock, length of (Ans.) 743; substitution of granite for sandstone (Ans.) 743 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
- Expiring Laws continuation (B. 165 1°*,) 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3458 (vol. iv).
- Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 886 (vol. ii).
- France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2937 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1137; on M. for Com. (remarks) 1385 (vol. ii); "qualifications in counties," 2085; on personal explanation of Mr. Mills, 2140; "registration of voters," 2299; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1528 (vol. ii), 2137 (vol. iii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.

- Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2028 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Business (Ms. to sit on Saturdays) 3246, 3459 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Officials in the N.W., names, &c., on M. for Ret., 66 (vol. i).
- Govt. Rights to Water Lots on Rivers (Ans.) 2238 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Yards in Montreal (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).
- Guerin, Mr., Rep. of Survey of Improvements on the Ottawa Riv., 1040 (vol. ii).
- Half-breed Claims, communication from Mr. Jackson, (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Harbor Commissioners at Three Rivers (B. 150) Govt. Loan, prop. Res., 2497 (vol. iii).
- Harbors in Guysborough Co., re-survey (Ans.) 51 (i).
- Hatzfeld Divorce B. 107 (*Mr. Kilvert*) on 1°, 672 (i).
- High Commissioner, in Com. of Sup., 3386 (vol. iv).
- Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).
- House of Commons Commissioners' Rep. *re* Staff (Ans.) 2750 (vol. iv).
- Immigrant Buildings at Lévis, construction of (Ans.) 89 (vol. i).
- Immigrant Sheds at Medicine Hat, construction of (Ans.) 351 (vol. i).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2819 (vol. iv).
- Indian Troubles at Metlakatla, on M. for copies of Cor., 304 (vol. i).
- Inspector of Public Works, Ret. respecting (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).
- Internal Economy Commission, increased expenses of, in Com. of Sup., 3449 (vol. iv).
- Land and Cable Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).
- Land grants to Railways in the N. W. (B. 147) prop. Res., 2440; in Com. on Res., 2483, 2488, 2517, 2518, 2521; M. to conc. in Res., 2533 (vol. iii); 2° m., 2770; in Com., 2855 (vol. iv).
- Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1660 (vol. ii); in Com., 2759-2761 (iv).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 620 (vol. i).
- Longueuil and Lévis Ry., Survey of (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).
- Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, 2517, 2518 (vol. iii).
- Man. Indian Agency, management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).
- Man. Judiciary (B. 162) prop. Res., 3395 (vol. iv).
- Mattawa, Mountain Rapids and Long Sault, Improvements (Ans.) 1040 (vol. ii).
- Military Storehouses in Quebec, lease (Ques.) 1039 (ii).
- Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2°, 3045; in Com., 3046 (vol. iv).
- McCarthy, C., Public Works Dept., Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.

- McIsaac's Pond as a harbor of refuge (Ans.) 36 (vol. i).
 Mounted Police Barracks at Fort Macleod, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).
 Napanee Public Buildings (Ans.) 77 (vol. i)
 Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. and the C.P.R. (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copy of Repts., &c., 696 (vol. i).
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2483-2488 (vol. iii).
 Official Arbitrators, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 88 (i).
 Optional Subjects, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
 Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1225 (vol. ii).
 Ottawa River Survey and Exploration (Ans.) 131 (i).
Parliamentary Companion, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (iv).
 Penitentiaries Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1892 (vol. iii).
 Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
 Postmaster, Assistant, at Ottawa, Allowance to, on conc., 3397 (vol. iv).
 Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. 63 (*Mr. Watson*) on M. to refer back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Rys., &c., 713 (vol. i).
 Port Credit Harbor, Repairs to (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).
 Port Rowan Harbor of Refuge, on M. for Ret., 299 (i).
 Post Office at village of Montmagny (Ans.) 246 (vol. i).
 Printing and Advertising, Ret. (remarks) 28 (vol. i).
 Private Bills, Reception of Repts. (M. to extend time) 1094 (vol. ii).
 Public Works, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).
 Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Stmbt. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2521 (iii).
 Ry. from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 189, 193; (M. to adjn. deb.) 200 (vol. i).
 Rys. in the Co. of Grey, Refund of bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for copy of memorial, 59 (vol. i).
 Real Property in the N.W.T. (B. 109, 1°*) 742 (vol. i).
 Red Point Harbor Breakwater (Ans.) 1039 (vol. ii).
 Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3405 (iv).
 Representation in Parlt. of the N.W.T. B. 45 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2° (M. to adjn. deb.) 495 (i).
 Return, imperfect (remarks) 101 (vol. i), 1386 (vol. ii); on enquiries for (remarks) 363, 455 (i), 3395 (iv).
 Riel, Louis, employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).
 St. Peter and St. Paul, adjmt. for (M.) 2889 (vol. iv).
 St. Thomas, Public Buildings at, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 80 (vol. i).
 Sable Island telegraphic communication (Ans.) 57 (i).
 Sec. of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv).
 Select Standing Com. on Rys., Canals and Telegraph Lines (M. to add name of *Mr. Bain*) 125 (vol. i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.

- Sittings of the House (M. for two sittings on each day) 3459 (vol. iv).
 Short Line Ry. See "Subsidies."
 Short Line Ry., Plans, Repts., &c. (Ans.) 246 (vol. i).
 Somerville, N.S., Breakwater, repair of (Ans.) 57 (i).
 Statistics relating to the Public Service (Ans.) 2854 (iv).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. (B. 158) M. for Com. on Res., 2971-2974; in Com. on Res., 2975-2977, 2986, 2989, 2994-2996; on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3250, 3257-3259; 1°* of B., 3293; 2° m. and in Com., 3380, 3399-3401; on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts., 3401 (vol. iv).
 Superior Court of Quebec (prop. Res.) 3293 (vol. iv).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Justice, Dept. of) 898 (vol. ii); (Optional Subjects) 3411 (vol. iv); Public Works, Dept. of) 911, suppl., 3448 (vol. iv), (contingencies) 921 (vol. ii); (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 3350 (vol. iv).
Collection of Revenues: Post Office (allowance to Asst. Postmaster at Ottawa) conc., 3397; Public Works (Agent and contingencies, B.C.) 3308; Repairs, &c. (Harbors and Slides) 3307; (Land and Cable Telegraphs) 3307; (Telegraph and Signal Service) 3307; (Telegraph Lines, B. C.) 3307 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2819 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) conc., 2765 (vol. iv); (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Commission) 3449 (vol. iv).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Chinese Commission) 3421, 3387, conc., 3396; (*Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises*) 3455; (Mounted Police Barracks at Fort Macleod) 3387; (*Parliamentary Companion*) 3387 (vol. iv).
Penitentiaries: St. Vincent de Paul (payment to G. F. Baillairge) 3350 (vol. iv).
Pensions (Veterans of 1812) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Capital: B. C. (Esquimalt Graving Dock) 2916; Ottawa (additional buildings) 2916; Port Arthur (construction of harbor) 2916. *Consolid. Fund*: Buildings (Ont.) 3385; Harbors and rivers (N. S.) 3409, (N. W.) 3420, (Ont.) 3386, (Quebec) 3385, 3419; Miscellaneous (High Commissioner) 3386; Roads and Bridges, 3420; Telegraphs, 3386, 3420. *Income*: Buildings (Man.) 2919, (N. B.) 2918, (N. S.) 2917, (N. W. T.) 2919, 3452, (Ont.) 2918, (P. E. I.) 2918, (Quebec) 2918, (Repairs, &c.) 2919; Dredging, 2922, conc., 2923; Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 2921, (Mar. Provs. generally) 2923, (N. B.) 2920, (Ont.) 2920, 3433, (P. E. I.) 2919, (Quebec) 2920; Telegraphs, 2922 (vol. iv).
 Telegraph and Signal Service in B.C. (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).
 — and Signal Service, in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 2922, 3386, 3420 (vol. iv).
 Telegraph System in Cape Breton, Extension of (Ans.) 78 (vol. i).
 Translation of *Hansard* and Votes and Proceedings (remarks) 594 (vol. i).
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2555 (vol. iii), 2935 (iv).
 Trutch, J. W., employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 744 (i).
 Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 2676 (vol. iv).
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).
 Water Lots in N.S., application for (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).

Langevin, Hon. Sir Hector—Continued.

- White Point, N.S., Breakwater, repair of (Ans.) 52 (i).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 428 (vol. i).
- Woodstock, N.B., Public Buildings, Inspector of (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).
- Wharves on P.E.I., grant for construction, &c. (Ans.) 351 (vol. i).
- Wood supplies for Govt. Buildings, Ottawa (Ans.) 429 (vol. i), 1387 (vol. ii).

Laurier, Hon. W., East Quebec.

- Can. Agent at Paris, appointment of, on M. for Papers, 982 (vol. ii).
- C. P. R. Extension to Canadian ports on the Atlantic (Ques.) 290; Vernon Smith's Rep., on M. for copies, 294; St. Martin's Junction to Quebec (M. for copies of Cor.*) 533 (vol. i).
- North Shore Line, Subsidy to (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 41 (vol. i).
- Res. respecting further Loan, on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 2863; neg. (Y. 55, N. 89) 2864 (vol. iv).
- Short Line Ry., Montreal to the Atlantic, on M. for Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c., 39 (vol. i).
- Chenevert, J. A., employment of, by Public Works Dept. (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).
- Commercial relations between France [and Canada, on M. for copies of Cor., 831 (vol. ii).
- Commercial Treaty with Jamaica (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).
- Disturbance in the N. W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3119-3128; on M. to adjn. deb., 3212 (iv).
- Prisoners held for Trial (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3440 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1167; (Amt.) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; in Com., "usufructuary," 1445, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1454, 1455, 1456; "tenant," 1480; "actual value," 1596, 1604; "parish," 1593; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1626-1629 (ii), 1984 (iii); on Amt. (*Mr. McIntyre*) to M. for 3° 3057; on Amt. (*Mr. Fisher*) to M. for consdn. of B., 3070 (vol. iv); (Ques. of Order) 1510, 1619; on M. that Com. rise, 1424 (vol. ii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067 (vol. ii).
- Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N.W., on M. for Ret., 96 (vol. i).
- Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2761; on M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 51, N. 65) 2763 (vol. iv).
- Meredith, Chief Justice, resignation of (M. for copy) 43 (vol. i).
- Nav. of River St. Lawrence B. 159 (*Mr. McLelan*) on Order for 2°, 3436 (vol. iv).
- North Shore Ry., purchase of, by Govt. (Ques.) 189 (i). Ry. from Montreal to the sea-board (Res.) 189 (vol. i).
- Return, enquiry for, 895 (vol. ii).

Laurier, Hon. W.—Continued.

- Riel, Treatment of, in Prison (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).
- Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 2976, 2986, 2994; on M. to conc. in Res., 3250; (Amt.) 3257; in Com on B., 3399 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY :

- Legislation : H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) conc., 3373 (vol. iv).
- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ouimet*) to M. for 2°, 167 (i).
- Ways and Means—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in the N.W., 3119-3128; on M. to adjn. deb., 3212 (iv).

Lesage, Mr. C. A., Dorchester.

- C. P. R. Extension to Canadian ports on the Atlantic, Vernon Smith's Rep. (M. for copies) 294 (vol. i).
- Short Line Ry. from Montreal to the Atlantic (M. for Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c.) 38 (i).
- Etchemin River Line, Survey of (Ques.) 350 (vol. i).
- Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2992-2994; (Amt.) 3289; neg. (Y. 36, N. 101) 3292 (vol. iv).
- Short Line Ry., Mr. Wicksteed's Rep. (Ques.) 1744 (iii).

Lister, Mr. J. F., West Lambton.

- Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of, on M. for copies, 357 (vol. i).
- Brandon, Postmaster at, Salary and Allowances (Ques.) 2029 (vol. iii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for 3°, 1301; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1303 (ii).
- Cornwall Public Buildings (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).
- Coste, Louis and Eugène, employment of (Ques.) 1131 (ii).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Trial of Riel (Ques.) 2358 (iii).
- Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 309 (i).
- Dumont, Extradition of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 390 (vol. i).
- Fishing Licenses, Lake Erie, names of persons granted (M. for Ret.) 964 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1150-1153; on M. for Com., 1344-1347, 1352; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1732-1736 (vol. ii), 1860-1864; (Indians) 2009-2012; "qualifications in counties," 2066, 2070, 2075; "who shall not vote," 2088, (Indians) 2153-2155; "registration of voters," 2264, 2283, 2286, 2316; "revision of voters' lists," 2324, 2338, 2343; "general provisions," 2344; "appeal," 2364; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2371; on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3066 (vol. iv).
- Indian Superintendents, office of (Ques.) 88 (vol. i).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1082, 1084 (vol. ii).
- Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 184 (vol. i).
- License Commissioners in Essex (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).

Lister, Mr. J. F.—Continued.

- Maritime Court of Ont. Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2^o, 128 (vol. i).
 Moody, John, employment of (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).
 Northerly and Westerly Boundaries of Ont., proceedings, moneys paid, &c. (M. for Ret.) 210 (vol. i).
 Personal Explanation, *re* statement made by Min. of Marine (remarks) 693 (vol. i).
 Rys. in the Co. of Grey, refund of bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for copy of memorial, 59 (vol. i).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. Municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 585 (vol. i).
 Squatters in the Qu'Appelle Valley (M. for Ret.) 205 (i).
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) on prop. Res., 1279 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY :

- Fisheries* (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).
Militia (Ammunition) 2905; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2908; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2910 (vol. iv).
 Watson, Ebenezer, of Sarnia, office of (Ques.) 188 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. A. C., King's, P.E.I.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1047; (Amt.) 1062 (vol. ii).
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice, B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 150 (i).
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2^o, 944, (ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns" (Amt.) 1623 (vol. ii); telegram read *re* election in P.E.I., 1903 (iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3^o, 3054 (iv).
 Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).
 Red Point Harbor Breakwater (Ques.) 1039 (ii).

SUPPLY :

- Public Works—Income*: P.E.I., 2918 (vol. iv).
 Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1674 (vol. ii).
 Weight and Measurement of Root Crops (M. for copies of Cor.*) 201 (vol. i).
 Winter Crossing from P.E.I. (M. for copies of Cor.) 62 (vol. i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A., Carleton, Ont.

- Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).
 Address, on The, 19; M. for Com. to draft, 27; draft Rep., 27; His Excell. reply, 113 (vol. i).
 Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. (B. 141, 1^o*) 2345 (vol. iii); in Com., 2962, 2967; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3^o, 3002, 3427 (vol. iv).
 Administration of Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1^o*) 1 (vol. i).
 Administration of the N.W.T. (*Mr. Caron*) in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 2934 (vol. iv).
 Advances to Provinces B. 7 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. to introd., 32 (vol. i).
 Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 1320 (vol. ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- American Engineers' visit to N.S., in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).
 Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2546 (vol. iii).
 André, Father, Letter from, in 1883 (Ans.) 3425 (iv).
 Annunciation Day, adjmt. for (M.) 714 (vol. i).
 Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1024 (vol. ii).
 Ash Wednesday, adjmt. for (M.) 125 (vol. i).
 Banking Facilities for Agriculturists B. 36 (*Mr. Orton*) on Res., 120 (vol. i).
 Bankruptcy or Insolvency (M. for Sp. Com.) 47; Pets. respecting (M. to refer to Sp. Com.) 125 (vol. i).
 Bell and Kavanagh Land Claims, on M. for copies of O.C., &c., 481 (vol. i).
 Benson, Mr., M.P., Death of (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).
 Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825, 2827 (vol. iv).
 Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3446 (vol. iv).
 Boundary between Ont. and Man. (Ans.) 51 (i).
 B.C. Penitentiary, suspension of Rules, on M. for copies of Cor., 824; in Com. of Sup., 990 (vol. ii).
 British Medical Acts Return (remarks) 939 (vol. ii).
 Bureau of Agriculture, Establishment of (Ans.) 76 (i).
 Business of the Session (remarks) 211 (vol. i); (M.) to meet at 1 o'clock, 1744 (vol. iii).
 Cabinet Representation for B.C. (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (Ans.) 363 (vol. i).
 — Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on ques. to fix day for 2^o, 713; procedure, 714 (vol. i); (Ans.) to fix day for consdn. of Sen. Amts., 2530 (vol. iii); on Sen. Amts., 2645, 2650, 2652–2656 (vol. iv).
 — Druggists' Licenses (Ans.) 1306 (ii).
 — Expenses of prosecutions under (Ans.) 1306 (ii); 3320 (vol. iv).
 Can. Contingent for the Soudan (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).
 C.P.R. Agreement by Co. to Terms of Resolution (Ans.) 1915 (vol. iii).
 — Change in existing arrangements (Ans.) 695 (vol. i), 1744 (vol. iii).
 — Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) prop. Res. 2420 (vol. iii); in Com., 3032 (vol. iv).
 — Debt, floating and unsecured (Ans.) 219 (i).
 — Extension of, to Quebec (Ans.) 291 (vol. i).
 — Length of gaps (explanation) 838 (vol. ii).
 — Forty Mile Belt in B.C. (Memo. read) 1983 (iii).
 — Govt. Mortgage, changes (Ans.) 36 (vol. i).
 — Homesteads within Ry. Belt (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
 — Land Area in the 48-mile belt accepted by Co. (Stmnt.) 782 (vol. ii).
 — Land Grant accepted by Co., number of acres (Ans.) 568, 744 (vol. i).
 — Land rejected by Co. in Ry. Belt (Stmnt.) 965; (Ans.) 927 (vol. ii).
 — Legislation respecting (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).
 — Payment of Interest by Co. (Ans.) 1677 (vol. ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- C. P. R. Proposals by Co. (remarks) 746 (vol. i).
 ——— Relief of, by Govt. (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).
 ——— Res. respecting further Loan (remarks) on adjmt. of deb., 2643; in Com., 2724, 2725, 2727, 2729-2731, 2733, 2734, 2737-2741, 2743-2747, 2862; on M. to rec. Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 2859 (vol. iv).
 ——— Timber dues to Govt. by Co. (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2535-2539 (vol. iii).
 Capital Account Expenditure, on M. for Stmt., 46 (i).
 Cape Breton Island Claims under terms of Confederation, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Inverness*) 615 (i).
 Carlton, Evacuation of, Rep. (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).
 Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2^o, 102 (vol. i).
 Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2^o, 254 (vol. i).
 Census of the N.W.T., &c., B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com. on Res., 75; in Com. on B., 171; on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 214 (vol. i).
 Central Prison of Ont. Acts Amt. (B. 129, 1^o*) 1226 (vol. ii); 2^o m., 2402 (vol. iii).
 Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 29; on presentation (remarks) 236 (vol. i).
 Chinese Immigration Restriction B., notice of Res., 2497 (vol. iii).
 Civil Service B. (Ans.) 28 (vol. i).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1097; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3^o, 1284 (vol. ii).
 Clark, G.M.K., sums paid, on M. for Ret., 697 (vol. i).
 Clothing and Great Coats, in Com. of Sup., 2909 (iv).
 Colonisation Co.'s modification of agreement (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii), 2241 (vol. iii).
 Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) (remarks) 1671 (vol. ii).
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2430 (vol. iii).
 Consolidn. of the Statutes, Rep. of Commissioners (presented) 32 (vol. i).
 Contingencies, Deptl., in Com. of Sup., 915 (vol. ii).
 Corpus Christi, adjmt. for (M.) 2301 (vol. iii).
 Copyright, Law of, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Edgar*) 713 (i).
 County Court Judges, Man. (B. 162) in Com. on Res., 3435, 3436 (vol. iv).
 County Court Judges' Salaries (Ans.) 3073 (vol. iv).
 Crozier, Supt., Rep. of, *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds, 3425 (vol. iv).
 Debates, Official Rep., in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3363 (vol. iv).
 Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Coms. (B. 26) prop. Res., 67; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to appoint Sel. Com. to rep. to House, 70; on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 72; on Ques. of Order, 73; 2^o and in Com., 175; 3^o on a a div., 212 (vol. i).
 Deputy Speaker (M.) appointing Malachy Daly, Esq., 72 (vol. i); Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3353 (iv).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Dewdney, Gov., communications from (Ans.) 3425 (iv).
 Disputed Boundaries of Ont., Imperial Legislation (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).
 Disturbance in the N. W. (Ans.) 693, 714 (vol. i), 723; (remarks) 1832 (vol. ii).
 ——— André, Father, letter from (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Assistance to families of Militiamen, 894 (ii).
 ——— Assistance to Settlers (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).
 ——— Civil Service Volunteers (Ans.) 3043 (iv).
 ——— Claims, &c., of Half-breeds (Ans.) 1474 (vol. ii).
 ——— Compensation for losses (Ans.) 3321 (vol. iv).
 ——— Crowfoot, communication from (read) 1038 (ii).
 ——— Crozier, Supt., Rep. of, *re* Indian sympathy with Half-breeds (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Dewdney, Lieut.-Gov., communications with Govt. (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Duck Lake, Engagement at (Tels. read) 790 (vol. ii); Rep. of Fight (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).
 ——— Dumas, Michel, appointment as farm instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2856 (iv).
 ——— Fort Pitt Disaster, confirmation of news, 1281; (Tel. read) 1301 (vol. ii).
 ——— Frog Lake, Massacre at (Stmnt.) 994 (vol. ii).
 ——— Govt. officials in the N.W., communications with (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Grandin, Bishop, communications from (Ans.) 3321, 3423 (vol. iv).
 ——— Half-breed grievances (*Mr. Blake*) 2040-2042 (vol. iii).
 ——— Half-breed Commission (letter read from Mr. Street) 1607; work of (remarks) 1566, 2169 (ii).
 ——— Imp. Govt., commn. with (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).
 ——— Indemnity to Members in the field, on prop. M. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 812 (vol. ii).
 ——— Indians at Fort Qu'Appelle, loyalty of (Tel. read) 1320 (vol. ii).
 ——— Isbester, James, appointment as far instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Mounted Police Officers, Reps. from, of Engagements (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 761-765 (vol. i).
 ——— on further information (remarks) 745, 813 (ii).
 ——— Poundmaker, Skirmish with, Tel. from Herchmer (read) 1649 (vol. ii).
 ——— Prisoners held for Trial, 3443 (vol. iv).
 ——— Prisoners surrendered by Poundmaker (Ans.) 2065 (vol. iii).
 ——— Raid on Houses at Battleford, 889 (vol. ii).
 ——— Relief of destitute families (remarks) 3321 (iv).
 ——— Religious Rites refused prisoners 2998 (vol. iv).
 ——— Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence (reply) 3110-3119 (vol. iv).
 ——— Rewards for Bravery (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).
 ——— Riel's proposal to accept money (Ans.) 3426 (iv).
 ——— Riel, Trial of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Stoney Indian rising (Stmnt.) 863 (vol. ii).
 —— Volunteers, recognition of Services of (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii); prop. Res., 3321 (vol. iv).
 Divorce Court, creation of a (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).
 Dom. and Prov. Franchises, despatch from Mr. Fielding (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).
 Dom. Day, Sitting of the House on (Ans.) 2773 (vol. iv).
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 28 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2^o, 1007; on M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii).
 Dom. Lands, frauds in Dept. (Ans.) 1915, 2170 (vol. iii).
 —— Dumont's lot on Saskatchewan (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).
 —— in B. C., Timber dues (Ans.) 2240 (vol. iii).
 —— Revenue for 7 months 1884-85 (Ans.) 290 (i).
 —— Sales, receipts on account (Ans.) 2854 (vol. iv).
 Dom. Police, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).
 Dorchester Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 989 (vol. ii).
 Dumas, Michel, appointment as farm instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Duck Lake Engagement, Rep. of (Ans.) 1567 (ii).
 Dumont, Extradition of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Dynamite, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).
 Easter, adjmt. for (Ans.) 713 (vol. i).
 Edmonton and Saskatchewan Colon. Co.'s Township Surveys (Ans.) 2171 (vol. iii).
 Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).
 Etchemin River Line, Survey of (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).
 Exchange Bank, Claims against (Ans.) 89; Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 393 (vol. i).
 Expenditure on Capital Account, on M. for Stmnt., 46 (i).
 Explosive Substances (B. 95, 1^o*) 545 (vol. i); 2^o m., 893; in Com., 1167; 3^o m., 1335 (vol. ii).
 Evangelical Lutheran Church of Can. B. 60 (*Mr. McCarthy*) in Com., 693 (vol. i).
 Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
 Factory B. (Ans.) 29 (vol. i).
 Federation of the Empire, proposals for (Ans.) 51 (i).
 Finance Minister, Health of (Ans.) 2497 (vol. iii).
 Fish taken in the Miramichi, on M. for Ret., 295 (i).
 Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 221 (vol. i).
 Fishery Arrangements with U.S. (remarks) 2890 (iv).
 Franchise (B. 103, 1^o) 629 (vol. i); Order for 2^o read (remarks) 1095; 2^o m., 1133; in Com., 1385; "woman suffrage, 1388, 1458; "owner," 1444, 1445, 1449, 1452, 1453, 1457; "tenant," 1475, 1481; "occupant," 1493; "person" (Indians) 1484, 1486, 1487, 1489, 1563, 1574 (vol. ii), 2023 (vol. iii); (Chinese) 1582, 1558; "farm," 1591; "parish," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1596, 1600 (vol. ii), "qualifications in cities and towns," 1745, 1932, 1937, 1983-1988, 1992-2003, 2757-2759 (vol. iv); "qualifications in counties," 2053, 2060, 2062, 2064, 2065, 2079, 2080, 2394; on disqualifying revising barristers, 2086 (vol. iii); "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104, (Amts.)

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- 2139; "registration of voters," 2172, 2177-2180, 2228, 2231, 2241, 2244, 2269, 2273, 2279-2294, 2300, 2310-2319; revision of voters' lists," 2321, 2326-2335, 2339-2345, "general provisions," 2344, 2351, 2353-2356; "appeal," 2360-2365, 2395; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2370, 2373, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "farm," 2393 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2758; M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 3052; on Amt. (*Mr. McIntyre*) to M. for 3^o, 3056; "remuneration of revising officers, &c.," prop. Res., 2420 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059 (vol. iv); on procedure, 1470; on Mr. Trow's pair with Mr. Williams (remarks) 1470; on taking up items consecutively (remarks) 1471 (vol. ii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 2137, 2207 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to House, 1510, 1512, 1513 (vol. ii); on Ques. of Order, 1825, 1969, 2143; on personal explanation of Mr. Mills, 2140; (remarks) 2146, 2160 (vol. iii).
 Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2026, 2028, 2496 (vol. iii).
 French Half-breeds at St. Laurent, Claims of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1316, 1319 (vol. ii).
 Geological Survey, Management of (Ans.) 114 (i).
 Govt. Agents in the N.W.T., Fees from Settlers (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Business (Ms.) to take in Thursdays, 451 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965; Mondays, 1336 (vol. ii); Saturdays, 1824 (vol. iii), 2676; (remarks) 3293 (vol. iv).
 Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2464; on M. to conc. in Res., 2525 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Officials in the N. W., communications from (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Grandin, Bishop, commn. from (Ans.) 3423 (iv).
 G. T. R. Returns, on enquiry respecting (remarks) 662 (vol. i); 964 (vol. ii).
 —— Stockholders, Ret. respecting (remarks) 28, 101, 113, 350, 566 (vol. i); Ans. of Mr. Hickson (Ans.) 927, 1094, 1278 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2210 (iii); enforcement of Order of House, 3426 (iv).
 —— Rivière du Loup Branch, Sale of (Ans.) 1039 (ii).
 Guns used in fight with Poundmaker (Ans.) 2170 (iii).
 Half-breed Minors, Man., Claims of unenumerated (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).
 Half-breed Commission, information respecting (Ans.) 1567, 1607 (vol. ii); Claims recognized and rejected (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 Half-breed Indian Reserves and Homesteads (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).
 —— Plots on the Saskatchewan (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).
 —— Scrip (Ans.) 1914 (vol. iii).
 —— Settlement of Claims (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).
 —— Settlement, undisturbed occupation (Ans.) 1567 (vol. ii).
 Homesteads within Ry. Belt (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Horses for Troops in N.W., purchase of (Ans.) 1306 (ii).
 Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).
 Hughes, D. J., Official conduct of (Ans.) 77; on M. for Ret., 98 (vol. i).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2841, 2846 (vol. iv).
 Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3450.
 Indian Advancement Act, application of (Ans.) 77 (i).
 Indian Affairs, Dept. of, Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 901 (vol. ii).
 Indian Reserve, Victoria Arm, B.C. (Ans.) 1211 (ii).
 Indian Schools in the N.W. and Man. (Ans.) 568 (i).
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 867 (vol. ii); 3243, 3314-3320, 3341, 3392, 3393; conc., 2922, 3373 (vol. iv).
 Indian Superintendents, office of (Ans.) 88 (vol. i).
 Indian Titles in Ont. acquired by Govt. (Ans.) 632 (i).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii).
 Insolvent Debtors, distribution of Assets prov. B. 4 (M. to transfer to Govt. Orders) 1280 (vol. ii).
 Insolvency, on ques. as to Legislation (remarks) 1038 (vol. ii).
 Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 85 (vol. i).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3296, 3297 (vol. iv).
 Interior, Dept. of, Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 915, 968-973 (vol. ii), 2764 (vol. iv).
 International Ferries B. 17 (*Mr. Patterson, Essex*) on M. for 2°, 254 (vol. i).
 Isbester, J., appointment as farm instructor (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 Jamaica, Trade relations with (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).
 Judges in N.B., appointment for year's circuit (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).
 Judicial Reform in the N.W.T., petitions, &c. (Ans.) 1306 (vol. ii).
 Justice, Penitentiaries Branch, in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii).
 Kingston Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 985 (vol. ii).
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3345 (vol. iv).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. (B. 147) prop. Res., 782 (vol. ii); 2443-2445, 2503 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 2891, 2894 (vol. iv).
 Lands in Ry. Belt in B.C., and Homestead Act (Ans.) 289 (vol. i).
 Law Reports, Ont., in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).
 Lebel, Antoine, Indian Agent, acting without sureties (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).
 Librarian of Parliament, office of (Ans.) 41 (vol. i).
 Library of Parlt. Joint Com. (M. for Mess. to Sen.) 36 (vol. i).
 Library of Parlt. (B. 139) prop. Res., 1659, 1661; in Com., 1668-1670; 2° m., 2402 (iii); in Com., 2760 (iv).
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
 Lieut.-Gov. of N.B. (Ans.) 362 (vol. i).
 Lieut.-Gov. of Quebec, Oath of Office (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).
 Lingan Mines, C. B., aiding civil power at, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 621 (vol. i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Liquor License Act, 1883, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 1211; on M. to conc. in Res. (remarks) 1226 (ii).
 ——— (B. 134, 1°) 1281 (vol. ii); 2° m., 2400 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768, 2894, 2897; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2959 (vol. iv).
 ——— Boards of Commissioners under (Ans.) 77 (i).
 ——— Constitutionality of (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).
 ——— Putting in force, in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
 ——— Regulations directing License Fund under (Ans.) 76 (vol. i).
 ——— Supreme Court Judgment (Ans.) 29 (vol. i).
 Loan of £4,000,000 recently effected (Ans.) 2998 (iv).
 Losses and Expenses through Troubles in the N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3454 (vol. iv).
 McLeod, N., Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 McManus, C., gratuity to widow of, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (vol. iv).
 Man., Claim for a Subsidy (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2780-2783 (explanation) 2785; in Com., 2791, 2794, 2824, 3047-3050 (vol. iv).
 Man. Half-breed Minors, Claims preferred and rejected (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii); temporarily absent (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 989 (vol. ii).
 Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2503 (vol. iii).
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 908 (vol. ii).
 Maritime Court of Ont., Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 129, 131; on Order for Com., 215; in Com., 496 (vol. i).
 Members' Indemnity, payments to those absent through sickness (Ans.) 3473 (vol. iv).
 Meredith, Chief Justice, resignation of, on M. for copy, 43 (vol. i).
 Messages from His Ex.: Ans. to Address, 113 (i).
 ——— Claims of Man., 202 (vol. i).
 ——— Internal Economy Commission, 40 (vol. i).
 ——— Pets., Res., &c., on Bankruptcy, 101 (vol. i).
 ——— Thanks of Queen for condolence on Death of Duke of Albany, 32 (vol. i).
 ——— Washington Treaty, Fishery Clauses, Cor. and Papers, 3232 (vol. iv).
 Meeting of the House, irregularity (remarks) 2996 (iv).
 Minister of Interior, absence of (Ans.) 964 (vol. ii).
 Minister of Rys., office of (Ans.) 41, 52 (vol. i).
 Model Farm, Establishment, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
 Morgan, H. J., payments to, by Govt. for services, on M. for Stmt., 120 (vol. i); for "Annual Register," in Com. of Sup., 3351 (vol. iv).
 Morgan, J. H., Services as Forestry Commissioner (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).
 Mounted Police Barracks, Tenders or (Ans.) 351 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
 Mounted Police, in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3392 (vol. iv).
 ——— Recruits (Stmt. of number, and horses purchased) 1607; (remarks) 1566 (vol. ii).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- N. S. Rys., Consolid. and completion (Ans.) 2530 (iii).
 North Shore Ry., purchase of, by Govt. (Ans.) 189 (vol. i); use of by C. P. R. (Ans.) 1915 (vol. ii).
 N. W. Mounted Police Augmentation (B. 144) prop. Res., 994 (vol. ii); in Com. on Res., 2402; M. to conc. in Res., 2421, 2426, 2428; Res. conc. in and 1^o* of B., 2430 (vol. iii); 2^o m., 2770; 3^o m., 2820 (vol. iv).
 ——— (B. 140, 1^o*) 1670 (vol. ii); 2^o m., 2772; 3^o m., 2822 (vol. iv).
 ——— Commissioners' Rep. (Ans.) 2359 (vol. ii); (presented) 2820 (vol. iv).
 ——— Increase of force (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 ——— Officers Reps. of Engagements (Ques.) 3425 (iv).
 N. W., Papers respecting (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Oaths of Office (B. 1, 1^o*) 1 (vol. i).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2556 (vol. iii); M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2753; on M. to conc. in Res., 2756 (vol. iv).
 Offences against the Person (assault and battery) Act Amt. B. 42 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2^o (M. to adjn. deb.) 219 (vol. i).
 Offences against the Person Act Amt. (B. 123, 1^o*) 1037 (vol. ii); on 3^o (remarks) 2768 (vol. iv).
 Ontario's Boundaries, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 51, 115, 567 (vol. i), 2998, 3321 (vol. iv).
 ——— on M. for copies of O.C.'s Imp., Can. or Provl., 52 (vol. i).
 Ontario's Claims to country north of height of land and south of Hudson's Bay, &c. (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).
 Ontario, Northern Boundary of, Res. of Govt. (Ans.) 1133 (vol. ii).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2^o, 628 (vol. i).
 Patents issued to Settlers, Prince Albert (Ans.) 964 (ii).
 Payment of Deptl. Clerks, delay in (Ans.) 2170 (iii).
 Pensions, New Militia conc. 2765 (vol. iv).
 Permits granted in Territory awarded Ont. (Ans.) 115 (vol. i).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks and rule read) 1891-1894 (vol. iii).
 St. Laurent Settlement, Plans and Surveys, Receipt of (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works Act Amt. (B. 131, 1^o*) 1278 (vol. ii).
 Prince Albert Colonization Co.'s Township Surveys (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).
 Printing and Printing Paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2803, 2805 (vol. iv).
 Privilege, Ques. of, Disturbance in the N.W., on article in *Hamilton Spectator*, 813 (vol. ii).
 ——— on article in *Toronto News*: French aggression, &c. (remarks) 1679 (vol. ii).
 ——— on paragraph in *Free Press* (remarks) 171 (i).
 Privy Council Office, in Com. of Sup., 899; contingencies, 914 (vol. ii).
 Prorogation (Ans.) 3473 (vol. iv).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Provincial Leg., compilation of Cor., &c., conc., 3434 (iv).
 Provincial Rys. taken over by Govt. (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).
 Qu'Appelle Valley Farming Co.'s agreement (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).
 Queen's Birthday, adjmt. for (M.) 2030 (vol. iii).
 Ry. Belt on Vancouver Island (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
 Ry. from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 199 (vol. i).
 Rys. and Canals, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).
 Rys. centreing in Ottawa, on M. for Ret. (M. to adjn. deb.) 88 (vol. i).
 Relief of distress in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (iv).
 Representation of the N.W.T. in Parl. B. 45 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2^o, 362 (vol. i).
 Representation of the N.W.T. in Parl., on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 293 (vol. i).
 Returns, on enquiries for (remarks) 427 (vol. i), 966, 1038, 1132, 1167, 1209 (vol. ii), 2936 (vol. iv).
 ——— Preparations of, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).
 Revised Statutes of Canada B. 130 (M. to dschg. Order) 2402 (vol. iii).
 Richelieu Navigation Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) on prop. Amt. (remarks) 1210 (vol. ii).
 Rideau Canal, increase of water supply, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).
 Riel's proposal to accept money (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
 Riel, Treatment of, in prison (remarks) 2357 (vol. iii).
 Roundhouse at Selkirk erected on private property issue of Patent (Ans.) 2030, 2171 (vol. iii).
 Royal Military College, in Com. of Sup., 2914 (vol. iv).
 St. Clair Ranch Co., Rents paid, &c. (Ans.) 2240 (iii).
 St. George's Day, on M. for adjmt., 1305 (vol. ii).
 St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 986-989 (vol. ii).
 Salaries, H. of C., in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).
 Salaries of Ministers (Ans.) 3073 (vol. iv).
 Schmidt, Louis, and others, of Prince Albert District, employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 1915 (vol. iii).
 Seduction, &c., punishment of, B. 27 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 619 (vol. i).
 Settlers' Claims, Prince Albert District (Ans.) 1567 (ii).
 Settlement of Claims of Man. half-breed Minors (Ans.) 1743 (vol. iii).
 Settlement of Settlers Claims at Prince Albert, &c. (Ans.) 2358 (vol. iii).
 Select Standing Coms. (M.) 2; M. for Sp. Com. to prepare Lists, 27; Committees appointed and Lists prepared (presented) 30; conc. in, 32 (vol. i).
 Short Line Ry., Engineers' Reps. (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).
 ——— Govt. Grants to (Ans.) 1678 (vol. ii).
 ——— Plans and Reps. (Ans.) 479, 567 (vol. i).
 ——— Rep. of Mr. Wicksteed (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).
 ——— 2nd Rep. of Mr. Light (Ans.) 1744 (vol. iii).
 ——— from Montreal to Atlantic, in Com. on Res., 2977; (Amt.) 2982 (vol. iv).
 Short Line Survey from St. Charles (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.

- Simpson, G. A., Govt. Land Agent (Ans.) 57 (vol. i).
 Speech from the Throne, consideration of (M.) 2.
 Squatters in the Qu'Appelle Valley, on M. for Ret., 205 (vol. i).
 Standing Committees, non-summoning of, for organization (remarks) 67 (vol. i).
 ——— on Colonization and Immigration (M.) to add Messrs. Baker, Vic., and Jackson to Com., 299 (vol. i).
 Stationery used in H. of C., Expense of (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
 Statutes of Canada Consolidation (B. 130, 1^o) 1226 (vol. ii).
 ——— Revision of, Commissioners' Rep. (M.) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 777 (vol. ii).
 ——— Distribution of (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).
 Stipendiary Magistrates in N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. (B. 158) prop. Res., 2531 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 2977; (Amt.) 2982; in Com. on B., 3380 (vol. iv).
 Sunday Excursions, prohibition B. 19 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 266 (vol. i).
 Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 271 (vol. i).
 Superior Court of Que., Chief Justice of (Ans.) 429 (i).
 Superior Court Judges, Que. (B. 161), prop. Res., 3375; in Com. and 1^o* of B., 3395 (vol. iv).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2^o, 163 (vol. i).
 Surveys and Explorations in the N.W. (Ans.) 2323 (iii).
 Surveys and Plans of Battleford and Edmonton (Ans.) 2357 (vol. iii).
 Sutherland, Dr., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).

SUPPLY:

- Administration of Justice*, 985 (vol. ii), 3448 (vol. iv).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Archives, care of) 1024 (vol. ii).
Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3312. *Income: Rideau Canal* (increase of water supply) 3313 (vol. iv).
Civil Govt. (Indian Affairs, Dept. of) 901, contingencies, 915; (Interior, Dept. of) 968, 973, contingencies, 915 (vol. ii), conc., 2764 (vol. iv); (Justice, Penitentiaries Branch) 914; (Marine, Dept. of) 908; (Privy Council Office) 899, contingencies, 914; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 914 (vol. ii).
Dominion Lands—Income (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345 (iv).
Dominion Police, 985 (vol. ii), suppl., 3350 (vol. iv).
Indians (Assistance to Institutions) 3392; (B.O.) 3314; (Grant to supplmt. Fund) 3242; (Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River) conc., 2922; (Man. and N.W.T.) 3314, 3317-3320, 3341, conc., 3373; (N.S.) 3243; (N.W.T., to complete service) 3393 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii); (Election Expenses) 3452 (vol. iv); (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450 (vol. iv); (Salaries) 991 (vol. ii). *Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2798; (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2803, 2805 (vol. iv).
Militia (Aiding civil power at Lingan Mines, C.B.) 3452; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2909; (Royal Mil. Coll.) 2914 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (American Engineers' Visit to N.S.) 3457; (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3351, 3353; (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453; (Fabre, Mr., salary and contingencies) 3244; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3245; (Losses and Expenses through Troubles in N.W.T. (3454); (Liquor License Act, putting in force of) 3244; (Mounted Police Barracks) 3244;

Macdonald, Rt. Hon. Sir John A.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- (Ontario Law Reports) 3351; (Payment to H. J. Morgan for "Annual Register") 3351; (Provincial Legislation, compilation of Cor., &c) conc., 3434; (Relief of Distress in N.W.T.) 3455; (Returns, preparation of) 3245; (Transport of families from Oka to Township of Gibson, Indian Reserve) 3457 (vol. iv); (Vote of \$1,000,000) conc., 2237 (vol. iii).
Immigration, 2841, 2846 (vol. iv).
N. W. Mounted Police, 3243; suppl., 3392 (vol. iv).
Penitentiaries: B.C., 990; Dorchester, 989; Kingston, 985 (vol. ii), (gratuity to widow of McManus) 3350; (vol. iv); Manitoba, 989 (vol. ii), (payment to Dr. Sutherland) 3351 (vol. iv); St. Vincent de Paul, 986-989 (vol. ii).
Pensions (New Militia) conc., 2765 (vol. iv); (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii).
Rys.—Capital: I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3296, 3297 (iv).
 Timber Licenses issued since 1882 in N.W.T., &c. (Ans.) 863 (vol. ii).
 Timber Limits in Territories awarded Ont., 115 (vol. i).
 Trade Relations between Canada and U.S. (Ans.) 1387. (vol. ii); with Jamaica (Ans.) 429 (vol. i).
 Transport of families from Oka to Township of Gibson, Indian Reserve, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (vol. iv).
 Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1^o, 630 (vol. i); in Com., 1670 (vol. ii).
 Treaty Negotiations by Sir A. Shea (Ans.) 1387 (vol. ii).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3312 (vol. iv).
 Vacancy in a Judicial District, N.S. (Ans.) 2750 (vol. iv).
 Veterans of War of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii).
 Volunteers on Active Service, increase of pay of (Ans.) 2170 (vol. iii).
 Volunteers in the N.W., recognition of Services (Ans.) 1566 (vol. ii); M. for Com. on Res., 3376; in Com., 3377-3380; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3380; 1^o* of B., 3380 (vol. iv).
 Volunteers of 1837-38, on Res. recognizing Services, 38 (vol. i).
 Vote for relief of Settlers in the N.W. (Ans.) 1744 (iii).
 Vote to Genl. Middleton (notice) 3457 (vol. iv).
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559 (vol. iii), 2773, 2899, 2901, 3075; on M. for Com. of Sup. (reply) to Mr. Weldon, 3320-3333 (vol. iv).
 Watson, Ebenezer, of Sarnia, office of (Ans.) 183 (i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) *re* Disturbance in the N.W., in Amt. to Com., 761 (vol. i), 3110-3119 (vol. iv); (personal explanation) *re* workmen of Montreal, 521; (remarks) as to time for concluding deb., 662 (vol. i); in Com. (whiskey) 3226; Excise Duties, 3295 (iv).
 Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 216 (vol. i).
 Writ for Lévis County, issue of (Ans.) 633; (remarks) 661 (vol. i).

Mackenzie, Hon. A., East York.

- Administration of the N.W.*, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2927, 2930, 2932 (vol. iv).

Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.

- Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 48 (vol. i).
- Bank of Upper Canada, Stmnts. respecting (Ques.) 112 (vol. i).
- Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 893 (vol. ii).
- Business of the House, on M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1745 (vol. iii).
- C. P. R. Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for Stmnt., 111 (vol. i).
- Section B., Engineers' Reports on re-measurement and re-classification, on M. for copies, 123 (i).
- Section B, Judge Clark's Rep. on Award to Contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).
- Census of the N.W. B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 172 (i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 280 (vol. i).
- Clark, G. M. K., sums paid to, on M. for Ret., 698 (i).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2434 (vol. iii).
- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 3045 (vol. iv).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Stoney Indian rising (remarks) 863 (vol. ii).
- Dom. Lands sold or leased for timber, logs, staves, cordwood, &c. (M. for Stmnt.*) 40 (vol. i).
- Evangelical Lutheran Church of Can. B. 60 (*Mr. Mc Carthy*) in Com., 693 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to House, 1510 (vol. ii).
- Franchise B. Pets., presentation of (remarks) 2024 (iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310 (vol. ii).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070 (vol. ii).
- Inspectors of Public Works Ret. (Ques.) 606 (vol. i).
- Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2776; (Ques. of Order) 2786 (vol. iv).
- Man. Indian Agency, management of, on M. for copy of Rep. made by Govt. Commission, 62 (vol. i).
- Meeting of the House, irregularity of time, 2997 (iv).
- North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copies of Reps., &c., 697 (vol. i).
- Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, reflecting on Mr. Galt (remarks) 49 (vol. i).
- Protestant Volunteers in the 65th Battalion (remarks) on newspaper paragraph, 2998 (vol. iv).
- Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. Municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).
- St. Thomas Public Buildings, amount expended, on M. for Ret., 81 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY:
- Canals—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (Williamsburg) 3301; (Welland) 3202 (vol. iv).
- Civil Govt.* (Militia, Dept. of) 898 (vol. ii).
- Railways—Capital*: Repairs, &c. (I. C. R.) 3300 (vol. iv).
- Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 273 (vol. i).

Mackenzie, Hon. A.—Continued.

- Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' Loan B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) on 1°, 2751 (vol. iv).
- Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559 (vol. iii).
- Ways and Means*—on explanation of Mr. McLelan (remarks) 535 (vol. i).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 82 (*Mr. Cameron, Victoria*) on M. for 2°, 428 (vol. i).

Mackintosh, Mr. C. H., Ottawa City.

- Disturbance in the N.W., on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3175-3190 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1241-1245; on M. for Com. (explanation) 1376 (ii).
- High Commissioner, Instructions issued to, respecting Immigrants (Ques.) 290 (vol. i).
- Privilege, Ques. of, personal allusions in deb. (remarks) 3247 (vol. iv).
- Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 2387 (vol. iv).
- SUPPLY:
- Legislation* (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2808 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in the N. W., 3175-3190 (vol. iv).

Macmaster, Mr. D., Glengarry.

- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 387 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "revision of voters' lists," 2324, 2343; "general provisions," 2352; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2380-2382, 2386 (vol. iii); personal explanation, correction in Official *Debates*, 2619 (vol. iv).
- Privilege, Ques. of, article in Port Arthur *Herald* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).
- SUPPLY:
- Miscellaneous* (Doutre, J., claim re Halifax Commission) 3392 (iv).
- Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 160 (vol. i).

Macmillan, Mr. D., East Middlesex.

- Bankrupt Estates and Official Assignees (M. for Ret.) 303 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N. W., on Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3468 (vol. iv).
- Fish taken in the Miramichi (M. for Ret.) 295 (vol. i).
- London Life Insurance Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 76, 1°*) 313 (vol. i); in Com., 1723 (vol. ii).

McCallum, Mr. L., Monck.

- C. P. R. Resolutions, &c., in Com., 2742, 2744 (vol. iv).
- Clothing and Great Coats, in Com. of Sup., 2908 (iv).
- Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3446 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1871, 1994-1996; "registration of voters," 2258, 2272, 2283, 2284; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2373, 2383, (remarks)

McCallum, Mr. C.—Continued.

1965 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1424, 1496 (vol. ii); (Ques. of Order,) 1467 (vol. ii), 1733, 1867; (personal explanations) 1873, 1970 (vol. iii); member not speaking to ques. before Com. (remarks) 1919 (vol. iii).

Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303 (vol. iv).

North Saskatchewan River Improvements (M. for copy of Repts., &c.) 615, 695 (vol. iv).

Oxford and New Glasgow Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).

Refund of Ry Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 570, 616 (vol. i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303; (Welland) 3302. *Income* (Welland) 3418 (vol. iv).

Militia (Clothing and Great Coats) 2908 (vol. iv).

Railways—Capital: Short Line between Oxford and New Glasgow, 3415 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 801 (ii).

Welland Canal, in Com. of Sup., 2302, 3418 (vol. iv).

Western Ont. Pac. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 94, 1°*) 534 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. D., North Simcoe.

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 65, 1°) 235 (vol. i).

— B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com. (Amt.) 1058; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061 (vol. ii).

C. P. R. Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2688-2692; in Com., 2728, 2740, 2744-2746 (vol. iv).

Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) 2° m., 282; on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) 6 m. h., 287; 2° on a div., 289; (B. 13) 2° m., 254 (vol. i).

Court of Railway Commissioners (B. 12, 1°) 40 (vol. i).

Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada incorp. (B. 60, 1°*) 180 (vol. i).

Fort Macleod Ranch Tel. Co.'s B. 80 (*Mr. Hall*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2357 (vol. iii).

Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 454 (vol. i).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 496-499, 502, 504 (vol. i).

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 622 (vol. i).

Patent Act Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 268; (B. 64, 1°) 234; 2° m., 622; M. withdn. and Order dschgd., 629 (vol. i).

Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 86, 1°) 362 (vol. i).

McCraney, Mr. W., Halton.

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 958, 1059 (vol. ii); on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061; on Sen. Amts., 2647, 2651 (vol. iv).

— Druggists Licenses (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii).

— Prosecutions under (Ques.) 1306 (ii) 3320 (iv).

— Liquor Certificates granted under, in Halton (M. for Ret.*) 67 (vol. i).

C. P. R. Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract on M. for Stmnt., 484 (vol. i).

McCraney, Mr. W.—Continued.

"Dominion Annual Register," payments on account of (M. for Stmnt.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1410; "person" (Indian) 1541; (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1773-1775 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065 (vol. iv).

Indian Lands in Trafalgar, unsold (M. for List*) 533 (vol. i).

Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2960 (vol. iv).

Morgan, H. J., payments to, by Govt., for services (M. for Stmnt.) 120 (vol. i).

Return, imperfect (remarks) 101 (vol. i); enquiry for, 1064 (vol. ii).

Ways and Means—on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com. (explanation) 544 (vol. i); in Com. (mouldings and picture frames) 846 (vol. ii).

Wood Supplies, Govt. Buildings, Ottawa (Ques.) 429 (i).

McDougall, Mr. H. F., Cape Breton.

Fish caught in Bras d'Or Lakes, bounty paid on (M. for Stmnt.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Subsidies to Rys. in N.S. and Cape Breton (M. for Stmnt.) 140 (vol. i).

SUPPLY :

Fisheries, 3387 (vol. iv).

McDougald, Mr. J., Pictou.

Albion Mines Savings Bank (B. 15, 1°*) 46 (vol. i).

Rock Lake, Souris and Brandon Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 110, 1°) 742 (vol. i).

SUPPLY :

Miscellaneous (American Mining Engineers' visit to N.S.) 2456- (vol. iv).

Railways—Capital: I.C.B., 3299; Short Line Railway (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (steel) 805 (vol. ii).

McGreevy, Mr. T., West Quebec.

Finance Minister, Health of (Ques.) 2497 (vol. iii).

McIntyre, Mr. P. A., King's, P.E.I.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1790 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Income: P.E.I. 2918 (vol. iv).

McIsaac, Mr. A., Antigonish.

Bayfield, N.S., Breakwater, extension of (Ques.) 77 (i).

Mail Service between Antigonish and Sherbrooke (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).

Tracadie Breakwater, N.S., expenditure on (M. for Stmnt.*) 147 (vol. i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W., Colchester.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143, 2° m., 2466 ;
in Com., 2467-2475, 2541 (vol. iii).
- Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 921 (vol. ii).
- Allan Steamship Co. and claim of Government *re*
Newfield and Moravian (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res.,
2541, 2544, 2546, 2548 (vol. iii).
- Automatic Buoys, Liverpool Harbor, N.S. (Ans.) 479
(vol. i), 1914 (vol. iii).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and
Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Auditor Genl., &c., 135,
137 (vol. i).
- Bounty to Fishing Vessels, on M. for Stmt., 98 (vol. i).
- Brooklyn, N.S., Breakwater, Wharfage collections
(Ans.) 479 (vol. i).
- Buoys in Victoria and Nanaimo Harbors (Ans.) 479 (i).
- C. P. R. Trestles and Bridges, number of, on M. for
Stmnt. (Amt.) 100, 107 (vol. i).
- Can. Fisheries Exhibit, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).
- Can. registration of Shipping, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
- Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) 2° m., 2439 ; in
Com., 2534-2540 (vol. iii).
- Cape Race Light, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (vol. iv).
- Caron, Clovis, salary and expenses as Fishery Overseer
(Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
- Chapleau, Sheriff, communications from, *re* outbreak
in the N. W., 3426 (vol. iv).
- Coffin's Island Lighthouse, protection (Ans.) 1915 (iii).
- Communication with P.E.I. (Str. *Lansdowne*) in Com.
of Sup., 927 (vol. ii).
- Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*)
prop. Res., 2419 ; in Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (vol. ii).
- Deep water fisheries off coast of B. C. (Ans.) 3073 (iv).
- Discovery Island, B. C., Lighthouse on (Ans.) 479 (i).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Chapleau, Sheriff, communica-
tions from, *re* outbreak, 3426 (vol. iv).
- Land Surveys of St. Laurent (Ans.) 3424 (iv).
- Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communica-
tions with Govt. (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Memorials, &c., respecting grievances, answers
to (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- North-West Council, Res. *re* Half-breed Claims,
(Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Petitions and Res., &c., Half-breeds and Settlers
Claims (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Prince Albert and St. Laurent Settlements,
Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ans.) 3426 (iv).
- Prince Albert Colonization Co.'s Land, Settlers
and Squatters Improvements (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- Qu'Appelle Half-breeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh
(Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
- River Lots, Claims, settlement of, Mr. Pearce's
letter respecting (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- St. Laurent River Lots, re-survey (Ans.) 3424
(vol. iv).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.

- Disturbance in the N. W., St. Louis de Langevin, Peti-
tion from Settlers (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Schmidt, answer to letter of (Ans.) 3424 (iv).
- Surveys of River Lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ans.)
3324 (vol. iv).
- Surveys on Rivers, mode of (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Taché, Archbishop, communication from, *re*
Half-breeds (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ans.)
3424 (vol. iv).
- Dom. Lands Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).
- Surveys and Examinations of Survey Rets., in
Com. of Sup., 3344 (vol. iv).
- Sales of, for 1884-85 (Ans.) 2997, 3073 (vol. iv).
- Doutre, J., *re* Halifax Commission, in Com. of Sup.,
3392 (vol. iv).
- Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies, in Com. of Sup.,
3245 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries Act, extension of, to the N.W. (Ans.) 51 (i).
- Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 3387 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 910 (vol. ii).
- Fisheries Inspector, B.C., name and date of appointment
(Ans.) 694 (vol. i).
- Fisheries, protection of, after July (Ans.) 2360 (iii).
- Fisheries protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of
Cor., 702 (vol. i).
- Fishery Bounty distribution, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- Fishery Bounties, number and amount of Claims paid,
&c., on M. for Stmt., 56 (vol. i).
- Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Coun-
sel, in Com. of Sup., 3390 (vol. iv).
- Fishery Protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2955 (iv).
- Fish-breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2953-2955 (vol. iv).
- Fish Ladders in La Have River, Ans. 2239 (vol. iii).
- Fish taken in the Miramichi, on M. for Ret., 295 (vol. i).
- France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of
Sup., 2938 (vol. iv).
- Free Fishing allowed American Fishermen (Ans.) 3321
(vol. iv).
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Act Amt. B. 119 (*Mr.*
Costigan) 2° m., 2419 ; in Com., 2439 (vol. iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costi-*
gan) 2° m., 2548 ; in Com., 2549-2554 (vol. iii).
- Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).
- Gauvreau, Jules, salary and expenses as Fishery Over-
seer (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
- Govt. of the N. W. T., in Com. of Sup., 3243 (vol. iv).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Harbor Master at Halifax Acts Amt. (B. 148) prop.
Res., 2421 ; M. for Com. on Res., 2522 ; in Com.,
2522 ; M. to conc. in Res. and 1°* of B., 2534 (vol. iii).
- Half-breed and Settlers' Claims, Pets. and Res. (Ans.)
3426 (vol. iv).
- Heney, J., Govt. property occupied by (Ans.) 3426 (iv).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Hudson Bay Expedition, Supplies furnished to (Ans.)
783 (vol. ii).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.

- Huron and Superior, Lakes, Surveys of, in Com. of Sup. 3244 (vol. iv).
 Indians, Man. and N. W. T., conc., 3374 (vol. iv).
 Inland Revenue Acts Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) prop. Res. 2421; M. for Com. on Res., 2526; in Com. on Res., 2528 (vol. iii).
 Inland Revenue, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 917 (ii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals, B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1080 (vol. ii).
 Inside Service, Extra Clerks, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).
 Interior Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 3408; conc., 3433 (iv).
 Lake Simcoe Fisheries, Legislation respecting (Ans.) 3073 (vol. iv).
 Land and Surveys of St. Laurent (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3345 (iv).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2522 (vol. iii).
 Land Sales or Settlement in N.W. south of 24-mile Belt (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 Lansdowne, Steamer, and communication with P.E.I. (Ans.) 927 (vol. ii).
 Lansdowne, Steamer, engine and boiler (Ans.) 189 (i).
 Leduc, Father, and Mr. Maloney, communications with Govt. (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Life boats and Stations, in Com. of Sup., 2947 (vol. iv).
 Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951, 3250 (vol. iv).
 Lighthouse and Fog Alarms, construction of, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (vol. iv).
 Life-saving Apparatus in C.B. (Ans.) 239 (vol. i).
 Life-saving Service at Port Rowan (Ans.) 149; on M. for copies of Cor., 142 (vol. i).
 Lindsay, D., Deputy Collector of Inland Revenue, Superannuation of (Ans.) 2531 (vol. iii).
 Liverpool Harbor, N.S., Automatic Buoys (Ans.) 479 (vol. i), 1914 (vol. iii).
 Longley, G. C., Collector of Inland Rev., Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 Long Point Fishing Grounds (Ans.) 289 (vol. i).
 Maintenance and Repairs, in Com. of Sup., 2951 (iv).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2790; on Res., 2925 (vol. iv).
 Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Rep. (presented) 113 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 906-911, 922 (vol. ii).
 Marine Hospitals, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (vol. iv).
 Marine Stores, purchase of, in Halifax (Ans.) 1915 (iii).
 Masters and Mates, Examination of, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
 Memorials, &c., respecting Half-breed grievances, answers to (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
 Millard, Mr., collection of Fines imposed upon (Ans.) 1211 (vol. ii).
 Moody, John, employment of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
 Narrows, Erection of a Lighthouse at (Ans.) 112 (vol. i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.

- Navigation in Canadian Waters Act Amt. (B. 132) prop. Res. and in Com., 1278; 1°* of B., 1279 (vol. ii); M. to dschg. Order for 2°, 2399 (vol. iii).
 Navigation of River St. Lawrence (B. 159, 1°*) 3293; on Order for 2°, 3436; 2° m., 3470 (vol. iv).
 N. W. Central Ry., Land grant to, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3382 (vol. iv).
 N.W. Council, Res. re Half-breed Claims (Ans.) 3425 (iv).
 N.W. Council, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 3392 (vol. iv).
 Obstructions in nav. waters, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Short Line Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3414 (vol. iv).
 Parrsborough Breakwater, construction of, on M. for copy of tenders, 66 (vol. i).
 Port Mulgrave and Guysborough, Canso and Arichat, communication between (Ans.) 114 (vol. i).
 Prince Albert and St. Laurent Settlements, Reps. of Messrs. Russell and Aldous (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
 Prince Albert Colon. Co.'s Land, Settlers or Squatters' Claims, Improvements (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).
 Public Expenditure, on Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2377-2883 (vol. iv).
 Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Stmbt. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2522 (iii).
 Qu'Appelle Halfbreeds, Rep. of Mr. Walsh (Ans.) 3426 (vol. iv).
Queen of the Isles, Str., employment of (Ans.) 1131 (ii).
 Returns, production of (Ans.) 188 (vol. i).
 Return, on enquiries for (remarks) 838, 1133 (vol. ii).
 Rimouski, Steamer, Subsidy to (Ans.) 114 (vol. i).
 Rivers and Streams, Rental of (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).
 River lots, N.W., settlement of Claims, Mr. Pearce's letter respecting (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Roach, Mr., and Pilotage Commission (Ans.) 3427 (iv).
 Rogers' patent Fish Ladder, Cor. and Reps., on M. for copies, 872 (ii); purchase and use of (Ans.) 3073 (iv).
 Russell, A., Dept. of Interior, Superannuation of (Ans.) 2530; Russell, L., 2531 (vol. iii).
 St. Laurent River Lots, re-survey (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 St. Louis de Langevin, petitions from Settlers (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Salmon Fishing in Bathurst Harbor, regulations, &c. (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).
 Satuma Island, B. C., Lighthouse on (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).
 Sawdust in La Have River, N. S. (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).
 School of Navigation at Quebec (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).
 Schmidt, Louis, answer to letter of (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
 Shingle Shavings in the Mersey River (Ans.) 1039 (ii).
 Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. (B. 133) prop. Res., 1279; in Com. and 1°*, 1280 (vol. ii); 2° m. and in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 805 (vol. ii).
 Supplies for Steamer *Neptune*, on M. for copies of Accts., &c., 229 (vol. i).

McLelan, Hon. A. W.—Continued.**SUPPLY:**

- Civil Govt.*: Deptl. Contingencies (Agriculture) 921, (Inland Revenue) 917; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 910 (vol. ii); (Interior, Dept. of) 3408, conc., 3433 (vol. iv); (Marine, Dept. of) 906-911, contingencies, 922 (vol. ii).
- Dominion Lands—Capital* (Surveys and Exam. of Survey Rets.) 3344. *Income* (Inside Service, extra Clerks, &c.) 3346; (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345; (Outside Service, Agencies) 3346 (vol. iv).
- Fisheries* (Canadian Fisheries Exhibit) 2956; (Distribution of Bounty) 2956; (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953-2955. *Consolidated Fund*, 3387; (Fishery protection Steamers) 2955 (vol. iv).
- Geological Survey*, 3346 (vol. iv).
- Indians* (Man. and N.W.T.) conc., 3374 (vol. iv).
- Lighthouse and Coast Service*, 3250; (Agencies, Rents, &c.) 2951; (Cape Race Light) 2952; (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms) 2952; (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951; (Salaries, &c.) 2950 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Doutre, J., re Halifax Commission) 3392; (Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies) 3245; (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3393; (Govt. of N.W.T.) 3243; (Hudson Bay Expedition) 3245; (N.W. Council, Salaries, &c.) 3392; (Surveys, Lakes Huron and Superior) 3244 (vol. iv).
- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2938 (vol. iv).
- Marine Hospitals*, 2956 (vol. iv).
- Ocean and River Service* (Can. Registration of Shipping) 2950; (Examination of Masters and Mates) 2946; (Govt. Steamers) 2945; (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2946, 2947, 2950; (Obstructions in nav. waters) 2950; (Water and River Police) 2950; (Wrecks and Casualties) 2950 (vol. iv).
- Rys.—Capital*: I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3297; (Repairs, &c.) 3300; (Short Line Ry., Oxford and New Glasgow) 3414 (iv).
- Scientific Institutions* (Meteorological Observatories) 2956 (iv).
- Surveys of Lots at St. Albert, &c. (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Surveys on Rivers in N.W., mode of (Ans.) 3424 (iv).
- Taché, Archbishop, communication from, re Half-breeds (Ans.) 3425 (vol. iv).
- Vegreville, Father, Cor. with Mr. Deville (Ans.) 3424 (vol. iv).
- Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3336 (vol. iv).
- Water and River Police, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means*—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 505-512; (explanation) 534 (vol. i); in Com. (cutlery) 845; (steel) 805 (vol. ii).
- Wrecks and Casualties, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).

McMullen, Mr. J., North Wellington.

- Banking Facilities to Agriculturists B. 36 (*Mr. Orton*) on Res., 117, 120 (vol. i).
- Bergin, Surgeon Genl., Services of (Ques.) 1914 (iii).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries (M. for Rep. of Aud. Genl., &c.) 135, 136 (i).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and dispute with Mr. Tilton (M. for Ret.*) 312 (vol. i).
- Bonded machinery in use (Ques.) 3320 (vol. iv).
- C. P. R., Government employes along line (M. for names, &c.*) 56 (vol. i).
- Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2708-2712 (vol. iv).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- C. P. R., Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 482 (vol. i).
- Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2650 (vol. iv).
- Chinese Commission (M. for copy of Commission; names of Commissioners, date, salary, &c.) 56 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 277 (vol. i); on Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) to M. for 3°, 1297 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 977 (vol. ii).
- Collins, J. E., sums paid to, for services (M. for Ret.) 699 (vol. i).
- Debates*, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Riel, Trial of (Ques.) 2358 (iii); on M. to adjn. deb. on *Mr. Blake's Res.*, 3212 (iv).
- Dumont, Extradition of (Ques.) 2358 (vol. iii).
- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 390 (vol. i).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*, to M. for 2°, 1200-1204; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1395; "tenant," 1476, 1477, 1479; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1685-1690 (vol. ii), 1853, 1856, 1860; "manhood suffrage," 1961-1964, 1992, 1995, 2000; "qualifications in counties" (Amt.) 2052, 2059, 2063, 2067, 2070, 2075, 2080, 2082; "who shall not vote," 2100, (Indians) 2135-2137; "registration of voters," 2190-2193; "revision of voters' lists," 2396; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2386; "farm," 2393 (vol. iii); on Ms. that Com. rise, 1438, 1509, 1514 (vol. ii).
- G. T. R., Returns required under Act of 1879, &c., miles of Main Line, &c., on M. for Stmt., 230 (vol. i).
- Rivièrè du Loup Branch, Sale (Ques.) 1039 (ii).
- Grant, G., Militia Dept., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2531 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Officials in the N. W., names, &c. (M. for Ret.) 66 (vol. i).
- High Commissioner, amounts paid on account of (M. for Ret.) 210 (vol. i).
- Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2832, 2834, 2842, 2849 (iv).
- Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1078, 1090 (vol. ii).
- Indemnity to Members, increase of, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).
- I. C. R., Coal, Carriage of, from Spring Hill Mines (M. for Ret. of quantity) 533 (vol. i).
- Free Passes and reduced fare Tickets (M. for Ret.*) 505 (vol. i).
- Miscellaneous works, in Com. of Sup., 3299 (iv).
- Jones, W. H., Sec. of State's Dept., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
- Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2797 (vol. iv).
- Lindsay, D., Deputy Collector of Inland Revenue, Superannuation of (Ques.) 2531 (vol. iii).
- Longley, G. C., Collector of Inland Rev., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).

McMullen, Mr. J.—Continued.

- McCarthy, C., Public Works Dept., Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 McLeod, N. (Indian Affairs) Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).
 Printing and Advertising, Ret. respecting (Ques.) 28 (i).
 Printing and Publishing Co.'s, sums paid to and services rendered (M. for Ret.*) 147 (vol. i).
 Privilege, Quee. of, paragraph in *Montreal Herald* (remarks) 1131 (vol. ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).
 Post Office Savings Bank, depositors in, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).
 Ry. Comnrs. and Dom. Arbitrators (Ques.) 114 (vol. i).
 Rys. in the Co. of Grey, refund of Bonuses to Co. Council, &c., on M. for memorial, 60 (vol. i).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 578 (vol. i).
Queen of the Isles, Str., employment of (Ques.) 1131 (ii).
 Returns, on enquiries for (remarks) 211, 490 (vol. i), 1038, 1063, 1913 (vol. iii).
 Returns, imperfect, Govt. advertising (remarks) 67 (i).
 Rivers and Streams, Rental of, sums received by Dept. of Fisheries (M. for Ret.*) 448 (i); (Ques.) 2359 (iii).
 Ross, N. N., of Quebec, name and salary of successor to (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii).
 Russell, A., Dept. of Interior, Superannuation of (Ques.) 2530; Russell, L., 2531 (vol. iii).
 Speaker, Dep., Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3353 (vol. iv).
 Superan. Fund, number on list, &c. (M. for Ret.) 56 (i).
 SUPPLY:

- Civil Govt.* (Civil Service Examiners) 977 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2832, 2834, 2842, 2849 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450; (*Publishing Debates*) 991 (vol. ii); (Miscellaneous Salaries, Library, &c.) 2797 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3353 (vol. iv).
Railways—Capital: I.C.R. (miscellaneous works) 3299 (vol. iv).
 Terry, Charles Hunter, gratuity to (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).
 Tilton, Mr., and Staff Commander Bolton, dispute between (M. for Ret.*) 312 (vol. i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 722–729 (vol. i); in Com. (winceys) 842 (vol. ii).
 Wilkinson, J. A., sums paid to, and for what services (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).
 Wood and Wilkinson, sums paid to, and services rendered (M. for Ret.*) 147 (vol. i).

McNeill, Mr. A., North Bruce.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 955, 962 (vol. ii).
 Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on M. for 2°, 285 (i).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1121, 1125, 1126 (vol. ii).

McNeill, Mr. A.—Continued.

- Factories B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt to substitute Can. Temp. Act for resuming adjd. deb. for 2°, 948 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1412; "qualifications in counties," 2073; (remarks) 1946, 2204; (Ques. of Order) 1468 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (personal explanation) 2171; (affidavits) 2495 (vol. iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2554 (vol. iii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1069; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3°, 1330 (vol. ii).
 Medals for Volunteers who served in the N.W. (Ques.) 2274 (vol. iii).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. (*Mr. Carling*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2556; in Com., 2558 (iii).
 Privilege, on Ques. of, Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2103 (vol. iii).
 SUPPLY:
Civil Govt. (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 903 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 3395 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 798 (ii).

Massue, Mr. L. H., Richelieu.

- Antwerp International Exhibition, on M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Commissioner, 306 (i).
Debates, Official Rep. of, delay in distributing French translation (remarks) 746 (vol. i).
 Dom. properties in County of Richelieu (M. for Stmtnt.*) 147 (vol. i).

Mills, Hon. D., Bothwell.

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2961, 2963, 2964; (Amt.) 2967; neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; on M. for 3°, 3000; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (vol. iv).
 Administration of the N. W., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2926, 2931 (vol. iv).
 Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2466; in Com., 2471–2474 (vol. iii).
 Agent and Contingencies, B.C., in Com. of Sup., 3308 (iv).
 Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).
 Alaska and B. C. Boundary Line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 706 (vol. i).
 Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2543–2547 (vol. iii).
 Arts, Agriculture and Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
 Bankruptcy or Insolvency, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com., 47 (vol. i).
 Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2825 (vol. iv).
 B. C. Eastern Boundary, Cor. with Govt. of B. C. and Imp. Govt., &c. (M. for copies*) 533 (vol. i).
 Business of the House, on M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1744 (vol. iii).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Canada and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2944 (vol. iv).
- Canada and Germany, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. for 2°, 953; in Com., 1047 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2652, 2656, 2664 (vol. iv).
- C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan (remarks) on adjmt. of deb., 2643; in Com., 2736, 2741-2743, 2745; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 55, N. 89) 2864 (vol. iv).
- In Com. of Sup., 3383 (vol. iv).
- Section B, Judge Clark's Rep. on Award to Contractors, on M. for copy, 133 (vol. i).
- Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2534-2536 (vol. iii), 2767 (vol. iv).
- Carriers by Land B. 5 (*Mr. Coughlin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) to M. for 2°, 288 (vol. i).
- Census Commissioners and Enumerators in the N. W., &c.; in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Fope*) 75 (vol. i).
- Census of Man. and the N.W. B. 21 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 171; (Amt.) to recom. neg. on a div., 215 (vol. i).
- Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1097; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1283 (ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823 (vol. iii).
- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 975, 981 (ii).
- Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
- Committees, Sessional Clerks, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2795 (vol. iv).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 127 (vol. i); in Com. on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2770 (vol. iv).
- Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii).
- Debates, Official Rep. of, on First Rep. of Com. (remarks) 35 (vol. i); on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep., 3362 (vol. iv).
- Debates, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii); conc., 3372 (vol. iv).
- Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 915, 920 (ii).
- Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Coms. (Amt.) to Res. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) 72 (vol. i).
- Disputed Territory, Indian title, information relating to (Ques.) 594 (vol. i).
- Disturbance in the N.W., Commission, work of the (Ques.) 791; (remarks) 1566.
- Duck Lake, Engagement at, 791 (vol. ii).
- Expense B. 129 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for 2°, 2855 (vol. iv).
- Major Walsh's Rep. (remarks) 839 (vol. ii).
- on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3190-3199; on adjmt. of deb., 3160 (vol. iv).
- Dundas and Waterloo Road, on prop. Res. (*Sir Hector Langevin*) 451 (vol. i).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Employment of prisoners without the walls of Gaols B. 87 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 1658 (vol. ii).
- Fabre, Mr., Salary, &c., in Com. of Sup., 3244 (vol. iv).
- Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. for 2°, 882-886 (ii).
- Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 225 (vol. i).
- France and Quebec, fortnightly line, in Com. of Sup., 2937, 3042 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1161-1166; in Com., 1388; "woman suffrage," 1391, 1458; "usufructuary," 1449, 1453, 1454, 1455; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1477; "occupant," 1483; "farm," 1591 (vol. ii), 2393 (vol. iii); "person" (Indians) 1484, (Amt.) 1485, 1507, 1568, (Chinese) 1583, 1589; "city," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1599, 1605 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1747, 1761, (Indians) 1849, 1910-1913, 1934-1937; "manhood suffrage," 1964-1967, (Indians) 1976, 1988, 1991-2003, 2004-2006 (vol. iii), 2758 (vol. iv); "qualifications in counties," 2053, 2056, 2060, 2063, 2065-2063, 2072, 2075, 2078-2083, 2085, 2394; "disqualifying revising barrister," 2086; "who shall not vote" (Amt.) 2087, (Indians) 2149, 2160; "registration of voters," 2181-2185, 2229, 2233, (Amt.) 2227, 2243, 2266, 2270, 2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2282, 2285, 2287, 2288, 2293, 2300, 2315, 2316, 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2322, 2325, 2332, 2336, 2340-2343, 2345-2349; "general provisions," 2353, 2354; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indians) 2373-2376, 2387, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "appeal," 2361, 2364, 2366, 2396; "preamble," 2759 (vol. iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 30.2, 3062; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 3052; on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) 3054; on Amt. (*Mr. Weldon*) 3059; on M. for consdn. of B., on Amt. (*Mr. Holton*) 3070; (Amt.) 3 m. h., 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072 (vol. iv); (Ques. of Order) 1432; reading extracts, 1461-1465, 1619 (vol. ii), 1920, 2242 (vol. iii); appeal from Chair to House, 1510; on M. that Com. rise, 1422, 1432; (Ques. of Order) 1435; taking up items consecutively (remarks) 1471 (vol. ii); ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1798; (personal explanation) 2139 (vol. iii).
- Franchise B. Pets., on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2024 (vol. iii).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1320 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 452 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Loan B. 145 (*Mr. Bowell*) on prop. Res., 2463; in Com., 2465 (vol. iii).
- Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2917, 2921, 2923 (vol. iv).
- Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Hughes, D. J., charges against, on M. for Ret., 99 (i).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2330 (vol. iv).
 Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).
 Indian affairs in B. C., Cor. between Govt. of Canada and B. C. (M. for copies) 863-867 (vol. ii).
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 2922, 3242, 3313, 3314, 3318, 3342; conc., 3373 (vol. iv).
 Indian Titles in Ont. acquired by Govt. (Ques.) 632 (i).
 Indian Troubles at Metlakatla, on M. for copies of Cor., 304 (vol. i).
 Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2922 (vol. ii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1071, 1090; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3^o, 1326; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3^o, 1330 (vol. ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3297 (vol. iv).
 Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 970 (vol. ii); conc., 2764 (vol. iv).
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 3345 (iv).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2446-2448 (vol. iii).
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 497 (vol. i).
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 1662; in Com., 1667 (vol. ii), 2762 (vol. iv).
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796, 2798 (iv).
 License Act, Dom., working of, on M. for Cor., 312 (i).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2^o, 621 (vol. i).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2784-2786; in Com., 2792-2795, 2924 (vol. iv).
 Marine, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 909 (vol. ii).
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).
 Mining and Timber Lands north of Lakes Superior and Huron, ownership of (M. for O.C., &c.) 66 (vol. i).
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2427 (iii).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to receive Rep. of Com. on Res., 2753 (iv).
 Offences against the Person (assault and battery) Act Amt. B. 42 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2^o, 219 (vol. i).
 Ont. and Man., Boundary between (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).
 Ontario's Boundaries (M. for copies of O.C., Imp., Can. or Provl.) 52 (vol. i).
 Ontario's Claims to country north of Height of Land, and south of Hudson Bay, &c. (Ques.) 51 (vol. i).
 — Disputed Boundaries of, Imperial legislation (Ques.) 51, 115 (vol. i); 2854, 2998, 3321; (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3437 (vol. iv).
 — Northern Boundary of, Res. of Govt. (Ques.) 1132 (vol. i).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2^o, 628 (vol. i).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1893 (vol. iii).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

- Port Arthur Harbor, construction of, in Com. of Sup., 2917 (vol. iv).
 Postmaster Genl., in Com. of Sup., 902 (vol. ii);
 Powder Magazines at Fort Howe, St. John, N.B. (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).
 P.E.I., Refund of Duties to merchants and fishermen, Commissioners' Rep. (M. for copy) 831 (vol. ii).
 Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798, 2802, 2805-2807 (vol. iv).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on interpolation of words in despatch 3247 (vol. iv).
 Proofs of Entries in Books of Accounts B. 113 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 2466 (vol. iii).
 Railway from Montreal to the sea-board, on Res. (*Mr. Laurier*) 200 (vol. i).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 570 (vol. i).
 Representation in Parlt. of N. W. T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3406, 3408 (vol. iv).
 Returns, enquiries for, 427, 715 (vol. i), 1955, 2393 (vol. iii), 2936 (vol. iv).
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3312 (vol. iv).
 Robertson, John D., compensation to, for premises and land taken for I.C.R. (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Rys. and Canals, Minister of (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3436 (vol. iv).
 Secretary of State, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 900 (ii).
 Senate, Salaries, &c., conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
 Statutes of Can., revision of, Commissioners' Rep., on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to conc. in Mess. from Sen., 781 (vol. ii).
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (vol. iv).
 SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
Canals—Income : Rideau Canal (increase of water supply) 3312 (vol. iv).
Civil Govt. (Agriculture, Dept. of) 904; (Civil Service Examiners) 975, 981; Deptl. Contingencies (Indian Affairs) 915, (Inland Revenue) 920; (Interior, Dept. of) 970 (vol. ii), conc., 2764 (vol. iv); (Marine, Dept. of) 909; (Militia, Dept. of) 898; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 902; (Sec. of State, Dept. of) 900 (vol. ii).
Coll. of Revenues : Post Office, 3308, 3310; Public Works (Tel. lines, B. C.) 3307; (Agent and contingencies, B. C.) 3308 (iv).
Dominion Lands—Capital (Surveys and Examination of Survey Rets.) 3344. *Income* (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345; (Inside Service, extra Clerks, &c.) 3346 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2830 (vol. iv).
Indians (B. O.) 3313; (Grant to suppl. Fund) 3242; (Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River) 2922; (Man. and N. W. T.) 3314, 3318, 3342, conc., 3373 (vol. iv).
Legislation : H. of C. (Ooms., extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2795; (increased Indemnity to Members) 3450 (vol. iv); (*Debates*, publishing) 991 (vol. ii), conc., 3372. *Miscellaneous* (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796, 2798; (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2798, 2808, 2805-2807. *Senate* (Salaries, &c.) conc., 2765 (vol. iv).

Mills, Hon. D.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Can. and Antwerp) 2944; (Can. and Germany) 2945; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 3042 (vol. iv).
- Miscellaneous* (Commercial Agencies) 3245; (Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies) 3244; (Returns, preparation of) 3245 (iv).
- Ocean and River Service* (Govt. Steamers) 2345 (vol. iv).
- Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 993 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (iv).
- Public Works—Capital*: Port Arthur (construction of Harbor) 2917. *Income*: Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2923; (Ont.) 2921 (vol. iv).
- Railways—Capital*: C. P. R., 3383; I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3297 (vol. iv).
- Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 272 (vol. i).
- Surveys and Exam. of Returns, in Com. of Sup., 3344 (iv).
- Surveys and Exploration in N. W. (Ques.) 2029 (iii).
- Telegraph lines, B. C., in Com. of Sup., 3307 (vol. iv).
- Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' B. 150 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2935 (vol. iv).
- Timber Permits granted in Territory awarded Ont. (Ques.) 114, 115; M. for Ret., 115; (M. for copies, &c.*) 124, 210 (vol. i).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1^o, 631 (vol. i).
- Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 993 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
- Volunteers Services in the N. W., Recognition of, B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3378; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 3384 (vol. iv).
- Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2902, 3333-3336 (vol. iv).
- Ways and Means—The Tariff*: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 512-521, (explanation) 539 (vol. i); in Com. (sugar) 3224 (vol. iii); (woollen rags) 784; (woollen fabrics) 793, 795 (vol. ii); (whiskey) 3223; disturbance in the N. W., on Res. granting \$1,700,000, 2532 (vol. iii); on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to Com., want of confidence, 3190-3199 (vol. iv).
- Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835; in Com. on B., 1675 (ii).

Mitchell, Hon. P., Northumberland, N.B.

- Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).
- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3^o, 3001 (iv).
- Australian and Tasmanian Colonies, trade with (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 36 (vol. i).
- Bankrupt Estates and Official Assignees, on M. for Ret., 303 (vol. i).
- Bolton, Staff Commander, and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries, on M. for Rep. of Aud. Genl., 136, 137 (i).
- Business of the House, Tariff deb. (Ques.) 595 (vol. i).
- C. P. R., Res. respecting further loan, in Com., 2860 (iv).
- Casualties on G. T. R. and C. P. R. and Branches (M. for Stmt.) 226 (vol. i).
- Civil Service Acts Amt B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1097, 1111; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 3 m. h., 1282; neg.

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823 (vol. iii).
- Collection of Revenues, in Com. of Sup., 3233 (vol. iv).
- Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., out in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 150 (i).
- Customs, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 901 (ii), 3233 (iv).
- Debates*, Official Rep. of, First Rep. (remarks) 35 (vol. i); on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep., 3370; on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) 3362 (iv).
- Disturbance in the N. W., movement of Troops from N. S. (remarks) 873 (vol. ii).
- Skirmish with Poundmaker (Ques.) 1646 (ii).
- Financial Commissioner in Eng., in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).
- Fishery arrangements with the U.S. (remarks) 2890 (iv).
- Fishery protection Steamers, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
- Fish taken in the Miramichi (M. for Ret.) 295 (vol. i).
- Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 224 (vol. i).
- France and Quebec, fortnightly line, in Com. of Sup., 2938, 2940 (vol. iv).
- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2^o, 1145, (explanation) 1149; in Com. "person" (Indians) 1577, (Chinese) 1582 (vol. ii) "qualifications in cities and towns," 1807, (Amt.) 1938; "manhood suffrage," 1939, 1980, (Amt.) 1987, 1991; "qualifications in counties," 2069, 2072; on personal explanation of *Mr. Blake*, 2542; on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1800 (vol. iii); (Ques. of Order) 1467; reading extracts, 1463 (vol. ii).
- Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 50 (*Mr. Temple*) on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1386 (ii).
- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 453 (vol. i); Wednesdays, 965 (vol. ii).
- G. T. R. Double Track, Montreal and Toronto, assurance, &c., given to Govt. (M. for copy, &c.) 143 (i).
- Importation of Rails (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).
- Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 817 (vol. ii).
- Returns, enquiries for, 566, 662 (vol. i), 964 (vol. ii), 2393 (vol. iii), 3000, 3395 (vol. iv).
- Return, imperfect, presented by *Mr. Hickson* (remarks) 860; (Ques.) 1278 (vol. ii).
- Returns required under Act of 1879, &c., miles of Main line, &c. (M. for Ret.) 229 (vol. i).
- Stockholders' List, Ret. respecting (Ques.) 28, 101, 350; (remarks) 113; (M. for Ret.) 234 (vol. i); (remarks) 2210 (vol. iii); and Ans. of *Mr. Hickson* (Ques.) 927; and action of *Mr. Hickson* (Ques.) 1094 (vol. ii); enforcement of Order of House (Ques.) 3426 (iv).
- Indians, Man. and N.W. T., in Com. of Sup., 3340 (iv).
- Insolvent Debtors Assets Distribution B. 3 (*Mr. Curran*) on M. for 1^o, 29 (vol. i).
- I. C. R., conc., 3395 (vol. iv).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Interior, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 970 (vol. ii).
 Interior, Dept. Rep. (appeal to Members to speak louder) 49 (vol. i).
 Land Grants and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N. W., on M. for Ret. (personal explanation) 94 (vol. i).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2453-2456; (Ques. of Order) 2459; (personal explanation) 2460 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 2891 (vol. iv).
 Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951 (vol. iv).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2924; in Com. on B., 3048, 3050 (vol. iv).
 Maritime Court of Ont. Extension of Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) on M. for 2°, 130 (vol. i).
 Newfoundland and the Dom., Trade Relations between (Ques.) 3042 (vol. iv).
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2425 (iii).
 Official Assignees under Bankrupt Act, 1869 (M. for Ret. of Estates, &c.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 903 (vol. ii).
 P. E. I. and G. B., &c., Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).
 Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).
 Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2799, 2800, 2801 (vol. iv).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on remarks of Mr. McMullen, 1131 (vol. ii).
 Volunteers' Services, recognition of, in the N. W. B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3380; on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3380 (iv).
 Refund of Duties to persons in P.E.I., in Com. of Sup., 3455 (vol. iv).
 Salaries, Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2951 (vol. iv).
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3287 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3287 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Charges of Management* (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 897; (Printing Dom. Notes) 898 (vol. ii).
Civil Government (Customs, Dept. of) 901; (Fisheries, Dept. of) 911; (Interior, Dept. of) 970; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 903 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 3233 (vol. iv).
Fisheries (Fishery Protection Steamers) conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 3340 (vol. iv).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper) 2799-2801 (vol. iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Salaries, &c.) 2951 (vol. iv).
Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2938-2940; (P. E. I. and G. B., &c.) 2942 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Refund of duties to persons in P. E. I.) 3455 (iv).
Railways—Capital: L. C. B., conc., 3395 (vol. iv).

Mitchell, Hon. P.—Continued.

- Treasury Board, Constitution of, B. 104 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on 1°, 630 (vol. i).
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559-2773 (vol. iii); on M. for Com. of Sup., 2899, 3336-3338; (personal explanation) 2902 (vol. iv).
 Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports, on M. for Ret., 138 (vol. i)

Moffat, Mr. R., Restigouche.

- Customs Law, violation of, in N.S., by John Leander Mackenzie (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Dodge, Brenton, of Kentville, N.S., dismissal of (M. for Ret.*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B., in Com. "qualifications in counties," 2056 (vol. iii).

Mulock, Mr. W., North York.

- Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2543, 2546 (vol. iii).
 C. P. R. connection with Ont. system of Rys. (M. for copy of offers, &c.*) 532; (Ques.) 569 (vol. i); offers to construct line (M. for copies) 1444 (vol. ii).
 ——— Res. respecting further Loan, in Com., 2731, 2736, 2738, 2744 (vol. iv).
 ——— Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 482 (vol. i).
 ——— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 102 (vol. i).
 Canadian Fisheries (M. for copies of O. C., &c., &c., &c.) 55 (vol. i).
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2537, 2540 (vol. iii).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com. on Res., 279 (vol. i); on M. to conc. in Res., 889; in Com., 1106, 1113, 1118, 1121; on Amt. (*Mr. Mitchell*) 3 m. h., to M. for 3°, 1283; on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3°, 1295; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1303; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1304 (vol. ii); on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1823 (vol. iii).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 974 (vol. ii).
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) on M. for 2°, 126 (vol. i); in Com., 2768 (iv).
 Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. (B. 111, 1°) 742 (vol. i).
 Controverted Elections Acts Amt. (B. 98, 1°) 605 (vol. i).
 Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3354 (vol. iv).
 Disturbance in the N.W., luxuries for the Volunteers, forwarding of (remarks) 968 (vol. ii); Duck Lake, Rep. of engagement (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii).
 Dominion Lands Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 370 (vol. i).
 Fisheries Act Amt. (B. 90, 1°) 426 (vol. i).
 Fisheries protection in the N.W., on M. for copies of Cor., 701 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1379, 1384; "woman suffrage," 1421, 1426-1430;

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

"owner," 1473; "tenant," 1482; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1538; "actual value," 1607; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1715-1723 (vol. ii), 1882, 1887; "manhood suffrage," 1978, (Amt.) 1985, 1992, 2000; "qualifications in counties," 2053; (Amt.) 2054, 2059, 2064, 2070; (Amt.) 2072, 2073, 2076; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2137; "registration of voters," 2223-2227, 2248, 2272, 2286, 2287, 2291, 2300, 2302, 2317; "revision of voters' lists," 2322, 2327, 2329, 2331, 2335, 2340, 2349; "general provisions," 2354; "appeal," 2360, 2363; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2372 (vol. iii); "preamble," 2758; on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3^o, (Amt.) neg. (Y.46, N. 96) 3061; on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; in Com., 3052; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 3052 (vol. iv); (remarks) 1933; on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1800; on procedure, 1470; (Ques. of Order) 1619 (vol. ii), 1920 (vol. iii).
 Geological Survey, in Com. of Sup., 3349 (vol. iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1066, 1068, 1074-1078, (Amt.) 1090; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 1324, neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327 (vol. ii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3296 (vol. iv).
 Lake Simcoe Fisheries, permits granted (M. for Ret.*) 1444 (ii); Legislation respecting (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
 Library of Parl. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2759-2762 (vol. iv).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., 2897; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 2958 (iv).
 Liquor License Act, in Com. of Sup., 3423 (vol. iv).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2783; in Com., 3049 (vol. iv).
 Militia, Active, number of members of (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) on M. for 2^o, 3045 (vol. iv).
 Northern and Pacific Junction Ry. Co. and Northern Ry. Co. of Can., &c. (M. for copy of Lease) 56 (vol. i).
 N. W. Council Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 3392 (vol. iv).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2^o, 267, 624 (vol. i).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1891 (vol. iii).
 Postmaster at Maitland, removal of (Ques.) 1743 (iii).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).
 Returns, production of (Ques.) 188 (vol. i); (remarks) 1133 (vol. ii).
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (*Mr. Desjardins*) in Com., 1352 (vol. ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).
 Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name, 2320 (vol. iii).
 Superintendents of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 270 (vol. i).

Mulock, Mr. W.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Trent River Nav.) 3311 (iv).
Income: Rideau Canal (increase of water supply) 3313 (iv).
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 974 (vol. ii).
Dom. Lands—Income (Outside Service, Agencies) 3346 (vol. iv).
Geological Survey, 3349 (vol. iv).
Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3423 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3354; (N.W. Council, Salaries, &c.) 3392 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund (Ont.) 3385. Telegraphs, 3420 (vol. iv).
Rys.—Capital: I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3296 (vol. iv).
 Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle incorp. (B. 39, 1^o*) 125 (vol. i).
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).
 Tolls on certain Railway Companies (M. for Stmt., &c.) 54 (vol. i).
 Trent Riv. Navigation, in Com. of Sup., 3311 (vol. iv).

O'Brien, Mr. W. E., Muskoka.

Charlinch Post Office, appointment or removal of Postmaster, &c., on M. for Papers, 708 (vol. i).
 Disturbance in the N.W., description of Arms, (remarks) 814 (vol. ii).
 Inland Fisheries of the Dom., Queen vs. Robinson (M. for copy of Judgment of Supreme Court) 229 (vol. i).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 571 (vol. i).
 Sunday Excursions prohibition B. 19 (*Mr. Charlton*) on M. for 2^o, 265 (vol. i).
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 783; (woollen fabrics) 794 (vol. ii).

Orton, Mr. G. T., Centre Wellington.

Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) 3002; on M. to adjn. deb., 3432 (vol. iv).
 Administration of the N. W. T., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2929-2931 (vol. iv).
 Banking Facilities for Agriculturists (B. 36, Res.) 115, 118; 1^o* of B., 120; 2^o m., 620 (vol. i).
 Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on prop. Res., (*Mr. Kranz*) 238 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders, 714 (vol. i); on Sen. Amts., 2646, 2649, 2653 (vol. iii).
 Carriers by Land B. 13 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on Amt. (*Mr. Curran*) 6m. h., to M. for 2^o, 288 (vol. i).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 3^o, 2893 (iv).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2^o, 621 (vol. i).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com. on Res., 2925 (vol. iv).
 North-West Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2428 (iii).
 Privilege, Ques. of, article in *News Record* (explanation) 3000; on explanation of *Mr. Kaulbach* of vote

Orton, Mr. G.—Continued.

on Can. Temp. Act, 3073; on reading newspaper paragraphs (remarks) 3161 (vol. iv).

Squatters in Township 3, Ranges 23 and 24 west, on M. for Ret., 234, (vol. i).

Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3472 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen rags) 787, 789 (ii).

Ouimet, Mr. J. A., Laval.

Criminal Law Amt., Houses of ill-fame, gambling and disorderly houses (B. 56 1°), 170 (vol. i).

Land Grant and Land Grant Bonds to Rys. in Man. and N. W., on M. for Ret., 97 (vol. i).

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 164; (Amt.) 165 (vol. i).

Paint, Mr. N., Richmond, N.S.

Clearing Vessels without Harbor Master's certificate (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii);

Debates, Official Rep., omissions from (remarks) 3474 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1991; "in counties," 2072, 2077, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (vol. iii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1311, 1313 (vol. ii).

Great American and European Short Line Ry., Cor. between Dom. Govt. and Govt. of N. S., Engineers' Repts., &c. (M. for copies) 78 (vol. i).

Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 2523 (vol. iii).

Rand's Indian Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Kirk*) to M. to conc. in Amts., 3403 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Mortuary Statistics) 1029 (ii).

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (St. Peter's Canal) 3312. *Income*: Miscellaneous (road dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3419 (vol. iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, construction) 2953 (vol. iv).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2937, 2941 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (*Rand's Indian Dictionary*) 3420 (vol. iv).

Railways—Capital: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3417; I.C.R. (miscellaneous works) 3298; (Short Line between Oxford and New Glasgow) 3415 (vol. iv).

Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Observatories) 2956 (iv).

Ways and Means—in Com. (glucose syrup) 850 (vol. ii).

Paterson, Mr. W., South Brant.

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2467-2474 (vol. iii).

Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2542-2546, 2548 (vol. iii).

Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 2766 (vol. iv).

Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 59, 1°*) 170 (vol. i).

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

Bonuses to Rys. by Ont. Legislature, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3447 (vol. iv).

C. P. R., Immigration to Man. and N. W., Cor. between the Govt. and Co. (M. for copies*) 147 (vol. i).

— Resolutions respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2720-2723 (vol. iv).

Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2537-2540 (vol. iii).

Colonial and Indian Exhibitions B. 126 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).

Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).

Consolid. Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2527; in Com., 2528 (vol. iii), 2968-2971; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3433 (vol. iv).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3235 (vol. iv).

Customs Seizures at Winnipeg (M. for Stmt.) 293 (vol. i); (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3363 (vol. iv).

Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3352, 3357 (vol. iv).

Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 915, 917, 921, 923 (vol. ii).

Division List, correction (remarks) 994 (vol. ii).

Drawbacks on Manufactured Exports (M. for Ret.) 139 (vol. i).

Dundas and Waterloo Macadamized Road, Sale by Govt. (M. for copies of Papers, &c.*) 147 (vol. i).

Election Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1360-1364; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1489, 1492, 1571, 1574 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1793-1798, 1800-1804, 1931; "manhood suffrage," 1981, 2004, (Indian) 2013-2019; "qualifications in counties," 2056, 2059, 2074, 2079, 2084; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2123-2127, 2162; "registration of voters," 2259-2263, 2199-2205, 2269, 2273, 2279, 2283, 2285, 2291, 2298, 2300, 2315, 2318; "revision of voters' lists," 2337; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indian) 2367-2369, 2376, 2387; "appeal," 2367; "offences," 2391 (vol. iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068; neg. (Y. 38 N. 87) 3068; on M. to conc. in Amts., 3071 (vol. iv); on procedure, 1470; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1423, 1430, 1435, 1507, 1556 (vol. ii), 2138, 2209 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, reading extracts, 1463, 1765; appeal from Chair to House (rule read) (Ques. of Order) 1921; (Ques. of Privilege) 2102; (remarks) 2146 (iii).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1309, 1312, 1317, 1320 (vol. ii), 2551 (vol. iii).

Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 850-853, 856 (vol. ii).

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

- Indemnity to Members, increased, in Com. of Sup., 3450 (vol. iv).
 Indian Lands unsold in Township of Toronto (M. for List*) 147 (vol. i).
 Indian Supplies in the N.W., Tenders, &c. (M. for Rets.*) 532 (vol. i).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1070, 1089; on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) 1331 (vol. ii).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2456–2460 (vol. iii).
 Library of Parlt. B. 139 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 1669 (vol. ii).
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2798 (vol. iv).
 License Act, Dom., working of, on M. for Cor., 311 (i).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 2791, 2792 (vol. iv).
 Militia, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 914 (vol. ii).
 Morgan, J. H., appointment as Forestry Commissioner (M. for O.C., &c.*) 147 (vol. i).
 Ocean Mail Service, renewal of Contract B. 151 (*Mr. Carling*) on M. to conc. in Res., 2757 (vol. iv).
 Printing Com., on M. to conc. in Second Rep., 149 (i).
 Rand's Micmac Dictionary, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).
 Roads and Bridges, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).
 Senate, extra Expenses, in Com. of Sup., 3448 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3472; in Com., 3472 (vol. iv).
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3215, 3218 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions) 2766 (vol. iv); (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032 (vol. ii).
Civil Government: Deptl. Contingencies (Agriculture) 921; (Customs) 916, 921, 923; (Inland Revenue) 917, 921; (Finance and Treasury Board) 915; (Interior) 915; (Militia) 914 (Public Works) 921; (Railways and Canals) 923 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 3235 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2819, 2832, 2836, 2840, 2844–2846, 2849–2852 (iv).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 3315–3318; (Assistance to Institutions) 3392 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (Election Expenses) 3452; (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3450. (Miscellaneous (Salaries, Library, &c.) 2798. Senate (extra Expenses) 3448 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3352, 3357; (Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary) 3420 (vol. iv).
Pensions (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (iv).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund: Roads and Bridges, 3420. Telegraphs, 3420 (vol. iv).
 Trade Relations with Mexico (Ques.) 632 (vol. i).
 Veterans of War of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (vol. ii); conc., 2765 (vol. iv).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1675 (vol. ii).
 Wheat and Flour, Duties on, Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 532 (vol. i).
 Wheat and Flour Imports and Exports (M. for Ret.) 138 (vol. i).
 Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 412–426; in Com., 772–775 (vol. i); (earthenware and stoneware) 848; (glucose syrup)

Paterson, Mr. W.—Continued.

- 850–853, 856; (steel) 804 (vol. ii); (spirits and tobacco) 3229; (sugar) 3215, 3218; (whiskey) 3226 (vol. iv); (winceys) 842 (vol. ii).

Patterson, Mr. J. C., North Essex.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., “qualifications in cities and towns,” 1986 (vol. iii).
 International Ferries (B. 17, 1°*) 46; 2° m., 254 (i).
 Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit River Ry. Co. (B. 24, 1°*) 67 (vol. i).
 Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 121, 1°*) 927 (ii).

Platt, Mr. J. M., Prince Edward, Ont.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; in Com., 1059 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2647 (vol. iv).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1119, 1127 (vol. ii).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2911 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1336–1341; “woman suffrage,” 1439; “person” (Indian) 1525; “actual value,” 1606 (vol. ii); “qualifications in cities and towns,” 1784–1789; “manhood suffrage” and (Indians) 1977; “revision of voters’ lists,” 2343; “who shall not vote” (Indians) 2127–2129 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2946 (vol. iv).
 Importation of Prison Manufactures (Ques.) 2169 (iii).
 Life-boats and Stations, in Com. of Sup., 2947–2950 (iv).
 Market Battery, Kingston, lease of property (M. for copies of O. C., &c.) 210 (vol. i).
 Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 2909 (vol. iv).
 Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1032 (vol. ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303–3306 (vol. iv).
 Port Credit Harbor Co., Reports made to Govt., &c. (M. for copies*) 124 (vol. i).
 Salmon Point Breakwater, construction (M. for Cor., &c.) 210 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Mortuary Statistics) 1032 (ii).
Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Murray) 3303–3306; (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3312 (vol. iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951; (Salaries, &c.) 2951 (vol. iv).
Militia (Clothing and Great Coats) 2909; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2911 (vol. iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 2946; (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2947–2950; (Wrecks and Casualties) 2950 (iv).
 Tête du Point Barracks, lease of (M. for copies of O.C., &c.) 210 (vol. i).
 Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3312 (vol. iv).
 Ways and Means—in Com. (hoop iron) 807; (salt cake) 806; (steel) 805 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1677 (vol. ii).
 Weller's Bay, “Range Lights” at (M. for Cor., &c.) 210 (vol. i).
 Wrecks and Casualties, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).

Pope, Hon. J. H., Compton.

- Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904, 921 (vol. ii).
- Agricultural, &c., Statistics, compilation, in Com. of Sup., 1036 (vol. ii).
- Agricultural Fertilizers B. 122 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2°, 2478; in Com., 2479-2481 (vol. iii).
- Air-Brakes, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 3299 (vol. iv).
- Allan Line, payments to, for assisted passages (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
- Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
- Antwerp International Exhibition, on M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com., 306 (vol. i).
- Archives, care of, in Com. of Sup., 1023, 1025 (vol. ii).
- Bradley, W. Ingles, services of, on M. for Ret., 479 (i).
- Canada and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2943 (vol. iv).
- Canada and Germany, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
- C. P. R., Ability of Co. to fulfil engagements under prop. Res., 2238 (vol. iii).
- Amended Plans and Profiles, B.C. (Ans.) 362 (i).
- Avalanches in the Selkirk Range (Ans.) 694 (i).
- Branch Lines (Ans.) 694 (vol. i).
- B. C. Sections, work on, on M. for Reps., &c., 204 (vol. i).
- Change in arrangements between Govt. and Co. (Ans.) 1913 (vol. iii).
- Connection with Ont. system (Ans.) 569 (i).
- Connection with Quebec (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).
- Construction near Lytton, B.C., on M. for Ret., 226 (vol. i).
- Cor. between Co. and Govt. re change in arrangements (Ans.) 2029 (vol. iii).
- Cost of construction from Winnipeg to 615 miles west, on M. for Stmt., 228 (vol. i).
- Co.'s Acts Amt. (B. 153, 1°, 2858; in Com., 3031; 3° m., 3293; 3° agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (vol. iv).
- Eastern Division, Earnings and Working Expenses (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Eastern Section, Progress Estimates (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).
- Eastern Section, quantities, classifications and prices, Engineers' Estimates, on M. for copies, 300, 301 (vol. i).
- Expenditure to complete Govt. construction (Ans.) 1130 (vol. ii).
- Govt. Sections in B. C., working of, by contractors (Ans.) 632 (vol. i).
- Grades and Curves, number of (Ans.) 632; maximum and minimum (Ans.) 694 (vol. i).
- Grades, Tangents and Curves (Ans.) 694 (vol. i); 2239 (vol. iii).
- In Com. of Sup., 3383 (vol. iv).
- Laborers' wages, payment of, on construction (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
- Levels, Grades, Tangents, &c., from summit of Rockies to Moody (Ans.) 888 (vol. ii).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.

- C. P. R., Location, change of, in B.C., 2239 (vol. iii).
- North American Contracting Co., and grades, curves, main line, &c., on M. for Stmt., 145 (vol. i).
- Port Moody and Savona's Ferry, extension of time (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Port Moody Wharf and Freight Shed, on M. for copies of Reps., Plans, &c., 296 (vol. i).
- Progress Estimates (Ans.) on adjmnt. of House, 188; for Feb., 429 (vol. i).
- Prop. Res. and *Mail* Newspaper (remarks) 1712 (vol. ii).
- Resolutions respecting further Loan (speech) 2559-2565; in Com., 2724, 2733, 2741, 2748-2750; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2858 (vol. iv).
- Rails for Govt. section in B.C. (Ans.) 1914 (iii).
- Rates in B. C. (Ans.) 1474 (vol. ii).
- Rolling Stock, Eastern Section, Western Division, change in, on M. for Ret., 303 (vol. i).
- Route, construction, rolling stock, extensions, cash subsidy, land grant bonds, &c., &c., on M. for Stmt., 45 (vol. i).
- Section B, Award of \$395,600 to contractors, payment of (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).
- Section B, Award of \$34,179.17, credits in Public Accounts (Ans.) 114 (vol. i).
- Section B, Arbitration, Evidence taken (Ans.) 112 (vol. i).
- Section B, Engineers' Reports on re-measurement and re-classification, on M. for copies, 122 (vol. i).
- Section B, opinion of Counsel as to binding character of Award (Ans.) 77 (vol. i).
- Section B, Rep. of Judge Clark on Award (Ans.) 78, 133 (vol. i).
- Subsidy, in Com. of Sup., 3295 (vol. iv).
- Tangents and Curves, number and aggregate length (Ans.) 744 (vol. i).
- Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 103, (vol. i).
- Western Division, Earnings and Working expenses (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).
- Western Terminus, route or routes from Port Moody to English Bay, on M. for plan, &c., 145 (i).
- Cape Breton Ry., construction of (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).
- Surveys, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).
- Cape Tormentine Ry., connection with (Ans.) 2997 (iv).
- Cape Traverse Branch Ry., payment to contractors for construction (Ans.) 694 (vol. i).
- Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).
- Catholic population of Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 363 (i).
- Census Commissioners and Enumerators in the N.W.T., (prop. Res.) 46; M. for Com. on Res., 74; M. to conc. in Rep. of Com., 125 (vol. i).
- Census of 1881, Absentees from Canada during (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).
- Census, Quinquennial, of Man., N.W.T., &c. (B. 21, 1°) 46; in Com., 171; consdn. of B. m., 212 (vol. i).
- Census, Fourth and Fifth Vols., issue of (Ans.) 48 (i).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.

- Change of Names in the N.W.T. (Ans.) 2359 (vol. iii).
 Cholera, precautions against (Ans.) 568 (vol. i).
 Clark, G. M., Sums paid to, apart from salary as Judge (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).
 Colonial and Indian Exhibitions (B. 126) prop. Res., 451 (vol. i); Res. in Com., 892; in Com. of Sup., 1032-1035; Res. conc. in and 1^o* of B., 1064 (vol. ii); in Com., 2399 (vol. iii).
 Contagious Diseases affecting Animals (B. 44) in Com., 1065-1073, 1089-1094 (vol. ii).
 Cornwall Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).
 Criminal Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).
 Dams at Lakefield and Young's Point (Ans.) 1130 (ii).
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 921, 923 (vol. ii).
 Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1026 (vol. ii).
 Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3384 (vol. iv).
 Fort Francis Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3385 (vol. iv).
 G. T. R., Double Track between Montreal and Toronto, assurance, &c., given to Govt., on M. for copy, 144 (i).
 ——— Imperfect Ret. presented by Mr. Hickson (remarks) 861 (vol. ii).
 Grant, Alpin, position of, under Govt. (Ans.) 429 (i).
 Great American and European Short Line Ry., on M. for Ret., 79 (vol. i).
 Grenville Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
 Health Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 2766 (vol. iv).
 High Commissioner, Instructions issued to, respecting Immigrants (Ans.) 290 (vol. i).
 Immigrant Patients in Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 3358 (vol. iv).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2810, 2813, 2816, 2831-2853 (vol. iv).
 Immigrants to the N. W., on M. for Stmt., 45 (vol. i).
 Immigrants settled in B. C. (Ans.) 189 (vol. i).
 Indians, in Com. of Sup., 3342 (vol. iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals (B. 44, 1^o) 125 (vol. i); 2^o m., 892; 3^o m., 1321; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) 1321; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3^o, 1325; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. 2397 (vol. iii).
 Inspecting Engineers' Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 3417, (vol. iv).
 Inspectors or Clerks of Works, persons employed as, on M. for Stmt., 139 (vol. i).
 I. C. R., Claims of Contractors, Sec. 16 (Ans.) 505 (i).
 ——— Construction to Indiantown (Ans.) 744 (vol. i), 816 (vol. ii).
 ——— Cost of Equipment (Ans.) 816 (vol. ii).
 ——— Cost of Working, &c., from 1879 to 1884, on M. for Stmt. (Amt.) 203 (vol. i).
 ——— Equipment, valuation of (Ans.) 888 (vol. ii).
 ——— Earnings and Working Expenses: 3073 (vol. iv); monthly (Ans.) 76, 114; for Jan., 1885, 428 (vol. i); for March and April, 2029 (iii).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 3296, 3299, 3300, 3417; conc., 3396 (vol. iv).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.

- I. C. R. Receipts and Expenses (Ans.) 1744, 1914 (iii).
 ——— Sale of Tickets on Chatham Branch (Ans.) 2289 (vol. iii).
 Lachine Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).
 Lake St. Francis Road Dyke, in Com. of Sup., 3419 (iv).
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 3049 (vol. iv).
 Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1027-1031 (ii).
 Murray Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3303 (vol. iv).
 Muskoka Lakes and River Severn Canal System (Ans.) 289 (vol. i).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., N.S., projected line, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 146 (vol. i); in Com. of Sup., 3413 (vol. iv).
 Patent Act 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on 1^o, 234; on M. for 2^o, 627 (vol. i).
 Pembina Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3417 (vol. iv).
 P. E. I. Ry., Cape Traverse Branch, payment of laborers, on M. for copies of Petitions, &c., 142 (i).
 Pringle, H. H., employment of, by Govt. (Ans.) 744 (i).
 Port Moody Dock, Tenders for repair (Ans.) 816 (ii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv).
 Purcell & Ryan, payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3452 (iv).
 Quarantine, appointment of Physicians to accompany Steamships (Ans.) 2169 (vol. iii).
 Quarantine, in Com. of Sup., 2853, 3358, 3411 (vol. iv).
 Rys. and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 76 (vol. i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 913, 923, 975 (vol. ii).
 Ry. Commissioners and Dom. Arbitrators (Ans.) 114 (i).
 Ry. Supplies, purchase of, in Halifax (Ans.) 1915 (iii).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 593 (vol. i).
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).
 Returns, production of (Ans.) 188; (remarks) 113, 455 (vol. i), 1132 (vol. ii), 2393 (vol. iii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3312, 3418 (vol. iv).
 Richelieu River Floods, Memorials from Riparian owners (Ans.) 606 (vol. i).
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. (Ans.) 569 (i).
 St. Romuald d'Etchimin, Station (Ans.) 1567 (ii).
 Settlers in Man. and N. W. T. (Ans.) 113 (vol. i).
 Settlers in the Dom. during calendar year 1884 (Ans.) 113 (vol. i).
 Settlers in the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
 Sheep Scab, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
 Short Line Ry. to the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 2239 (vol. iii).
 Simard, J., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3418 (vol. iv).
 Sleeping Cars, I.C.R., 3417 (vol. iv).
 Statistics relating to the Public Service (Ans.) 2531 (vol. iii).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2988 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies to Rys. (B. 164) prop. Res., 3457; on M. for Com. on Res., 3470; in Com., 3472 (vol. iv).

Pope, Hon. J. H.—Continued.

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Antwerp and Colonial Exhibitions) conc., 2766 (vol. iv); (Archives, care of) 1023, 1025; (Colonial Exhibitions) 1032-1035 (vol. ii), 3452 (vol. iv); (Compiling Agricultural and other Statistics in Man. and N.W.T.) 1036; (Criminal Statistics) 1026; (Dominion Exhibition) 1026 (vol. ii); (Health Statistics) 2766 (vol. iv); (Mortuary Statistics) 1027-1031 (ii).

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Cornwall) 3301; (Murray) 3303; (Lachine) 3301; (Trent River Nav.) 3311; (Welland) 3301, 3311; (Williamsburg) 3301; (Amount due Hugh Sutherland) 3385 (vol. iv). *Income:* (Rideau, Land damages in Township of Pittsburg) 3418; (Increase of water supply) 3312; (Grenville, payment to J. Simard) 3418. Miscellaneous (road dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3419; (Surveys and Inspections) 3313; (Welland) 3418 (vol. iv).

Civil Govt. (Agriculture, Dept. of.) 904, (contingencies) 921; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913, 975, (contingencies) 923 (vol. ii).

Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3308 (vol. iv).

Immigration, 2810, 2813, 2816, 2831-2853 (vol. iv).

Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 3342 (vol. iv).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Can. and Antwerp); 2943; (Can. and Germany) 2945 (vol. iv).

Miscellaneous (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (Purcell & Ryan, for supplies furnished to Lord Lorne and party) 3452 (vol. iv).

Quarantine, 2853; (Immigrant Patients) 3358; (Sheep Scab) 3358, 3411 (vol. iv).

Rys.—Capital: C. P. R., 3383; (Inspecting Engineers' Salaries, &c.) 3417; (Pembina Branch) 3417; (Subsidy) 3295. Cape Breton Ry. (Surveys) 3418; Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415; Eastern Extension Ry., 3300, 3384; I. C. R., 3383, conc., 3396; (applying Air Brakes) 3299; (miscellaneous works) 3296-3299; (Repairs, &c.) 3300; (Sleeping Cars) 3417. Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).

Surveys and Inspections (Canals) in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).

Sutherland, H., amount due, in Com. of Sup., 3385 (iv). Trent Valley Canal, plans and estimates of cost, &c., on Ms. for copies of Cor., &c., 145, 202 (vol. i).

Trent River Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3311 (vol. iv).

Turkish Pauper Immigrants (Ans.) 3475 (vol. iv).

Welland and Williamsburg Canals, in Com. of Sup., 3301, 3418 (vol. iv).

Wilkinson, J. A., sums paid to, and for what services (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).

Pruyn, Mr. M. W., Lennox.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. that Com. rise, 1425 (vol. ii).

Napanee, Public Buildings (Ques.) 77 (vol. i).

Reid, Mr. J., Cariboo.

C. P. R. Rates in B.C. (Ques.) 1474 (vol. ii).

Rinfret, Mr. C. J., Lotbinière.

Flannel Shirts for the Militia, Contract (Ques.) 1306 (ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1506, 1538; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1680-1683 (vol. ii).

House of Commons Commissioners' Rep. *re* Staff (Ques.) 2750 (vol. iv).

Rinfret, Mr. C. J.—Continued.

Le Fonds Post Office, establishment of (Ques.) 816 (ii). Peachy, J. W., Superannuation of (Ques.) 1743 (iii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 527-532 (vol. i).

Robertson, Mr. A., West Hastings.

Criminal Law Amt, Punishment of Burglars (B. 71, 1°) 270 (vol. i); (B. 136, 1°) 1335 (vol. ii).

Debates, Official Rep., on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. (Ques.) 3362 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N. W., Gatling Guns for use of Troops (Ques.) 813 (vol. ii).

Veterans of 1812, Extension of Pensions to widows of (Ques.) 36 (vol. i).

Robertson, Mr. T., Hamilton.

Can. Temp. Act Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders, 714 (i).

Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2769 (vol. iv).

Criminal Law Amt., openings cut in the Ice, &c. (B. 22, 1°*) 57; 2° m., 131; M. for Com., 150; Order for Com. dschg'd. and B. ref. to Sel. Com., 496 (vol. i).

Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adj'd. deb. for 2°, 943 (ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., on Ques. of Order, 1922 (vol. iii).

Govt. Business, conduct of (remarks) 3445 (vol. iv).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) in Com., 501, 503 (vol. i).

Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2797 (vol. iv).

Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2947 (vol. iv).

Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) in Com., 3047 (vol. iv).

Petitions, on presentation of (remarks) 1894 (vol. iii).

Soundings taken in Burlington Bay Canal, Rep. of Supdt. (M. for copies*) 1533 (vol. i).

South Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 37, 1°*) 125 (vol. i).

Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2830 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Immigration, 2818, 2843 (vol. iv).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2797 (iv).

Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3423 (vol. iv).

Ocean and River Service (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2947 (iv).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 719-722 (vol. i).

Robertson, Mr. T., Shelburne.

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (Ques.) 363 (vol. i).

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 92, 1°) 448 (vol. i).

Coal, tenders to supply Fog-whistles, &c. in Bay of Fundy (M. for copies*) 533 (vol. i).

Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 919 (vol. ii).

Fraser, D. M., and Dept. of Agriculture, Cor. between (M. for copies*) 533 (vol. i).

Robertson, Mr. T.—Continued.

- Great Village River Improvements, Colchester, N.S., (M. for Stmt. in detail*) 67 (vol. i).
Lion, seizure of Schooner, in N.S. (M. for copies of Rep., &c.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 621 (vol. i).
 Parrsborough Breakwater, construction of (M. for copies of Tenders) 66 (vol. i).
 Rogers' Patent Fish Ladder, Cor. and Reqs. (M. for copies) 870 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.: Deptl. Contingencies (Inland Revenue) 919 (vol. ii).

Ross, Mr. A. W., Lisgar.

- C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) 2712-2718 (vol. iv).
 Disturbance in the N.W., Assistance to Settlers through outbreak (Ques.) 2854; Compensation for losses (Ques.) 3321; Relief of destitute families, 3321 (iv).
 Equipment of the 90th Battalion (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2491 (vol. iii).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2777; in Com., 2793, 3050 (vol. iv).
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2491 (vol. iii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration, 2843 (vol. iv).

Royal, Mr. J., Provencher.

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3002; on M. to adjn. deb., 3431 (vol. iv).
 C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, on Amt. (*Mr. Watson*) 2867 (vol. iv).
 Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees B. 26 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Res. (Amt.) 72 (vol. i).
 Disturbance in the N.W., Assistance to settlers through outbreak (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).
 ——— Batoche, capture of, rumored indignities committed by Volunteers (Ques.) 3425 (vol. iv).
 ——— Compensation for losses (Ques.) 3321 (vol. iv).
 ——— Duck Lake, Engagement at, Rep. of (Ques.) 1567 (vol. ii).
 ——— on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) want of confidence, 3199-3212 (vol. iv).
 ——— Relief of destitute families (Ques.) 3321 (vol. iv).
 Equipment of the 90th Battalion (Ques.) 2854 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1390 (vol. ii).
 Half-breed Commission, information respecting (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).
 Land grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2448 (vol. iii).
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 74, 1°*) 313 (i).
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copy of Reqs., &c., 695 (vol. i).

Royal, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Privilege, Ques. of, interpolation of words in despatch, 3247 (vol. iv); par. in *Free Press* (remarks 170 (i)).
 Representation in Parlt. of the N. W. T., on Res. (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) to M. for Com. of Sup., 3406 (iv).
 Statistics relating to Public Service (Ques.) 2854 (iv).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 168 (vol. i).
 Ways and Means—on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) re Disturbance in the N. W., 3199-3212 (vol. iv).

Rykert, Mr. J. C., Lincoln and Niagara.

- Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 982 (vol. ii).
 Customs Seizure of School Books at Toronto (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1450; "tenant," 1477 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1761-1770, 2002; "in counties," 2058; "revision of voters' list," 2342 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order, 1435, 1465; on M. that Com. rise, 1437, 1500 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799, 1849 (vol. iii).
 Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2274, 2320 (vol. iii).
 Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s B. 69 (M. to conc. in Sen. Amts.) 1386 (vol. ii).
 Mackinley, A. & W., of Halifax, entry of School Books at undervaluation (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Maritime Court of Ont. Jurisdiction B. 11 (*Mr. Allen*) in Com., 496 (vol. i).
 Ont., Westerly Boundary of, argument before P. C., shorthand notes (M. for copy) 430-440 (vol. i).
 Printing, Public, changes in Contract (M. for copies of O.C.) 246 (vol. i).
 Railways centring in Ottawa, Bonuses granted to, on M. for Ret., 87; adjd. deb. rsmnd., 89 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 982 (vol. ii).

Wines, spirits, ale, beer, porter, &c., imported, amount of Rev. (M. for Ret.*) 313 (vol. i).

Scriver, Mr. J., Huntingdon.

- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 1058 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2649, 2664 (iv).
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3234 (vol. iv).
 Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2912 (vol. iv).
 Duties on Hay, Cor. between Can. and U.S., on M. for copies, 443 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "usufructuary," 1447, 1448, 1451; "occupant," 1484 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1995; (Indians) 2018 (vol. iii).
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2° 943 (remarks) 944 (vol. iii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals, B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1334; on Amt. (*Mr. Catudal*) to M. for 3°, 1327 (vol. ii).

Scriven, Mr. J.—Continued.

Lake St. Francis Road Dyke, in Com. of Sup., 3419 (iv).
 Oka Indians, transport of, in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).
 Sheep Scab, in Com. of Sup., 3411 (vol. iv).
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 3472 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Income: Miscellaneous (Road Dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3419 (vol. iv).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3310; (Customs) 3334 (iv).
Indians (Transport of families from Oka) 3457 (vol. iv).
Militia (Drill Pay, &c.) 2912 (vol. iv).
Quarantine (Sheep Scab) 3411 (vol. iv.).
Ways and Means—in Com. (barrels containing petroleum or its products) 843; (umbrella and parasol ribs, &c.) 858; (woollen rags) 787 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 832 (vol. ii).

Shakespeare, Mr. N., Victoria, B. C.

B. C. Penitentiary, suspension of Rules (M. for copies of Cor.) 823 (vol. ii).
 Cabinet Representation for B. C. (Ques.) 235 (vol. i).
 Chinese Commissioners' Rep. (Ques.) 29, 211 (vol. i).
 Chinese Immigration Restriction B. 156 (*Mr. Chapleau*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3011 (vol. iv).
 Chinese Interpreter, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 3024 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1391; "person" (Chinese) 1583, 1591 (vol. ii); "qualifications" (Indians and Chinese) 1974; (remarks) 1944 (vol. iii).
 Indian Affairs in B. C., Cor. between Govt. of Canada and B. C., on M. for copies, 869 (vol. ii).
 Indian Troubles at Metlakatla (M. for copies of Cor.) 304 (vol. i).
 Manufacturing Industries of Canada, Rep. on (remarks) on absence of information respecting B. C., 594 (i).
 Rice, increased duty on (Ques.) 695 (vol. i).
 St. George's Day, Adjmt. for (M.) 1305 (vol. ii).

Shanley, Mr. Walter, South Grenville.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res. (*Mr. Light's Rep.*) 3266 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Welland) 3301, 3311: (Trent Riv. Nav.) 3311 (vol. iv).
Rys.—Capital: C.P.R. (Pembina Branch) 3417; (Subsidy) 3296; I.C.R. (miscellaneous works) 3298 (vol. iv).

Small, Mr. J., East Toronto.

Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2660, (vol. iv).
 Federal Bank of Canada Capital Stock reduction (B. 10, 1°*) 2°, 57 (vol. i).
 Intoxicating Liquors, traffic in, further provision (B. 70, 1°) 270 (vol. i).

Small, Mr. J.—Continued.

Justices of the Peace, &c., Summary Proceedings B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) 1°*, 1130 (vol. ii).
 Kootenay Ry. Co. of B.C. incorp. (B. 83, 1°*) 349 (i)
 Pawnbrokers' Provision (B. 137, 1°*) 1474 (vol. ii).
 Volunteers in the N.W., recognition of Services (Ques.) 1566 (vol. ii).

Smyth, Mr. H., Kent, Ont.

Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (B. 16, 1°*) 46 (vol. i).
 Patents of Invention Acts Amt. (B. 29, 1°) 83 (vol. i).

Somerville, Mr. J., North Brant.

Bradley, W. Ingles, services of (M. for Ret.) 479 (vol. i).
Debates, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in First Rep. (remarks) 35 (vol. i).
 Expenses of Members of the Govt., &c., in Eng. or elsewhere (M. for Ret.*) 124 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1269-1272 (vol. ii); in Com., "woman suffrage," 1441; "person" (Indian) 1549 (vol. ii); "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2129-2133; "registration of voters," 2276, 2291, 2296 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 33, N. 87) 3065 (vol. iv).
 Govt. Printing and Advertising (Res.) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3033-3039 (vol. iv).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2812, 2836, 2843-2845 (iv).
 Mounted Police, compensation for injuries (M. for Ret.*) 505 (vol. i).
 Printing and printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2799-2802, 2804, 2806-2809 (vol. iv).
 Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Citizen*, 3162, 2213; personal allusions in deb., 3248 (vol. iv).
 Rental of Offices for use of Govt. in Ottawa (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Salaries of Ministers (Ques.) 3073 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY :

Immigration, 2812, 2836, 2843-2845 (vol. iv).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2799-2802, 2804, 2806-2809 (vol. iv).

Speaker, Mr. (HON. G. A. KIRKPATRICK) Frontenac.

Accommodation for Members (remarks) 49 (vol. i).
 Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141, interruptions by Members not in Order, 3430 (vol. iv).
 Address, Ans. to, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 113 (i).
 Amherst and P. E. I. Ry. Co's. incorp. B., on M. to introd., Rep. of Com. on Stndg. Orders ref. to, 349 (i).
 Bankruptcy, Pets., Res., &c., Message from His Ex. (read) 101 (vol. i).
 Beauce, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92, on M. to place B. 2nd Order on Public Bills and Orders (procedure) 714 (vol. i); on Sen. Amts. (rulings) 2657, 2664.
 Cape Breton, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- Census of the N. W. B. 21, Member called to Order on imputing motives, 213 (vol. i).
 Chinese Commissioners' Rep., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 234 (vol. i).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31, on Amt. (*Mr. Davies*) (ruling) remarks must be confined to Amt., 1300 (ii).
 Claims of Man., Mess. from His Ex. (read) 202 (vol. i).
 Commercial Bank of Windsor B. 117, suggestion to refer B. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1677 (ii).
 Controverted Elections, Judge's Reps. (read) 1, 593 (i).
 Cumberland, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).
Debates, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. ii).
 Disturbance in the N.W., Engagement at Batoche, despatch respecting (read) 1380 (vol. ii).
 Disturbance in the N. W. (ruling) speech must be finished before corrections can be made, 3161 (vol. iv).
 Divorce Cases, Evidence in (explanation) 428 (vol. i).
 Dundas and Waterloo Road, on prop. Res. (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 451 (vol. i).
 Estimates, The, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 289 (vol. i); Suppl. for 1884-85, 2820; Suppl. for 1885-86, 3359; Further Suppl. for 1885-86, 3423 (vol. iv).
 Factory B. 85, on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act (ruling on procedure) 944 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. 103, Chairman's ruling in Com. sustained (Y. 76, N. 46) 1513, (Y. 67, N. 41) 1944 (vol. ii).
 Franchise B. Pets., Signatures to, English practice quoted, 2027-2029; (remarks) 2274; on presentation of, 2320 (vol. iii).
 Grenville, South, Election, Ret. of Member elect (announcement) 3072 (vol. iv).
 Gov. Genl.'s Secretary, letter from, *re* Royal Assent to Bills (read) 1514 (vol. ii).
 H. of C. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
 Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s B. 69, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts. (remarks) 1387 (vol. ii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44, on Amt. (*Mr. Casey*) to M. for 3^d, full discussion of B. not in Order on an Amt., 1330 (vol. ii).
 Insolvent Debtors Assets B. 4, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to transfer to Govt. Orders (Votes and Proceedings quoted) 1281 (vol. ii).
 Inspection of Factories Res., suggestion that same stand first on Public Bills and Orders, 607 (vol. i).
 Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 40 (vol. i).
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 991 (vol. i), 2795, 2796, 3449 (vol. iv).
 Library, The, and Mr. Bourinot's work (remarks) 40 (i).
 Lennox Election, Judge's certificate, &c. (read) 1; Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).
 Levis Electoral District, Judge's Rep. (read) and Warrant issued, 593; Ret. of Member elect (announcement) 1385 (vol. ii).
 Man. Claims Settlement Res. (ruling) reference to what has taken place in Com. not in Order, 2783, 2786 (iv).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- Manitoba Indian Agency, missing Ret. (produced) 67 (i).
 Maskinongé, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and Ret. of Member, 1 (vol. i).
 Megantic, Ret. of Member to represent (announcement) 1 (vol. i).
 Members, New, Ret. of (announcement) 1, 133 (vol. i), 1192, 1385 (vol. ii), 3072 (vol. iv).
 Messages from His Ex. (read), 1, 40, 101, 113, 202, 234, 289 (vol. i), 1064 (vol. ii), 2234 (vol. iii), 2820, 3232, 3359, 3423, 3470, 3475 (vol. iv).
 Middleton, Genl., Grant to, Mess. from His Ex., 3470 (vol. iv).
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (procedure) 3046 (iv).
 Nicolet, Ret. of Member to represent (announcement) 1 (vol. i).
 Northumberland, West, Election, Judge's Rep. (read) and Warrant issued, 593; Ret. of Member elect, (announcement) 1192 (vol. ii).
 Ontario, West, Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and return of Member, 1 (vol. i).
 Parl., opening of, Commons summoned to Senate, 1 (vol. i); Prorogation, 3475 (vol. iv).
 Petitions, on presentation of (remarks and authorities quoted) 1891, 1893, 2027-2029, 2274, 2320 (vol. iii).
 Privilege, Ques. of (ruling) should conclude with a motion, 3161 (vol. iv).
 Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors (ruling) in Order to move the previous question, &c., 1045 (vol. ii).
 Prorogation, Letter from Acting Sec. to Gov. Gen. (read) 3473; Mess. from His Ex., 3475 (vol. iv).
 Queen's County, P. E. I., Vacancy in the Representation: Warrant issued and return of Member, 1 (i).
 Royal Assent to Bills (announcement) 1516 (ii), 3475 (vol. iv).
 Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name (remarks) 2320 (vol. iii).
 Sessional Clerks, extra, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2795 (iv).
 Soulanges Election, Judgment of Supreme Court (read) 1; Ret. of Member elect (announcement) 113 (vol. i).
 Speech from the Throne (Rep.) 2 (vol. i).
 Staff of the House, Res. and Schedules adopted by Commissioners (presented) 2497 (vol. iii).
 Stationery used in H. of C., Expense of (Ans) 290 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Legislation, H. of C. (Committees, extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2795; (Contingencies) 2796 (vol. iv); (Publishing *Debates*) 991 (vol. ii); (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Comm.) 3449 (vol. iv).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction, Limitation B. 68, on M. to introd. B. (remarks) 246, 270.
 Vacancies, notification of, 1 (vol. i).
 Volunteers in the N. W., Recognition of Services B. 160 (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 3380 (vol. iv).
 Warrants issued for new Elections (announcement) 1, 593 (vol. i).
 Washington Treaty, Cor. and papers (read) 3232; ruling) allusion to previous deb. not in order, 2899 (iv).

Speaker, Mr.—Continued.

- West Middlesex Election, Judge's Rep. (read) 1 (vol. i).
 Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 82, on M. for 2°, suggestion that Order be dschgd., 428 (vol. i).
 \$700,000 for N.W. Troubles, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 1064 (vol. ii).
 \$1,700,000 for N.W. Expenses, Mess. from His Ex. (read) 2234 (vol. iii).

Speaker, Mr. Deputy.

[See "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE" AND "PROCEDURE."]

Sproule, Mr. T. S., East Grey.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2468 (vol. iii).
 Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2547 (vol. iii).
 Brewers and Distillers, compens. on prop. Res., 241 (i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 956, 957, 958; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1048; on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. for 3°, 1952; in Com., 1054, 1057; on Amt. (*Mr. White, Cardwell*) 1061 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2648 (vol. iv).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 980 (vol. ii).
 Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2437 (vol. iii).
 Debates, Official Rep. on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3365 (vol. iv).
 Duties on Hay, Cor. between Canada and U.S., on M. for copies, 445 (vol. i).
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on M. for 2°, 831 (vol. ii).
 Fish-breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2954 (vol. iv).
 Fishery Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3390 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492, 1551; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications in cities and towns" (Indians) 1850, 2012; "qualifications in counties," 2073; "registration of voters," 2248; explanation, 2257; "appeal," 2361, 2366; "officers and duties," 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390 (vol. iii); explanation of vote on *Mr. Langelier's* Amt. (remarks) 3062 (vol. iv); on M. that Com. rise, 1437; (Ques. of Order) reading extracts, 1464 (vol. ii), 1920 (vol. iii).
 Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures 2392 (iii).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2550 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Business, on M. to take in Wednesdays, 966 (ii).
 Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1038.
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2492 (vol. iii).
 Land Improvement Fund Settlement (Ques.) 1039 (ii).
 Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2949 (vol. iv).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 2400 (vol. iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—Continued.

- Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1030 (vol. ii).
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2492 (vol. iii).
 Pa'tent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 25 (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) on M. for 2°, 267 (vol. i).
 Personal Explanation, article in *Canada Presbyterian and Meaford Monitor*, 2772 (vol. iv).
 Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 903 (ii).
 Privilege, Ques. of, paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 89, 566 (vol. i).
 Provincial Rys. taken over by Govt. (Ques.) 188 (i).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 583 (vol. i.)
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Mortuary Statistics) 1030 (ii).
Civil Govt. (Civil Service Examiners) 980; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 903 (vol. ii).
Fisheries (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2954 (vol. iv).
Immigration 2812 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3390; (Histoires Généalogique des Familles Françaises) 3456; (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Life-boats, Stations, &c.) 2948 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 733-739 (vol. i).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1674 (vol. ii).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-William, West Halifax.

- Animal Charcoal, importations of (M. for Ret.*) 533 (i).
 Canada and Antwerp, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2943 (vol. iv).
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2534, 2538, 2540 (vol. iii).
 Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1119, 1120, 1124 (vol. ii).
 Customs Seizures at N. S. ports of entry (M. for Stmt.*) 532 (vol. i).
 Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 809 (vol. ii).
 France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2941, 3041 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. McIntyre*) to M. for 3°, 3057 (vol. iv).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310, 1314 (vol. ii); in Com. on B., 2550 (vol. iii).
 Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 854 (ii).
 Harbor Master at Halifax B. 149 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 2523 (vol. iii).
 I. C. R., in Com. of Sup., 3298 (vol. iv).
 N. S. Rys., consolid. and completion (Ques.) 2530 (iii).
 Post Office Savings Banks in the Mar. Provs. (Ques.) 148 (vol. i).
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, in Com. on Res., 2991 (vol. iv).
 Steel, in Com. on Ways and Means, 804 (vol. ii).

Stairs, Mr. J. Fitz-William—Continued.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2991 (vol. iv).

Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3216, 3218 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Indians (Man. and N.W.T.) 3318 (vol. iv).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Can. and Antwerp) 2943; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2941, 3041 (iv).

Pensions (Veterans of War of 1812) 994 (vol. ii).

Rys.—Capital: I. C. R. (miscellaneous works) 3298 (vol. iv).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 994 (vol. ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 641-648; in Com. (duck) 809; (glucose syrup) 854; (steel) 804 (vol. ii); (sugar) 3216, 3218 (vol. iv).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).

Sutherland, Mr. H., Selkirk.

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1315 (vol. ii).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065 (vol. ii).

Sutherland, Mr. J., North Oxford.

Can. Temp. Act, 1877, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Sen. Amts., 2648-2652 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. (M. that Com. rise) 1496, 1497 (ii).

Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1071, (Amt.) 1085; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 2397 (vol. iii).

Prisoners, employment of, outside Gaols (B. 87, 1°*) 362 (vol. i).

Taschereau, Mr. T. L., Beauce.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1236; in Com., "usufructuary," 1447 (vol. ii).

Quarantine, appointment of Physicians to accompany Steamships (Ques.) 2169 (vol. iii).

Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3268.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3268 (vol. iv).

Tasse, Mr. J., Ottawa City.

Change of Names in the N. W. T. (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).

Debates, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr. Wood, Brockville*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 3364, neg. (Y. 18, N. 127) 3369; on conc., 3373; on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 3458 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N.W., on Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3465 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "who shall not vote," 2093, 2097 (vol. iii).

Ottawa River Ship Canal, on prop. Res. (*Mr. White, Renfrew*) 1219-1224 (vol. ii).

Tasse, Mr. J.—Continued.

Statistics relating to the Public Service (Ques.) 2531 (vol. iii), 2854 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Legislation: H. of C. (increased Expenses under Rep. of Internal Economy Commissioners) 3450 (vol. iv).

Ways and Means—The Tariff on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 677-687 (vol. i).

Taylor, Mr. G., South Leeds.

Fish Breeding, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2953 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. "that Com. rise, 1502 (vol. ii); in Com., "qualifications in counties," 2061 (vol. iii).

Terry Divorce (B. 97, 1° on a div.) 605 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (Fish-breeding, &c.) 2953 (vol. iv).

Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1676 (vol. ii).

Temple, Mr. T., York, N.B.

Central Bank of N. B. (B. 40, 1°*) 939 (vol. ii).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1129 (vol. ii).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in counties," 2054, 2058, 2084;

"revision of voters' lists," 2341 (vol. iii).

Fredericton and St. Mary's Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 50, 1°*) 170 (i); M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1386 (ii).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2494 (vol. iii).

Northern and Western Ry., Cor. between Dom. and Local Govt. of N.B. (M. for copies*) 533 (vol. i).

North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2494 (vol. iii).

Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3271 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3271 (vol. iv).

Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard, St. John, N.B.

Advances to Provinces (B. 7, 1°) 32; 2° m., 102 (i).

American Gold, substitution of, for Sovereigns (Ans.) 505 (vol. i).

Ascetic Acid, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).

Assistant Rec. Genl.'s, Montreal, St. John and Winnipeg, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).

Auditor Genl.'s Rep. (presented) 28 (vol. i).

Bank Advances to the Govt. (Ans.) 113 (vol. i).

Bank of B. C. (B. 105, 1°) 631 (vol. i).

Bank of Upper Can., Stmnts. respecting (Ans.) 112 (i).

Budget, The (Ans.) 76, 149, 211, (annual Stmnt.) 313 (i).

Brokerage and Commission, in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).

Business of the House, Tariff deb. (Ans.) 595 (vol. i).

C. P. R., Interest paid to Govt. by Co. on Loans (Ans.) 350 (vol. i), 1131 (vol. ii).

— Loan \$22,500,000, payments to Co. (Ans.) 29 (i).

Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard—Continued.

- C. P. R. Loan, \$30,000,000, payments on account of (Ans.) 1130 (vol. ii).
- Carpet Mats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (vol. ii).
- China and Porcelain ware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1104 (vol. ii).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor (B. 117, 1°*) 832 (vol. ii).
- Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. (B. 20, 1°) 46; 2° m., 126 (vol. i).
- Cutlery, in Com. on Ways and Means, 844 (vol. ii).
- Dominion Notes, issue and redemption, in Com. of Sup., 897 (vol. ii).
- Earthenware and Stoneware, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Emerson, Town of, aid to (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on prop. Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 367; (explanations) 371, 391 (i).
- Factories, Operatives in, on M. for Rets., Stmnts., &c., 37 (vol. i).
- Factory Commission, Rep. of, distribution of (remarks) 478 (vol. i).
- Financial Commr. in Eng., in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- Financial Inspector, in Com. of Sup., 895 (vol. ii).
- Five per cent. Consolid. Loan, retirement of, on M. for copies of O. C., 487; (explanations) 489 (vol. i).
- Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 220 (vol. i).
- Flour and cornmeal, increase of Duty on (Ans.) 148, 744 (vol. i).
- Gas Coke, in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (vol. ii).
- Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Gold Reserve, Govt. withdrawals, on M. for copies of Cor., 353, 355; (remarks) 361 (vol. i).
- Gov. Genl.'s Sec.'s Office, in Com. of Sup., 893 (ii).
- Imitation precious stones, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Inspection and Supervision of Banks, on Res. (*Mr. Casgrain*) 82 (vol. i).
- Inspection of Banks, Legislation (Ans.) 51 (vol. i).
- Land Improvement Fund Settlement (Ans.) 1040 (ii).
- Library of Parlt. (B. 139) prop. Res., 594 (vol. i).
- Loan, recent, Prospectus and Advertisements, on M. for Ret., 37 (vol. i).
- Manila Hats, in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Manufacturing Industries of Can., Rep. on (remarks) on absence of information respecting B. C., 594 (i).
- Mess. from His Ex. recommending grant of \$700,000 for N. W. Troubles (presented) 1063 (vol. ii).
- Money borrowed by Govt. in Can. (Ans.) 743 (vol. i).
- Montreal Turnpike Trust Debentures (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
- N. S.'s Claims for a Subsidy (Ans.) 189 (vol. i).
- Operatives in Factories, on M. for Rets., Stmnts., &c., 37 (vol. i).
- Pickles and Sauces, in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (vol. ii).

Tilley, Hon. Sir Leonard—Continued.

- Picture Frames, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Polariscopic Test for Sugar (Ans.) 479 (vol. i).
- Post Office Savings Bank, Depositors in, on M. for Ret., 821 (vol. ii).
- Post Office Savings Banks in the Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Printing Com., on M. to conc. in Second Rep., 149 (i).
- Printing Dom. Notes, in Com. of Sup., 898 (vol. ii).
- Private Banks and Brokers, Legislation (Ans.) 51 (i).
- Prussiate of Potash, in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (vol. ii).
- Public Debt of Can. (Ans.) 29 (vol. i).
- Public Debt, the gross amount of (Ans.) 76 (vol. i).
- Quebec, Advances on account of Provincial Subsidy (Ans.) 235 (vol. i).
- Returns, on Enquiry for (Ans.) 363 (vol. i).
- Rice, increased Duty on (Ans.) 695 (vol. i).
- St. Stephen's, N.B., Public Buildings, construction of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).
- Savings Banks in Mar. Provs., in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- Stamp Duty, commutation of, in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- Steam Communication with France (Ans.) 567, 568 (i).
- Small Savings, encouragement of, on M. for Ret., 91 (i).
- Subsidy to N. S., increase of (Ans.) 567 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY (Res. for Com.) 28 (vol. i):
- Charges of Management* (Asst. Rec. Genl., Montreal) 895; (Auditor and Rec. Genl., St. John) 895; (Auditor and Asst. Rec. Genl., Winnipeg) 895; (Brokerage and Commission) 896; (Commutation of Stamp Duty, &c) 897; (Country Savings Banks, N.B., N.S. and B.O.) 896; (Financial Commissioner in Eng.) 896; (Financial Inspector) 895; (Issue and Redemption of Dom. Notes) 897; (Printing Dom. Notes) 898 (vol. ii).
- Civil Govt.* (Gov. Genl. Sec.'s Office) 898 (vol. ii).
- Temporary Loans to Govt. by Banks (Ans.) 350 (vol. i).
- Terry, Charles Hunter, gratuity to (Ans.) 632 (vol. i).
- Tissue Paper, in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (vol. ii).
- Trade Relations with Foreign Countries (Ans.) 78; with Mexico, 632 (vol. i).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of (B. 104, 1°) 630 (i).
- Umbrella or parasol ribs, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (vol. ii).
- Ways and Means* (Res. for Com.) 27; (Budget Speech) 313; time for conclusion of Deb. (remarks) 662; in Com., 771 (vol. i); (acetic acid) 849; (carpet mats) 856; (china and porcelain ware) 847; (cutlery) 844; (earthenware and stoneware) 847; (gas coke) 783; (glucose syrup) 849; (imitation precious stones) 846; (Manila hats) 847; (pickles and sauces) 843; (picture frames) 846; (prussiate of potash) 846; (tissue paper) 849; (woollen fabrics) 840; (woollen rags) 785 (vol. ii).
- Wheat and Flour Duties, alteration of (Ans.) 148 (vol. i).

Trow, Mr. J., South Perth.

- Bounty to Fishermen, payment of, in Guysborough, N.S. (Ques.) 2751 (vol. iv).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Townshend*) 1050 (vol. ii).
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2437 (vol. iii).
 C. P. R. Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 483 (vol. i).
 Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 982 (vol. ii).
 Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1034 (vol. ii).
 Customs and Excise Receipts for June (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
Debates, Official Rep. of, on omissions (remarks) 3474; on M. to conc. in Fourth Rep. of Com., 3458 (vol. iv).
 Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 918, 921 (vol. ii).
 Disturbance in the N.W., Duck Lake, Rep. of fight at (Ques.) 1743 (vol. iii); on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).
 Dom. Lands Sales for 1884-85 (Ques.) 3072 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1460; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1596 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns," 1908; "in counties," 2056, 2073, 2076; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2133, (Amt.) 2163; "registration of voters," 2240, 2280; "revision of voters' lists," 2343 (vol. iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3063, neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064 (vol. iv); on pairing with Mr. Williams (explanation) 1470 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799; M. to print extra copies, 1855 (iii).
 Franchise B. Pets., genuineness of Signatures questioned (remarks) 2024 (vol. iii).
 Harbors and Rivers N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).
 Horses for Troops in N.W., purchase of (Ques.) 1306 (vol. ii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44, in Com., 1065; on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 1326 (vol. ii).
 Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2831-2833, 2834 (iv).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).
 Land Sales or Settlement in N.W. south of 24-mile Belt (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 Lake Simcoe Fisheries, Legislation (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
 Legislation, in Com. of Sup., 3470 (vol. iv).
 Loans to Govt., Temporary (Ques.) 2530 (vol. iii).
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, 3456 (vol. iv).
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2520 (vol. iii).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2787; in Com., 2792, 2795, 3050 (iv).
 Members' Indemnity, payment to those absent through sickness (Ques.) 3473 (vol. iv).
 Military organizations in Man. and N.W.T. (Ques.) 862 (vol. ii).
 Model Farm, Establishment, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
 Pauper Turkish Immigrants (Ques.) 3475 (vol. iv).

Trow, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Port Arthur Harbor, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (vol. iv).
 Postmaster at Maitland, removal of (Ques.) 1743 (iii).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).
 Post Office Savings Bank Deposits (Ques.) 2559 (iii).
 Printing of Parl., on M. to conc. in Tenth Rep. of Com., 3394 (vol. iv).
 Prorogation, closing remarks, 3474 (vol. iv).
 Purcell & Ryan, payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
 Refund to Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 592 (vol. i).
 Statutes, Distribution of (Ques.) 568 (vol. i).
 SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (Colonial Exhibitions) 1034 (ii).
Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 982; Deptl. Contingencies (Inland Rev.) 918, 921 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2831-2834 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (increased Expenditure under Rep. of Internal Economy Commission) 3470 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Establishment of a Model Farm) 3453 (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456; (Purcell & Ryan, for supplies furnished to Lord Lorne and party) 3453 (vol. iv).
Pensions (Veterans of War of 1812) 993 (vol. ii).
Public Works—Capital: Port Arthur (construction of Harbor) 2916 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Consolid. Fund: Harbors and Rivers (N.W.T.) 3420 (vol. iv).
 Vacancy in a Judicial District, N.S. (Ques.) 2750 (iv).
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 993 (vol. ii).

Tupper, Mr. C. H., Pictou.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1643, 1832; "registration of voters," 2250 (vol. iii).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1067 (vol. ii).
 Justices of the Peace, Duties of (B. 41, 1°) 125 (vol. i).
 Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on M. for 2°, 180; (Amt.) 6 m. h., 182, neg. (Y. 57, N. 87) 187; in Com., 497 (vol. i).
 Offences against the Person, Criminal Law Amt. (B. 43, 1°*) 125; 2° m., 218 (vol. i).
 Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 79, 1°*) 313 (vol. i).
 Scott Act, prosecutions under (Ques.) 41 (vol. i).
 Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction B. 3 (*Mr. Landry, Montmagny*) on M. for 2°, 156 (vol. i).
 Truro Bank incorp. (B. 78, 1°*) 313 (vol. i).
 Water Lots in N. S., applications for (Ques.) 429 (vol. i).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 455-463 (vol. i).
 Wharves, Docks and Piers in Navigable Waters (B. 18, 1°) 46; 2° m., 215; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 218 (vol. i).

Townshend, M. C. J., Cumberland.

- Amherst and P. E. I. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. (M. to introd.) 349 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. (B. 88, 1°*) 362 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 1050 (vol. ii).

Townshend, Mr. C. J.—Continued.

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1249-1254; in Com. (Amt.) "woman suffrage," 1388; agreed to, 1442 (vol. ii).

Tyrwhitt, Mr. R., South Simcoe.

Huron and Ont. Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 69, 1°*) 269 (i).

Vail, Hon. W. B., Digby.

Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c. B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2751 (vol. iv).

Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res. 2548 (vol. iii).

Ammunition, in Com. of Sup., 2905 (vol. iv).

Barracks at London, in Com. of Sup., 3412 (vol. iv).

Beet-root Sugar, importation of (Ques.) 744 (vol. i).

C. P. R. Res. respecting further loan, on M. to conc. in Res., 2861 (Amt.) 2861 (vol. iv).

— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. to M. for Stmt., 100 (vol. i).

Can. and Antwerp Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942-2945; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).

Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2538 (iii).

Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3415 (vol. iv).

Church Point and Trout Cove Piers, Engineers' Rep. (M. for copy) 54 (vol. i).

Civil Service Examiners, in Com. of Sup., 976, 984 (ii).

Culling and Measuring Timber B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 2476 (vol. iii).

Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3226-3238, 3240 (iv).

Deptl. Contingencies, in Com. of Sup., 914, 917, 922 (ii).

Digby Pier, Wharfage Collections for 1884 (M. for Ret.*) 532 (vol. i).

Disturbance in the N.W., on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).

Drill Pay, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2910 (vol. iv).

Eastern Extension Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3301 (vol. iv).

Fisheries, in Com. of Sup., 2964 (vol. iv).

Fisheries negotiations (remarks) 3074 (vol. iv).

Fisheries, protection of, after July (Ques.) 2359 (iii).

Fishery Bounty distribution in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).

Flag Treaty between U. S. and Spain (M. for copies of Cor., &c.) 219 (vol. i).

France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2930, 2941 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1274-1277; in Com., "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1606 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns" (Amt.) 1829-1832, 1990, 1994, 1999-2002; "in counties," 2394, 2084, 2085; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2165; "registration of voters," 2190, 2249, 2278, (Amt.) 2280, 2288, 2294, 2316 (vol. iii); on Ques. of Order (reading extracts) 1461 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2146 (vol. iii).

Free Fishing allowed Americans (Ques.) 3321 (vol. iv).

General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1310 (vol. ii).

Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945, 3396 (vol. iv).

Vail, Hon. W. B.—Continued.

Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2922 (vol. iv).

Harbor Master at Halifax B. 148 (*Mr. McLelan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2522; in Com., 2523 (vol. iii).

Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).

Hudson Bay Expedition Supplies (Ques.) 783 (vol. ii).

Inspection of Staples, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).

Lansdowne, steamer, engine and boiler (Ques.) 189 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).

Metaghan River Pier, Wharfage Collections for 1884 (M. for Ret.*) 532 (vol. i).

Military Branch and District Staff, Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 2903 (vol. iv).

Militia Clothing, in Com. of Sup., 2909 (vol. iv).

Military Properties, care of, in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).

Obstructions in nav. waters, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).

Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3413 (iv).

Polariscopic Test for Sugar (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).

Port Mulgrave as a sub-port, on M. for Papers, 447 (i).

Postmaster Genl., Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 904 (vol. ii).

Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3310 (vol. iv).

Post Office Savings Banks Depositors, on M. for Ret., 822 (vol. ii).

Printing and printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2806 (iv).

Privilege, Ques. of, personal allusions (remarks) 3248 (vol. iv).

Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 3308 (vol. iv).

Returns, Enquiries for, 211, 455, 714 (vol. i), 838 (ii).

Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (vol. i).

Sleeping Cars, conc., 3396 (vol. iv).

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2977 (vol. iv).

Sugars, importation of, at Halifax, from Jamaica (M. for Ret.) 40 (vol. i).

Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3216-3218, 3222-3224 (vol. iv).

Supplies for the Hudson Bay str. *Neptune* (M. for copies of Accts., &c.) 229 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agr. and Statistics (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv).

Canals—Capital: Repairs, &c. (Trent River Nav.) 3311; (Welland) 3302, 3311 (vol. iv).

Civil Government (Civil Service Examiners) 976, 984; (Deptl. Contingencies), 914, 917, 922; (Postmaster Genl., Dept. of) 904 (vol. ii).

Collection of Revenues (Customs) 3233, 3236-3238, 3240; (Inspection of Staples) 3242; (Post Office) 3310; (Public Works) 3308; (Weights and Measures and Gas) 3241 (vol. iv).

Fisheries (Distribution of Bounty) 2956 (vol. iv).

Legislation: Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2806 (vol. iv).

Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions (Can. and Antwerp) 2942-2945, conc., 2958; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2936 (vol. iv).

Marine Hospitals, 2957 (vol. iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (Salaries, &c.) 2950 (vol. iv).

Militia (Ammunition) 2905; (Barracks at London) 3412; (Clothing and Great Coats) 2909; (Drill Pay, &c.) 2910; (Military Properties, care of) 2916; (Salaries, Military Branch and District Staff) 2903 (vol. iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers) 2945, 3396; (Obstructions in nav. waters) 2950 (vol. iv).

Vail, Hon. W. B.—Continued.

SUPPLY—Continued.

- Pensions* (Veterans of War of 1812) 992 ; (vol. ii), 2766 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (N.S.) 2917 ; Harbors and Rivers (Mar. Provs. generally) 2922 (vol. iv).
Rys—Capital: Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3415 ; Eastern Extension Ry. (Repairs, &c.) 3301. I.C.R., conc., 3396, (Sleeping Cars) 3417 ; Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3413 (vol. iv).
Superintendence of Insurance, 2957 (vol. iv).
 Trent Riv. Nav., in Com. of Sup., 3302, 3311 (vol. iv).
 Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii), 2766 (iv).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 666–676 (vol. i) ; in Com. (sugar) 3216–3218, 3222–3224 (vol. iv).
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses (remarks) 2559, 2774 ; on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901, 3339 (vol. iv).
 Wheat, flour, cornmeal and corn, Duty collected in N.S. (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Weights and Measures and Gas, in Com. of Sup., 3241 (vol. iv).

Valin, Mr. P. V., Montmorency.

SUPPLY :

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (France and Quebec, fortnightly service) 2941 (vol. iv).

Vanasse, Mr. F., Yamaska.

- Expenditure for Rys, Canals, &c., in B.C., N.W.T., and other Provs. (M. for Stmt.*) 964 (vol. ii).
 Govt. rights to Water Lots on Rivers (Ques.) 2238 (iii).
 Longueuil and Lévis Ry. Survey (Ques.) 429 (i).

Wallace, Mr. N. C., West York, Ont.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for Com., 1341 ; in Com., "tenant," 1477, 1478 ; "person" (Indian) 1491 ; "actual value," 1602, 1604 (ii) ; "qualifications in counties," 2002, 2066, 2083 (iii).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on Rep. of speech in *Globe* newspaper (remarks) 1824 (vol. iii).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 578 (vol. i).
 School Books, consignment by Nelson & Sons (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 796 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. 1673 (vol. ii).

Watson, Mr. R., Marquette.

- Administration of Justice in the N. W. T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3001 (iv).
 Administration of the N. W. (*Mr. Caron*) in Com. on Res., 2931 (vol. iv).
 Bank of Winnipeg Incorp. Act. Amt. (B. 62, 1°*) 210 (vol. i).
 Bonuses granted to Rys., memorials, &c., respecting (M. for copies*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Calgary and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ques.) 351 (i).
 C. P. R., Completion of line west of Winnipeg, dates, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 964.

Watson, Mr. R.—Continued.

- C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, in Com., 2743, 2744 ; on M. to conc. in Res., 2865 (Amt.) 2867, neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868 (vol. iv).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) to M. for 2°, 954 (vol. ii).
 Civil Service Acts. Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1113–1115 (vol. ii).
 Colonial Exhibitions, in Com. of Sup., 1058 (vol. ii).
 Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice, B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (i).
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3236 (vol. iv).
 Disturbance in the N. W., Col. Scott's Battalion (Ques.) 1064 (vol. ii).
 ——— further intelligence, 812 (vol. ii).
 ——— organization of Companies in the N. W., 816 (ii).
 ——— on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).
 Dominion Exhibition, in Com. of Sup., 1027 (vol. ii).
 ——— Lands Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3346 (vol. iv).
 Dredging, in Com. of Sup., 2921 ; conc., 2923 (vol. iv).
 Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).
 Duck, in Com. on Ways and Means, 809 (vol. ii).
 Duties, Imposition of (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 Fisheries protection in the N. W., on M. for copies of Cor., 701 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1274 ; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1468 ; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1522, 1542 ; "occupant," 1484 ; "actual value," 1606 (vol. ii) ; "qualifications in cities and towns" (Indians) 1853, (Amts.) 1933, 1990, 1992, (Indian) 2008 ; "qualifications in counties," 2058 ; "registration of voters," 2268, 2295 ; "revision of voters' lists," 2344 (vol. iii) ; on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061 (vol. iv).
 General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com. on Res., 1307, 1315, 1316, 1319 (vol. ii) ; in Com., 2550–2554 (vol. iii).
 Harbors and Rivers, in Com. of Sup., 2921, 3420 (iv).
 Immigrant Sheds at Medicine Hat, construction of (Ques.) 350 (vol. i).
 Indians, Man. and N.W.T., in Com. of Sup., 3318 (iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1085, 1093 ; on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) to M. for 3°, 1332 (vol. ii).
 Land Board at Winnipeg, in Com., of Sup., 3345 (iv).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2449 ; in Com. on Res., 2492, 2493, 2512, 2513, 2517, 2519, 2521 (vol. iii).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2776 ; (remarks) 2788 ; in Com., 2793–2795, 2924–2926, 3047, 3049 ; on M. for 3°, 3075 (iv).
 Man. Penitentiary, in Com. of Sup., 990 (vol. ii).
 Man. and North-Western Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2517, 2519, 2521 (vol. iii).
 Man. South-Western Colon. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2512, 2519 (vol. iii).

Watson, Mr. R.—Continued.

- Medicine Hat and Fort Macleod Stage Line (Ques.) 351 (vol. i).
 Mounted Police Barracks, Tenders for (Ques.) 351 (i).
 North Saskatchewan River Improvements, on M. for copy of Repts., &c., 696 (vol. i).
 N. W. Central Ry., Land grant to, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3380 (vol. iv).
 N. W. Mounted Police Augmentation B. 144 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on prop. Res., 2414; on M. to conc. in Res., 2429 (vol. iii); in Com. on B., 2771 (vol. iv).
 North-Western Coal and Nav. Ry. Co., Land grants to, in Com. on Res., 2492, 2493 (vol. iii).
 Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. and Nav. Co. (B. 63, 1°*) 210; M. to refer back Rep. of Sel. Standing Com. on Rys., &c., 713 (vol. i).
- SUPPLY:
- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Colonial Exhibitions) 1035; (Dominion Exhibition) 1027 (vol. ii).
Canals—Income: Miscellaneous (Surveys and Inspections) 3313 (vol. iv).
Collection of Revenues (Customs) 3236 (vol. iv).
Dominion Lands—Income (Agencies) 3346; (Land Board at Winnipeg) 3345 (vol. iv).
Indians (Man. and N. W. T.) 3318 (vol. iv).
Militia (Drill Shed and Rifle Ranges) 2915 (vol. iv).
Penitentiaries (Man.) 990 (vol. ii).
Public Works: Dredging, 2921; conc., 2923. Harbors and Rivers (Man.) 2921; (N. W. T.) 3420 (vol. iv).
- Surveys and Inspections, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (iv).
 Tug-barges, dredge and machinery on Red River (M. for Ret.*) 964 (vol. ii).
 Volunteers' Services in the N. W., recognition of B. 160 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com. on Res., 3377; on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 3380 (vol. iv).
 Vote for Relief of Settlers in the N. W. (Ques.) 1744 (vol. iii).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on Res. (*Mr. Blake*) in Amt. to M. for Com., 769 (vol. i); in Com. (duck) 809 (vol. ii).
 Weights and Measures Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 1673 (vol. ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W., St. John (N.B.) City and County.

- A, B and C Batteries, in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).
 Administration of Justice in N.W.T. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2961 (vol. iv).
 Administration of the N. W., in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Caron*) 2929 (vol. iv).
 Better Preservation of the Peace Act Amt. B. 131 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2824–2826 (vol. iv).
 Bounty to Fishing Vessels (M. for Stmnt.) 98 (vol. i).
 Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters B. 101 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on M. for 2°, 893 (vol. ii).
 Campbellton and Gaspé, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).
 C. P. R., Res. respecting further Loan, on M. to conc. in Res. (Amt.) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865 (iv).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 959–964; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1045; in Com., 1046, 1050 (vol. ii).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.

- Cape Tormentine, Ry. connection (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).
 Central Bank of N. B. (B. 40, 1°*) 939 (vol. ii).
 Charlottetown Public Buildings, construction of (Ques.) 2359 (vol. iii).
 Coal entered ex-Warehouse, free or for exportation (M. for Stmnt.*) 100 (vol. i).
 Customs, in Com. of Sup., 3233–3235, 3240 (vol. iv).
 Dom. Drainage Co.'s B. 29 (*Mr. Haggart*) on M. for 2°, 1008 (vol. ii).
 Drawback on Ship-building Mtrls. (M. for Ret.*) 100 (i).
 Fish Inspector in City of St. John (Ques.) 2997 (vol. iv).
 Fisheries, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).
 Fishery Leases and Licenses issued by Dept. of Marine and Fisheries (M. for Ret.*) 533 (vol. i).
 Fishery protection Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
 Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 222 (vol. i).
 France and Quebec, Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2938 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1149; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1478; "person" (Indian) 1493, (Chinese) 1583; "farm," 1592; "parish," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1595; "actual value" (Amt.) 1596, 1600; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1727–1731 (vol. ii), (Amt.) 1805; "registration of voters," 2253, 2277, (Amts.) 2278, 2282, 2283, 2286, 2288, 2289, 2291, 2297, 2316, 2310; "revision of voters' lists," 2323, 2328, 2339, 2341, 2343, 2349 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Jenkins*) to M. for 3° (Amt.) 3058, neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060 (vol. iv); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; on M. that Com. rise, 1425; on taking up items consecutively, 1471, 1472; on Ques. of Order, appeal from Chair to House, 1512 (vol. ii); on ruling of Chairman (remarks) 1799 (vol. iv).
 Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 50, on M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 1386 (vol. ii).
 Govt. Steamers, in Com. of Sup., 2945 (vol. iv).
 Halifax Fishery Commission, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1090, 1092; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1322; on Amt. (*Mr. Armstrong*) 1333 (vol. ii).
 Instructions to Health Officers in N.B., and Quarantine Regulations (M. for Ret.*) 1443 (vol. ii).
 I. C. R., Casualties to Trains, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 100 (i).
 ——— Claims of Contractors of Sec. 16 (Ques.) 505 (i).
 ——— Commissioners appointed to settle claims (M. for copies of O.C., &c.*) 100 (vol. i).
 ——— Construction to Indiantown (Ques.) 744 (vol. i), 816 (vol. ii).
 ——— Erection of Wire Fences, Contracts for (M. for Ret.*) 532 (vol. i).
 ——— in Com. of Sup., 3384, 3298 (vol. iv).
 ——— Revenue and Working Expenses (M. for Stmnt.) 101 (vol. i).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.

- I.C.R. Rolling Stock, purchase of (M. for Ret.) 101 (i).
 Library, Salaries, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2796 (vol. iv).
 Life-boats, Stations, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).
 Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).
 Lighthouse at Quaco, Memorials or Cor. (M. for copies*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 58 (*Mr. Foster*) on M. for 2°, 621 (vol. i).
 Meteorological Observatories, in Com. of Sup., 2956; conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
 Military Magazine at St. John, N.B., disposal of (M. for Ret.) 606 (vol. i).
 Militia Act, 1883, Amt. B. 152 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 3047 (vol. iv).
 Mill St., St. John, Ry. crossing on, Memorials and Cor. (M. for copies*) 1442 (vol. ii).
 Navigation of Canadian Waters B. 132 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com. on Res., 1278 (vol. ii).
 Offences against the Person B. 123 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 2767 (vol. iv).
 Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3414 (iv).
 Partridge, prairie fowl, &c., in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (vol. ii).
 P.E.I. or N.B. and G.B. Steamship subvention, in Com. of Sup., 2942 (vol. iv).
 Powder Magazines at Fort Howe, St. John, N.B. (Ques.) 246 (vol. i).
 Public Works, in Com. of Sup., 2918, 3307 (vol. iv).
 Railways and Canals, in Com. of Sup., 913 (vol. ii).
 Reciprocity with the U.S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1016 (vol. ii).
 Registration of Shipping, in Com. of Sup., 2950 (vol. iv).
 Returns, enquiries for, Fisheries Cor., 2936, 3000 (iv).
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys. (M. for Ret.) 706 (vol. i).
 St. John Bridge and Ry. Extension Co. (Ques.) 569 (i).
 St. John, City and County, issue of Writ for Election (Ques.) 3427 (vol. iv).
 Short Line Ry., Montreal to Atlantic, on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3266 (vol. iv).
 Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 133 (*Mr. McLelan*) in Com., 1280 (vol. ii).
 Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) to M. to conc. in Res., 3266; in Com. on B. (vol. iv).
 Summary Proceedings before Magistrates B. 128 (*Mr. Caron*) in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Civil Government* (Fisheries, Dept. of) 911; (Railways and Canals, Dept. of) 913 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Public Works) 3307; (Customs) 3233-3235, 3240 (vol. iv).
Fisheries (Fishery protection Steamers) 2956 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2833 (vol. iv).
Legislation: Miscellaneous (Library, Salaries, &c.) 2796 (vol. iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Lighthouses and Fog-alarms, construction) 2952; (Maintenance and Repairs, &c.) 2951 (vol. iv).

Weldon, Mr. C. W.—Continued.**SUPPLY—Continued.**

- Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions* (Campbellton and Gaspé) 2942; (France and Quebec, fortnightly line) 2938; (P. E. I. and G. B., &c.) 2942 (vol. iv).
Militia (A, B and C Batteries) 2915 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Fishery Commission, increased remuneration to Counsel) 3388 (vol. iv).
Ocean and River Service (Canadian registration of Shipping) 2950; (Govt. Steamers) 2945; (Life-boats and Stations, &c.) 2950 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Income: Buildings (P. E. I.) 2918 (vol. iv).
Railways—Capital: I. C. R., 3384; (miscellaneous works) 3298; Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3414 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (Meteorological Observatories) 2956, conc., 2958 (vol. iv).
 Telegraph and Signal Serv., in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).
 Three Rivers Harbor Commissioners' B. 150 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com., 2935 (vol. iv).
 Washington Treaty, Termination of Fishery Clauses, Cor. and papers (Ques.) 3249; on M. for Com. of Sup., 3322-3330 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—in Com. (partridge, prairie fowl, &c.) 858 (vol. ii).
 Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters, B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 217 (vol. i).

Wells, Mr. R. M., East Bruce.

- Brewers and Distillers, compensation to, on prop. Res. (*Mr. Kranz*) 236 (vol. i).
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2168; (Amts.) 2432-2439 (vol. iii).
 Consolid. Ry. Act Amt. (B. 30, 1°) 101 (vol. i).

White, Mr. J., East Hastings.

- Administration of Justice in the N.W. B. 141 (*Mr. Caron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mills*) to M. for 3°, 3001 (iv).
 Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of, on M. for copies, 361 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 956, 958; on Amt. (*Mr. Burpee*) 1049 (vol. ii).
 C. P. R., Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 483 (vol. i).
 Carleton Branch Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3417 (vol. iv).
Debates, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3359; on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) 3369; Fourth Rep., 3458; remuneration of amanuensis (remarks) 3474 (vol. iv).
 Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 308 (i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492; "qualifications, &c." "manhood suffrage" and (Indians) 1983, 2008; "qualifications in counties," 2067; "who shall not vote," 2088, 2092, (Indians) 2155-2157 (vol. iii); (explanations) 1494, 1527; on Ms. that Com. rise, 1497; (remarks) 1652, 1701 (ii), 2151, 2214, 2203, 2206 (iii).
 ——— Scarcity of copies (remarks) 1131 (vol. ii).
 ——— Pets. on genuineness of Signatures (remarks) 2027 (vol. iii).

White, Mr. J.—Continued.

- Govt. Business, on M. to take in Thursdays, 452 (vol. i).
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).
 Insolvent Debtors, distribution of Assets provision B. 4, on M. (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1281 (vol. ii).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2511 (vol. iii).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. 134 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Mulock*) to M. for 3°, 2960 (vol. iv).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155, on M. for Com. on Res. (personal explanation) 2786 (vol. iv).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. 64 (*Mr. McCarthy*) on M. for 2°, 625 (vol. i).
 Privilege, Ques. of, on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press* (remarks) 3162 (vol. iv).
 Printing, printing paper, in Com. of Sup., 2806 (iv).
 Superintendent of Letter Carriers, in Com. on Res. (*Mr. Chapleau*) 273 (vol. i).

SUPPLY :

- Legislation* : H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3451.
 Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2806 (iv).
Liquor License Act (Administration of) 3421 (vol. iv).
Public Works—Consolidated Fund (Telegraphs) 3420 (vol. iv).
Rys.—Capital : Carleton Branch Ry. (purchase of) 3417 (iv).
 Telegraphs, in Com. of Sup., 3420 (vol. iv).

White, Mr. P., North Renfrew.

- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. 154 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for 2° and in Com., 3043 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1996 (vol. iii).
 G. T. R. Mail Trains, Brockville and Toronto, arrival and departure of, on M. for Ret., 818 (vol. ii).
 Guerin, Lister, Rep. of Survey of Improvements on Ottawa River (Ques.) 1040 (vol. ii).
 Indemnity to Members, in Com. of Sup., 3451 (vol. iv).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1084; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1322 (vol. ii).
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, in Com. of Sup., 3456 (vol. iv).
 Mattawa, Mountain Rapids and Long Sault, Improvements (Ques.) 1040 (vol. ii).
 Ottawa River Ship Canal, prop. Res., 1211 (reply) 1225 (vol. ii).
 Ottawa River Survey and Exploration (Ques.) 131 (i).
 Patent Act, 1872, Amt. (B. 25, 1°*) 67; 2° m., 266; (reply) 268; 2° neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (vol. i).
 Printing done outside of Contract (M. for Ret.) 860 (ii).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copy, 581; (explanations) 588, 591, 593 (vol. i).
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for Com. on Res., 3471 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY :

- Legislation* : H. of C. (Increased Indemnity to Members) 3451 (vol. iv).
 Miscellaneous (Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making) 3456 (vol. iv).

White, Mr. T., Cardwell.

- Annuity and Guarantee Fund of the Bank of Montreal (B. 48, 1°*) 170 (vol. i).
 C.P.R., Resolutions respecting further Loan, in Com., 2726-2729 (vol. iv).
 ——— Trestles and Bridges, number of, on Amt. (*Mr. McLelan*) to M. for Stmt., 108 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, voting on the, on M. for Stmt., 121 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) on M. for 2°, 950; on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 951, 953; in Com., 958, 963, 1056; on M. for 3° (Amt.) 1059; neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2650, 2663 (vol. iv).
 Canned Goods B. 142 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2539 (iii).
 Consolid. Insurance Act, 1877, Amt. B. 20 (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) in Com., 2432, 2438 (vol. iii); on Amt. (*Mr. Ives*) 2769 (vol. iv).
 Davis Divorce (B. 84, 1° on a div.) 426; M. to appoint day for 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 426; 2° on a div., 567 (vol. i).
 Debates, Official Rep. of, First Rep. (presented) 32; (remarks) 33; (M. to conc. in Second Rep.) 40; on Delay in distributing Daily Issue (remarks) 595; on delay in distributing French Translation (remarks) 746 (vol. i); Ms. to conc. in Third Rep. 2168 (vol. iii), 3359; on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) 3367; on omissions, 3249, 3474; M. to conc. in Fourth Rep., 3458; on conc., 3372; (vol. iv).
 Disturbance in the N. W., Indemnity to Members in the Field (prop. M.) 812 (vol. ii).
 Dom. Grange Mutual Fire Ins. Association (B. 55, 1°*) 170 (vol. i).
 Dom. License Act, working of, on M. for Cor., 310 (i).
 Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada (B. 60) in Com., 693 (vol. i).
 Exchange Bank, Govt. Advances to, on proposed Res. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) 380 (vol. i).
 Factory B. 85 (*Mr. Bergin*) on Amt. to substitute Can. Temp. Act to M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°, 946 (ii).
 Flag Treaty between U.S. and Spain, on M. for copies of Cor., &c., 223 (vol. i).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Mr. Laurier*) to M. for 2°, 1192-1197 (vol. ii); "qualifications in cities and towns" (manhood suffrage) 1945, 1996, (remarks) 2015, (Indian) 2019; "registration of voters," 2245, 2283, (remarks) 2261 (vol. iii); on M. that Com. rise, 1498, 1529; on Ques. of Order, 1620 (vol. ii), 1921; on ruling of Chairman, 1798 (vol. iii).
 Govt. Printing and Advertising, on Res. (*Mr. Somerville, Brant*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3039-3041 (iv).
 Inland Rev. Act Amt. B. 146 (*Mr. Costigan*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2528 (vol. iii).
 Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on prop. Res., 2452 (vol. iii).
 Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2783 (vol. iv).

White, Mr. T.—Continued.

- Man. South-Western Col. Ry. Co., Land Grants to, in Com. on Res., 2511 (vol. iii).
 Pension Fund Society of the Bank of Montreal (B. 49, 1°*) 170 (vol. i).
 Printing Com., Second Rep. (M. to conc. in) 149 (vol. i); Seventh Rep., 1822 (vol. iii); 9th Rep., 3293; Tenth Rep., 3393 (vol. iv).
 Printing, printing paper, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2802, 2805 (vol. iv).
 Refund of Ry. Bonuses to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 573 (vol. i).
 Returns, preparation of, in Com. of Sup., 3388 (vol. iv).
 Scott Act Pets., on M. to erase name, 2320 (vol. iii).
 Sessional Clerks, extra, &c., in Com. of Sup., 2896 (iv).
 Sugar, in Com. on Ways and Means, 3223 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

- Immigration*, 2814 (vol. iv).
Legislation: H. of C. (Committees, extra Sessional Clerks, &c.) 2896. Miscellaneous (Printing and printing paper, &c.) 2802, 2805 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Rets., preparation of) 3388 (vol. iv).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 394-412; in Com., 774 (vol. i); (sugar) 3223 (vol. iv).

Wigle, Mr. L., South Essex.

- Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. that Com. rise, 1501 (vol. ii).
 Mail Service on Can. Southern Ry. (M. for Ret.) 120 (i).
Ways and Means—in Com. (woollen fabrics) 795 (ii).

Williams, Mr. A. T. H., East Durham.

- Calgary, Edmonton and Athabasca Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 73, 1°*) 313 (vol. i).
 Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s (B. 23, 1°*) 67 (vol. i).

Wilson, Mr. J. H., East Elgin.

- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. 143 (*Mr. Costigan*) in Com., 2474 (vol. iii).
 Adulteration of Food, in Com. of Sup., 3242 (vol. iv).
 Agriculture, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 905 (vol. ii).
 Analysts, Public, remuneration of, in Com. on Res., 2548 (vol. iii).
 Bonuses to Rys. in Ont., Pets. for relief of (M. for copies) 356 (vol. i).
 Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. 92 (*Mr. Jamieson*) in Com., 957, 1058 (vol. ii); on Sen. Amts., 2656 (iv).
 Commercial Agencies, in Com. of Sup., 3245 (vol. iv).
 Deputy Speaker's Salary, in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "woman suffrage," 1417; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1515, 1536; "qualifications in cities and towns," 1723-1727 (vol. ii) 1901; "manhood suffrage," 1960, 1986, 1989; "qualifications in counties," 2060, 2068, 2073, 2077; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2120-2122; "registration of voters," 2205-2207, 2265, 2287; "appeal," 2362, 2367 (vol. iii).

Wilson, Mr. J. H.—Continued.

- Health Statistics, conc., 2766 (vol. iv).
 Hughes, D. J., Charges against (Ques.) 77; (M. for copies of Papers and Cor.) 98 (vol. i).
 Infectious and Contagious Diseases affecting Animals B. 44 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 1065, 1091; on Amt. (*Mr. Sutherland, Oxford*) to M. for 3°, 1322 (vol. ii).
 Mortuary Statistics, in Com. of Sup., 1027-1030 (vol. ii).
 O'Malley, Lieut. Col., Charges against and suspension (M. for copy) 101 (vol. i).
 Ports Stanley and Burwell Harbors of Refuge (M. for Ret.) 62 (vol. i).
 Post Office, in Com. of Sup., 3309 (vol. iv).
 Public Works, Dept. of, in Com. of Sup., 911 (vol. ii).
 Rideau Canal, in Com. of Sup., 3313 (vol. iv).
 St. Thomas Public Buildings, amount expended on (M. for Ret.) 79 (vol. i).

SUPPLY:

- Arts, Agriculture and Statistics* (Health Statistics) conc., 2766 (vol. iv); (Mortuary Statistics) 1027-1030 (vol. ii).
Canals—Income: Rideau Canal (water supply) 3313 (vol. iv).
Civil Government (Agriculture, Dept. of) 905; (Public Works, Dept. of) 911 (vol. ii).
Collection of Revenues (Adulteration of Food) 3242; (Post Office) 3309 (vol. iv).
Immigration, 2833, 2842 (vol. iv).
Miscellaneous (Commercial Agencies) 3245; (Dep. Speaker's Salary) 3351 (vol. iv).
Penitentiaries (Man., payment to Dr. Sutherland) 3350 (vol. iv).
Public Works: Consolidated Fund: (Ont.) 3385 (vol. iv).
 Refund of Ry. Bonus to Ont. municipalities, Memorials respecting, on M. for copies, 589, 618 (i).
 Sutherland, Dr., payment to, in Com. of Sup., 3350 (iv).

Wood, Mr. J. F., Brockville.

- Criminal Law Amt., openings, &c., cut in the Ice B. 22 (*Mr. Robertson, Hamilton*) on Amt. (*Mr. Hall*) 151 (i).
 Debates, Official Rep. of, on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com. (Amt.) 3361; neg. (Y. 63, N. 82) 3369 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "actual value," 1600 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2203; "registration of voters," 2317 (vol. iii).
 Islands in River St. Lawrence, Lease of, &c. (M. for Ret.*) 147 (vol. i).
 Narrows, Erection of a Lighthouse at (Ques.) 112 (i).
 Squatters in Qu'Appelle Valley, on M. for Ret., 205 (i).
 Subsidies to Rys. B. 164 (*Mr. Pope*) in Com., 3472 (iv).
Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 656-661 (vol. i).

Wood, Mr. J., Westmoreland.

- Amherst and P. E. I. Ry. Co.'s incorp. B., on M. to introd., 349 (vol. i).
 Debates, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr. Tassé*) on M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3365 (vol. iv).
 Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1731 (vol. i).
 Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. (B. 58, 1°) 170 (vol. i).
 Return Tickets on Govt. Rys., on M. for Ret., 707 (i).

Wood, Mr. J.—Continued.

Subsidies, further, to Rys. B. 158 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) in Com. on Res., 2982; on Amt. (*Mr. Langelier*) on M. to conc. in Res., 3269-3271 (vol. iv).

SUPPLY:

Immigration, 2845 (vol. iv).

Winter Crossing from P.E.I., on M. for copies of Cor., 63 (vol. i).

Woodworth, Mr. D. B., King's, N.S.

C.P.R., Rets. ordered by House since date of Contract, on M. for Stmt., 483 (vol. i).

Civil Service Acts Amt. B. 31 (*Mr. Chapleau*) in Com., 1126 (vol. ii).

Debates, publishing of, in Com. of Sup., 2765 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N. W., Half-breed grievances (remarks) 2045 (vol. iii); on M. to adjn. deb. on Mr. Blake's Res. (want of confidence) 3212 (vol. iv).

— Transport of Troops (remarks) 887 (vol. ii).

— Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3467 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on M. for 2°, 1228-1234; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1584; on M. that Com., rise, 1422; (Ques. of Order) 1467; reading extracts, 1464; unparliamentary language, 1540; (explanation) 1561 (vol. ii); (remarks) 2023 (iii).

Glucose Syrup, in Com. on Ways and Means, 854 (ii).

Immigration, in Com. of Sup., 2848 (vol. iv).

Land Grants to Rys. in the N. W. B. 147 (*Sir Hector Langevin*) on Amt. (*Mr. Blake*) to M. for 2°, 2892 (iv).

Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases Amt. B. 6 (*Mr. Cameron, Huron*) on Amt. (*Mr. Tupper*) 6 m. h., to M. for 2°, 182; in Com., 501 (vol. i).

Man. Claims Settlement B. 155 (*Mr. Bowell*) on M. for Com. on Res., 2787 (vol. iv).

Oxford and New Glasgow Ry., in Com. of Sup., 3414 (iv).

Reciprocity with the U. S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1010 (vol. ii).

Woodworth, Mr. D. B.—Continued.

Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets (B. 121, 1°*) 927 (vol. ii).

SUPPLY:

Immigration, 2848 (vol. iv).

Legislation: H. of C. (*Publishing Debates*) 2765 (vol. iv).

Pensions (Veterans of War of 1812) 993 (vol. ii).

Railways—Capital: Short Line Ry. (Oxford and New Glasgow) 3414 (vol. iv).

Veterans of 1812, in Com. of Sup., 993 (vol. ii).

Ways and Means—The Tariff: on M. (*Sir Leonard Tilley*) for Com., 555-561 (vol. i); in Com. (glucose syrup) 854 (vol. ii).

Weights and Measures Inspection Acts Amt. B. 118 (*Mr. Costigan*) on prop. Res., 835 (vol. ii).

Wharves and Docks in Navigable Waters B. 18 (*Mr. Tupper*) on M. for 2°, 217 (vol. i).

Wright, Mr. A., Ottawa County.

C. P. R. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. 153 (*Mr. Pope*) on M. for 2°, 3026-3031 (vol. iv).

Debates, Official Rep. of, on Amt. (*Mr. Hickey*) to M. to conc. in Third Rep. of Com., 3370 (vol. iv).

Disturbance in the N.W., on Vote of Thanks to Genl. Middleton and Volunteers, 3466 (vol. iv).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) on Amt. (*Sir Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2°, 1143 (vol. ii).

Yeo, Mr. J., Prince, P.E.I.

Cape Traverse Branch Ry., payment to Contractors for construction (Ques.) 694 (vol. i).

Cascumpee Harbor Improvements (Ques.) 479 (vol. i).

Customs Appraiser at Summerside, (Ques.) 350 (i).

Franchise B. 103 (*Sir John A. Macdonald*) in Com., "qualifications in cities and towns," 1647 (vol. ii).

Inland Rev. Collector at Summerside (Ques.) 350 (i).

Reciprocity with the U. S., on Res. (*Mr. Davies*) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 1004 (vol. ii).

INDEX—PART II.

SUBJECTS.

- A, B AND C BATTERIES, OFFICERS AND MEN, pay and allowances : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cameron, *Middlesex*) 313 (i).
- ABOLITION OF DUTY ON GRAIN. See "CUSTOMS."
- ACCIDENTS. See "CASUALTIES."
- ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: Remarks (Sir Richard Cartwright) 49 (i).
- ACTIVE MILITIA, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Mulock) 533 (i).
- ACTS, CONTINUED. See "EXPIRING LAWS."
- ADDRESS, ANS. TO: Mess. from His Ex., 113 (i).
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE: in Com. of Sup., 985 (ii), 3448 (iv).
- Administration of Justice, &c., in the N. W. T. B. No. 141** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°*, 2345; Res. prop., 2531 (iii); Res. in Com., 2926; 2° of B., 2934; M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; in Com. on B., 2961; M. for consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Mills) neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3000; deb. adjd., 3002; Order for rsmng. adjd. deb., 3427; Amt. neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 51.)
- Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°*, 1 *pro forma* (i).
- ADJOURNMENTS:
- ANNUNCIATION DAY: M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 714 (i).
- ASCENSION DAY: M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 1822 (iii).
- ASH WEDNESDAY: M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 125 (i).
- CORPUS CHRISTI: M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2301 (iii).
- DOMINION DAY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2773 (iv).
- EASTER: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 713 (i); M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 888 (ii).
- QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY: M. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2030 (iii).
- ST. GEORGE'S DAY: M. (Mr. Shakespeare) 1305 (ii).
- ST. PATRICK'S DAY: M. (Mr. Curran) 593 (i).
- ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL: M. (Sir Hector Langevin) 2889 (iv).
- Adulteration of Food, Drugs, &c., B. No. 143** (Mr. Costigan). 1°*, 2356; 2°, 2466; in Com., 2467-2541; Res. (remuneration of Analysts) prop., 2497; in Com., 2541, 2542 (iii), 2751; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751; 3° of B., 2751 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 67.)
- ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVTS.: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 45 (i).
- ADVANCES TO C.P.R. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1305 (ii).
- Advances to Provinces B. No. 7** (Sir Leonard Tilley). 1°, 32; 2°, 102 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1064 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 4.)
- ADVERTISING AND PRINTING, GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. Somerville, Brant) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3023 (iv).
- AGREEMENT BY C.P.R. CO. TO TERMS OF RES.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1915 (iii).
- AGRICULTURAL INS. CO. OF CAN., INCOMPLETE RET.: Remarks (Mr. Blondeau) 1386 (ii).
- AGRICULTURAL, &c., STATISTICS, COMPILATION: in Com. of Sup., 1036 (ii).
- Agricultural Fertilizers B. No. 122** (Mr. Ferguson, Welland). Res. prop., 936; in Com. and 1°*, 939; M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1320 (ii); 2°, 2476; in Com., 2478; 3°*, 2497 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- AGRICULTURAL, TIMBER, PASTURE, AND MINERAL LANDS AND TOWN SITES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Charlton) 209 (i).
- AGRICULTURE, BUREAU OF, ESTABLISHMENT: Ques. (Mr. Gigault) 76 (i).
- AGRICULTURE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 904, 921 (ii).
- Agriculturists.** See "BANKING."
- AID TO RYS. See "LAND GRANTS" AND "SUBSIDIES."
- AIR BRAKES, I.C.B.: in Com. of Sup., 3299 (iv).
- ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY LINE: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Gordon) 705 (i).
- ALBANY, DUKE OF, THANKS OF QUEEN FOR CONDOLENCE: Mess. from His Ex., 32 (i).
- Alberta and Athabaska Ry. Co.'s Incorp. B. No. 73** (Mr. Williams). 1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (i); in Com., 791; 3°*, 816 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- Albion Mines Savings Bank B. No. 15** (Mr. McDougald). 1°*, 46; 2°*, 113; in Com. and 3°*, 616 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 14.)
- ALGOMA, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS. See "CUSTOMS."
- ALLAN LINE, PAYMENTS TO, for assisted passages: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 567 (i); M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
- ALLAN STEAMSHIP CO. AND CLAIM OF GOVT. *re Newfield and Moravian*: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 148, 312 (i).
- ALLISON, MR. D. W.: Election declared null and void on Judges' Rep. on Controverted Election, 1 (i).
- ALLOWANCES TO CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).
- AMERICAN ENGINEERS' VISIT TO N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).
- AMERICAN GOLD, SUBSTITUTION OF, FOR SOVEREIGNS: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 505 (i).
- AMOUNTS COLLECTED IN WESTERN ONTARIO. See "DOMINION LANDS."
- AMOUNTS DUE CONTRACTORS ON C.P.R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 533 (i).
- ANDRÉ, FATHER, LETTER FROM, IN JAN., 1883: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- ANIMAL CHARCOAL, IMPORTATIONS OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stairs) 533 (i).

- Animals, Cruelty to, Prevention B. No. 47** (Mr. *Charlton*) 1°*, 147 (i).
- Animals, Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting, B. No. 44** (Mr. *Pope*). 1°; 125 (i); 2°, 892; in Com., 1064-1094; 3° m., 1321; Amt. (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*) to recom., 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to recom., 1324; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327; Amt. (Mr. *Catudal*) to recom., 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328; Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) to recom., 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332; Amt. (Mr. *Armstrong*) to recom., 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; Amt. (Mr. *Scriver*) to recom., neg. on a div., 1334; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to recom., neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334; 3°, 1335 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2397 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 70.)
- ANNUAL REGISTER.** See "DOMINION."
- Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of Bank of Montreal B. No. 48** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°* 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- ANNUNCIATION DAY, ADJMT. FOR:** M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 714 (i).
- ANTWERP AND COLONIAL EXHIBITION:** conc., 2766 (iv).
- ANTWERP INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION:** M. for copy of Cor. between Govt. and High Com. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
- APPRAISER AT SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.:** Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- ARBITRATORS.** See "OFFICIAL."
- ARCHIVES, CARE OF:** in Com. of Sup., 1023, 1025 (ii).
- ARGYLE HIGHLANDERS, PAYMENT OF ARREARS DUE:** Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 888; (M. for Ret.*) 1444 (ii).
- ARMOUR, MR. JUSTICE:** Rep. on Lennox Controverted Election, 1 (i).
- ARMS, DESCRIPTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 814 (ii).
- ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION, DOM.:** in Com. of Sup. 2913 (iv).
- ASBESTOS:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- ASCENSION DAY, ADJMT. FOR:** M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1822 (iii).
- ASCETIC ACID:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
- ASH WEDNESDAY, ADJMT. FOR:** M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 125 (i).
- ASSETS, DISTRIBUTION OF INSOLVENT DEBTORS.** See B. 4.
- ASSIGNEES.** See "OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES."
- ASSISTED PASSAGES:** See "ALLAN LINE."
- ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS, &C., THROUGH REBELLION:** See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W."
- ASSISTANT POSTMASTER OF OTTAWA:** in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3398 (iv).
- ASSISTANT REC. GEN., MONTREAL, &C.:** in Com. of Sup., 895, 896 (ii).
- ASSOCIATIONS, &C.:**
- ANNUITY AND GUARANTEE FUNDS SOCIETY OF BANK OF MONTREAL.** See B. 48.
- CANADA CO-OPERATIVE SUPPLY ASSOCIATION.** See B. 81.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC EMPLOYÉS RELIEF ASSOCIATION.** See B. 75.
- CONGREGATIONAL MISSIONARY SOCIETY.** See B. 51.
- HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.** See B. 114.
- LUTHERAN CHURCH OF CANADA.** See B. 60.
- PENSION FUND SOCIETY OF THE BANK OF MONTREAL.** See B. 48.
- "A TRIP TO DOM. OF CAN.," PAMPHLET: M. for copies (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
- AUDITOR GENL. AND DEPT. OF MARINE, RENTAL OF RIVERS:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i).
- AUDITOR AND REC. GENL. OF ST. JOHN AND WINNIPEG:** in Com. of Sup. 895 (ii).
- AUDITOR GENL.'S REP.:** presented (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 28; M. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to ref. to Public Accounts Com., 76 (i).
- AUSTRALIAN AND TASMANIAN COLONIES, TRADE WITH:** M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 36 (i).
- AUTOMATIC BUOY, LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N.S.:** Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).
- AVALANCHES IN THE SELKIRK RANGE:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 694 (i).
- AXLE GREASE:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- BAIN, MR. J. W.:** Election declared null and void on Judge's Rep. on Controverted Election, 1; re-elected 113 (i).
- BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT.:** M. for Rets. of amounts (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37; (Ques.) 113 (i).
- Banking and Loan Facilities to Agriculturists B. No. 36** (Mr. *Orton*). Res. prop., 115; in Com. and 1°* of B., 120 (i).
- Bank of British Columbia B. No. 105** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 631; 2°, 894 (ii); in Com. and 3°*, 2396 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 83.)
- Bank of Montreal Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society B. No. 48** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 12.)
- Bank of Montreal Pension Fund Incorp. B. No. 49** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 13.)
- BANK OF UPPER CANADA, STMNTS. RESPECTING:** Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 112 (i).
- Bank of Winnipeg Act Amt. B. No. 62** (Mr. *Watson*). 1°*, 210; 2°*, 281 (i); in Com. and 3°* 1007 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 10.)
- BANKRUPTCY AND INSOLVENCY:** M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Sp. Com. 47; Mess. from His Ex., 101; ref. to Com., 102; M. to ref. Petitions to Com., 125 (i).
- BANKRUPT ESTATES AND OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*) 303 (i).
- BANKS AND BANKING:**
- ALBION MINES SAVINGS BANK.** See B. 15.
- BANK OF WINNIPEG.** See B. 62.
- BANK OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.** See B. 105.
- BANKING AND LOAN FACILITIES TO AGRICULTURISTS.** See B. 36.
- BILLS OF EXCHANGE AND PROMISSORY NOTES.** See Bs. 16, 46 and 100.
- BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT.:** M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37; Ques. 113, 743 (i).
- BANK OF UPPER CANADA, STMNTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 112 (i).
- CENTRAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.** See B. 40.
- COMMERCIAL BANK OF WINDSOR.** See B. 117.
- DEPOSITS, GOVT., IN BANKS:** M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 29 (i).
- EXCHANGE BANK, ADVANCES TO:** prop. Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) censuring Govt., 295 (i).
- FEDERAL BANK OF CANADA.** See B. 10.
- GOVT. NOTES IN CIRCULATION:** Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- INSOLVENT BANKS.** See Bs. 66 and 127.

BANKS AND BANKING—Continued.

- INSPECTION AND SUPERVISION OF BANKS: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 51; prop. Res., 81 (i).
- LA BANQUE DU PEUPLE. See B. 53.
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fairbank) 819 (ii).
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 2359, 2465, 2559 (iii).
- POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS IN THE MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. Stairs) 148 (i); in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- PRIVATE BANKS AND BROKERS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 51 (i).
- SAVINGS BANKS (P. O. OR OTHERWISE) DEPOSITORS: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533 (i).
- TREASURY BANK. See B. 78.
- BARRACKS AT LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- BARRACK HUTS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
- BARRELS CONTAINING PETROLEUM OR ITS PRODUCTS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (ii).
- BATOCHÉ, BATTLE OF: Despatch respecting first Engagement, 1380; telegram from Gen. Middleton giving details of second fight, 1822; second despatch, 1835 (iii).
- BATOCHÉ, CAPTURE OF: Rumored indignities committed by Volunteers: Ques. (Mr. Royal) 2999, 3425 (iv).
- BATTERIES, A, B AND C. See "MILITIA."
- BAYFIELD, N.S., BREAKWATER, EXTENSION OF: Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 77 (i).
- BEAUCE: Vacancy in the Representation, Warrant issued and Ret. of Member to represent, 1 (i).
- BEAVER LINE OF STEAMERS AND I.C.R., FREIGHT RATE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 144 (i).
- BEE-TROOT SUGAR, IMPORTATION OF: Ques. (Mr. Vail) 744 (i).
- BELL AND KAVANAGH, LAND CLAIMS: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 479 (i).
- BELLEVILLE AND NORTH HASTINGS RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458; in Com., 3473 (iv).
- BENSON, MR., M.P., DEATH OF: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2357 (iii).
- BERGIN, SURGEON-GENERAL, SERVICES OF: Ques. (Mr. Mc Mullen) 1914 (iii).
- BIG BEAR. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W."
- BILL (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)
1°*, 1 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 2) To regulate the Employment of children and young persons and women in the Workshops, Mills and Factories of the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. Bergin.)
1°*, 29; Order for 2° dschgd., 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 3) To limit the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)
1°, 28; Order for 2° read., 102; 2° m., 151; Amt. (Mr. Ouimet) 165; neg., 167; 2° neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 4) To provide for the distribution of Assets of Insolvent Debtors.—(Mr. Curran.)
1°, 29; 2°*, 619 (vol. i); M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1280; agreed to, 1281 (vol. ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 5) Respecting the liability of Carriers by Land.—(Mr. Coughlin.)
1°*, 29; 2° m., 102 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 6) To further amend the Law of Evidence in Criminal Cases.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)
1°*, 29; 2° m., 176; consdn. resmd., 180; Amt. (Mr. Tupper) 6 m. h., 182; neg. (Y. 55, N. 87) 187; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496; Amt (Mr. Amyot) to recom. neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504; 3°*, 616 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 7) To amend the Act 37 Victoria, Chapter 17, intituled: "An Act to authorize the advance of a certain sum of money to the Province of British Columbia for the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and for other purposes."—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)
1°, 32; 2°, 102 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1064 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 4.)
- BILL (No. 8) Respecting the River St. Clair Railway Bridge and Tunnel Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)
1°* 40; 2°*, 57; in Com. and 3°*, 245 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 25.)
- BILL (No. 9) Respecting the Canada Southern Railway Company and the Erie and Niagara Railway Company.—(Mr. Bergin.)
1°*, 40; 2°*, 57; in Com., 245; 3°*, 281 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 15.)
- BILL (No. 10) To reduce the Capital Stock of the Federal Bank of Canada, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Small.)
1°*, 40; 2°*, 57; in Com. and 3°*, 428 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 9.)
- BILL (No. 11) To extend the Jurisdiction of the Maritime Court of Ontario.—(Mr. Allen.)
1°*, 40; 2° m., 127; 2°*, 131; Order for Com. read, 215; in Com; 496; 3°*, 616 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 12) For constituting a Court of Railway Commissioners for Canada, and to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°, 40 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 13) Respecting Carriers by Land.—(Mr. Mc Carthy.)
1°*, 40; 2° m., 254-282; Amt. (Mr. Curran) 6 m. h., 285; neg. (Y. 64, N. 74) and 2°*, 289 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 14) To consolidate and amend the Acts respecting the Election of Members of the House of Commons.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)
1°, 41 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 15) To continue an Act respecting the Albion Mines Savings Bank.—(Mr. McDougald.)
1°*, 46; 2°*, 113; in Com. and 3°*, 616 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 14.)
- BILL (No. 16) To amend the Law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.—(Mr. Smyth.)
1°*, 46 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 17) Respecting International Ferries.—(Mr. Patterson, Essex.)
1°*, 46; 2° m., 254; 2°*, 256 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 18) Respecting Wharves, Docks and Piers constructed in navigable waters.—(Mr. Tupper.)
1°, 46; 2° m., 215; 2°* and ref. to Sel. Com., 218 (vol. i).

- BILL (No. 19)** To provide for the better observance of the Lord's Day, commonly called Sunday, by prohibiting Sunday Excursions of certain kinds.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1°*, 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 20)** To modify the application of "The Consolidated Insurance Act, 1877."—(Sir *Leonard Tilley*.)
1°, 46; 2°, 126 (vol. i); in Com., 2430; Order for 3°, 2532; deb. adjd., 2533 (vol. iii); ref. back to Com., 2768; 3°, 2770 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- BILL (No. 21)** To provide for the taking of a Census in the Province of Manitoba, the North-West Territories and the District of Keewatin.—(Mr. *Pope*.)
1° of B. and Res. prop., 46; M. for Com. on Res., 74; in Com., 75; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 125; Res. agreed to and 2° of B., 126; in Com., 171; consdn. m. and Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 212; neg. on a div., 212; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 213; neg. (Y. 62 N. 120) 215; Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) to recom., 215; neg. on a div., 215; 3°*, 215 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 3.)
- BILL (No. 22)** To amend the Criminal Law, to declare it a misdemeanor to leave unguarded and exposed holes cut in the Ice on any navigable or frequented waters.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*.)
1°*, 57; 2°, 131; in Com., 150; Order dschg'd. and ref. to Sel. Com., 496 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 23)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Railway Company.—(Mr. *Williams*.)
1°*, 67; 2°*, 113; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- BILL (No. 24)** To incorporate the Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit Railway Company.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex*.)
1°*, 67; 2°*, 113; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 21.)
- BILL (No. 25)** Further to amend "The Patent Act of 1872."—(Mr. *White, Renfrew*.)
1°, 67; 2° m., 266; neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 26)** To provide for the appointment of a Deputy Speaker.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
Res. prop., 67; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to refer to Sel. Com., 70; neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72; 1°* of B., 74; 2°* and in Com., 175; M. for 3° agreed to on a div. and 3°*, 212 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 1.)
- BILL (No. 27)** To provide for the punishment of Seduction, and like offences.—(Mr. *Charlton*.)
1°*, 76; 2°, 619 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 28)** To incorporate the Dominion Drainage Company.—(Mr. *Haggart*.)
1°*, 88; 2°*, 113 (vol. i); M. for Com., 1007; deb. adjd., 1008; M. for Com., 1386 (vol. ii); in Com. and 3°*, 3053 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 95.)
- BILL (No. 29)** To amend the Act respecting Patents of Inventions.—(Mr. *Smyth*.)
1°*, 88 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 30)** To amend and consolidate "The Consolidated Railway Act, 1879," and the Acts amending it.—(Mr. *Wells*.)
18, 101 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 31)** To amend and consolidate the Canada Civil Service Acts of 1882, 1883 and 1884.—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)
1°, 101; Res. prop., 210; Res. (letter carriers) in Com., 270; Res. (C. S. Examiners, &c.) in Com., 273, 281 (vol. i); conc. m., 889; conc. in, 892; 2° of B. m., 1095; 2° and in Com., 1097-1130, 1281; 3° m., 1282; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3 m. h., 1282; neg. (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286; Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) to recom., 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to recom., 1294; neg. (Y. 53, N. 104) 1296; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to recom., 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1301; Amt. (Mr. *Lister*) to recom., neg. on same div., 1303; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to recom., 1303; neg. on same div., 1304; 3° on a div., 1304 (vol. ii); M. to conc. in Senate Amts., 1823, 2396 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 46.)
- BILL (No. 32)** Respecting Insolvency.—(Mr. *Billy*.)
1°, 101 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 33)** For the equitable distribution of Insolvents' Estates.—(Mr. *Beaty*.)
1°*, 113 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 34)** For the discharge of past Insolvents.—(Mr. *Beaty*.)
1°*, 113 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 35)** Further to amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879.—(Mr. *Bergeron*.)
1°*, 113 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 36)** To provide Banking and Loan facilities to those engaged in Agricultural pursuits.—(Mr. *Orton*.)
Res. prop., 115; in Com. and 1°* of B., 120 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 37)** Further to amend the Act to incorporate the South Saskatchewan Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*.)
1°*, 125; 2°*, 179; in Com. and 3°*, 672 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 17.)
- BILL (No. 38)** To amend the Acts relating to The Great Western and Lake Ontario Shore Junction Railway Company.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*.)
1°*, 125; 2°*, 179; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- BILL (No. 39)** To incorporate the Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle, and for other purposes connected therewith.—(Mr. *Mulock*.)
1°*, 125; 2°*, 180; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 33.)
- BILL (No. 40)** Further relating to The Central Bank of New Brunswick.—(Mr. *Temple*.)
1°*, 125; 2°*, 180 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 939 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 11.)
- BILL (No. 41)** To amend the Act respecting duties of Justices of the Peace in relation to Summary Convictions.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)
1°, 125; 2°, 892 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 42)** To amend the Act respecting Offences against the person.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)
1°*, 125; 2° m., 218 deb. adjd., 219 (vol. i).

- BILL (No. 43)** To authorize the Royal Canadian Insurance Company to reduce its Capital Stock, and for other purposes.—(Mr. Curran.)
1°*, 125; 2°*, 188 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°, 791 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 28.)
- BILL (No. 44)** Respecting Infectious or Contagious Diseases affecting Animals.—(Mr. Pope.)
1°, 125 (vol. i); 2°, 892; in Com., 1064-1094; 3° m., 1321; Amt. (Mr. Sutherland, Oxford) to recom., 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; Amt. (Mr. Mulock) to recom., 1324; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327; Amt. (Mr. Catudal) to recom., 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328; Amt. (Mr. Casey) to recom., 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332; Amt. (Mr. Armstrong) to recom., 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; Amt. (Mr. Scriver) to recom., neg. on a div., 1334; Amt. (Mr. Davies) to recom., neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334; 3°, 1335 (vol. ii); Sen. Amts conc. in, 2397 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 70.)
- BILL (No. 45)** Respecting the representation of the Territories in the House of Commons.—(Mr. Cameron, Huron.)
1°*, 147; 2° m., 362, 490; deb. adjd., 495 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 46)** Further to amend the Law relating to Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes.—(Mr. Gigault.)
1°, 147 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 47)** For the more effectual prevention of Cruelty to Animals.—(Mr. Charlton.)
1°*, 147 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 48)** Respecting the Annuity and Guarantee Funds Society of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 12.)
- BILL (No. 49)** To incorporate the Pension Fund of the Bank of Montreal.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 13.)
- BILL (No. 50)** To incorporate the Fredericton and St. Mary's Railway Bridge Company.—(Mr. Temple.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 289 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 873; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 26.)
- BILL (No. 51)** For granting certain powers to the International Coal Company (Limited).—(Mr. Desjardins.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 567 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 29.)
- BILL (No. 52)** Respecting the Sault Ste. Marie Bridge Company.—(Mr. Dawson.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 24.)
- BILL (No. 53)** Respecting La Banque du Peuple.—(Mr. Girouard.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 8.)
- BILL (No. 54)** To confirm the Union of the Canada Congregational Missionary Society, and the Congregational Union of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.—(Mr. Abbott.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 259; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 34.)
- BILL (No. 55)** To authorize the Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association to insure against fire the property of the Patrons of Husbandry wheresoever situate in Canada.—(Mr. White, Cardwell.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 246 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1210 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 93.)
- BILL (No. 56)** Respecting Disorderly Houses.—(Mr. Ouimet.)
1°, 170 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 57)** To amend the Criminal Law of Canada.—(Mr. Ouimet.)
1°, 170 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 58)** To amend the Liquor License Act of 1833.—(Mr. Foster.)
1°, 170; 2° m., 620; deb. adjd., 622 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 59)** To incorporate the Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Paterson, Brant.)
1°*, 170; 2°*, 281; in Com. and 3°*, 567 (vol. i). (48-49 Vic., c. 20.)
- BILL (No. 60)** To incorporate the Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°*, 180; 2°*, 246; in Com., 693; 3°*, 791 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 32.)
- BILL (No. 61)** Further to amend the Act incorporating the Richelieu Navigation Company, and the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Desjardins.)
1°*, 188; 2°*, 246 (vol. i); Notice of an Amt., 1210; in Com., 1347; 3°, 1352 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 91.)
- BILL (No. 62)** To amend the Act to incorporate the Bank of Winnipeg.—(Mr. Watson.)
1°*, 210; 2°*, 281 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 10.)
- BILL (No. 63)** To incorporate the Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Watson.)
1°*, 210; 2°*, 289 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 64)** Further to amend the Patent Act of 1872.—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°, 234; 2° m., 622; Order for 2° dschgd. 629 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 65)** To amend "The Canada Temperance Act of 1878."—(Mr. McCarthy.)
1°, 235 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 66)** Further to amend an Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations.—(Mr. Edgar.)
1°, 235 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 67)** Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. Baker, Victoria.)
1°, 246 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 68)** To limit the Appellate Jurisdiction of the Supreme Court, as respects matters of a purely local nature in the Province of Quebec.—(Mr. Landry, Montmagny.)
1°, 270 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 69)** Respecting the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tyrwhitt.)
1°*, 269; 2°*, 428 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 27.)

- BILL (No. 70)** To make further provision respecting the traffic in Intoxicating Liquors.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1° 270 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 71)** To amend the Criminal Law.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*.)
1° 270 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 72)** Respecting the Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *Bergin*.)
1°*, 213; 2°*, 405 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- BILL (No. 73)** To incorporate the Alberta and Athabasca Railway Company.—(Mr. *Williams*.)
1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (vol. i); in Com., 791; 3°*, 816 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 88.)
- BILL (No. 74)** Respecting the Manitoba and North-Western Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. *Royal*.)
1°*, 313; 2°*, 405, (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1180 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- BILL (No. 75)** To incorporate the Canadian Pacific Employés Relief Association.—(Mr. *Gault*.)
1°*, 313; 2°*, 490 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 23.)
- BILL (No. 76)** To amend the Act respecting the London Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*.)
1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°, 1723 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- BILL (No. 77)** To incorporate the Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Railway Company.—(Mr. *Kilvert*.)
1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- BILL (No. 78)** To incorporate the Truro Bank.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)
1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 79)** To incorporate the Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. *Tupper*.)
1°*, 313; 2°*, 490 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1180 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 90.)
- BILL (No. 80)** To incorporate the Fort Macleod Ranch Telegraph Company.—(Mr. *Ives*.)
1°*, 349; 2°*, 428 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1723 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2357 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 92.)
- BILL (No. 81)** Respecting the Canada Co-operative Supply Association (Limited).—(Mr. *Curran*.)
1°*, 349; 2°*, 428; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (vol. i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 31.)
- BILL (No. 82)** To incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*.)
1°*, 349; 2° m., 428; Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 428 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 83)** To incorporate the Kootenay Railway Company, British Columbia.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°*, 349; 2°*, 545 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 84)** For the relief of Amanda Esther Davis.—(C) from the Senate.—(Mr. *White, Cardwell*.)
1° on a div., 226; M. to fix day for 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 226; 2° on a div., 567; in Com. and 3°*, 693. (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 37.)
- BILL (No. 85)** Respecting Factories.—(Mr. *Bergin*.)
1°*, 362 (vol. i); 2° m., 873; deb. adjd., 886; M. to resume adjd. deb., 940; Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) to substitute B. (No. 94) Canada Temperance Act, 940; Amt. agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 86)** To amend the Act respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. *McCarthy*.)
1° 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 87)** To amend the Act 40 Victoria, Chapter 36, intituled: "An Act to provide for the employment, without the walls of Common Gaols, of Prisoners sentenced to imprisonment therein."—(Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*.)
1°*, 362 (vol. i); 2°, in Com., and 3°*, 1658 (vol. ii), (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 81.)
- BILL (No. 88)** Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. *Townshend*.)
1°*, 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 89)** Further to amend "The Patent Act of 1872."—(Mr. *Hay*.)
1°*, 362 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 90)** To amend "The Fisheries Act."—(Mr. *Mulock*.)
1° 426 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 91)** To incorporate the Winnipeg and Prince Albert Railway Company.—(Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*.)
1°*, 428; 2°, 567 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1180 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- BILL (No. 92)** Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. *Jamieson*.)
1° 448; Ques. and M. to fix day for 2°, 713 (vol. i); 2° m., 949; Amt. (Mr. *Ives*) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109) 954; 2° agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; in Com., 954; 3° m., 1045; Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) to recom., 1045; in Com., 1046; Amt. (Mr. *Bourbeau*) to recom., 1047; in Com., 1047; on M. to conc., Amt. (Mr. *Burpee*) 1047; neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. *Townshend*) to recom., 1050; in Com., 1050; Amt. (Mr. *Hickey*) to recom., 1051; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 64) 1054; Amt. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) to recom., 1059; neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062; Amt. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) to recom., neg., 1062; Amt. (Mr. *Gigault*) to recom., neg., 1062; 3°, 1063 (vol. ii); M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) to consdr. Sen. Amts., 2600; consdn. of Sen. Amts., 2644; (Amt.) 2645; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; (Amt.) 2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 108) 2651; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 75, N. 90) 2552; Amts., 2653-2657; Amt. (Mr. *Small*) 2660; neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2670; Amt. (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) 2674; neg., 2675 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 93)** To establish a Court of Claims for Canada. (Sir *Hector Langevin*.)
1° 449 (vol. i); prop. Res., 777 (vol. ii); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2439 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 94)** To incorporate the Western Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. *McCallum*.)
1°*, 534; 2°*, 616 (vol. i); in Com. and 3°*, 1288 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

- BILL (No. 95) Respecting Explosive Substances.—(K) from the Senate.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)**
 1°*, 545 (vol. i); 2°, 893; in Com., 1167; 3°, 1335 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 7.)
- BILL (No. 96) Statutes of Canada Consolidation.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)**
 Not introduced. See B. 130.
- BILL (No. 97) For the relief of Fairy Emily Jane Terry.—(E) from the Senate.—(Mr. Taylor.)**
 1° on a div., 605; 2° on a div., 672 (vol. i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 36.)
- BILL (No. 98) To amend the Acts respecting Controverted Elections.—(Mr. Mulock.)**
 1°, 605 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 99) To amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. Bourbeau.)**
 1°, 605 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 101) To amend the Law respecting Bridges, Booms and other works, constructed over or in navigable waters under the authority of Provincial Acts.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**
 1°, 605 (vol. i); 2° m., 893; 2°* and in Com., 894; 3°*, 895 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 6.)
- BILL (No. 102) To amend the Acts respecting the Department of the Secretary of State.—(Mr. Chapleau.)**
 1°, 629 (vol. i); 2° and in Com., 894; 3°*, 895 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 2.)
- BILL (No. 103) Respecting the Electoral Franchise.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.)**
 1°, 629 (vol. i); Order for 2° postponed, 1095; 2° m., 1133; Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1137; neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) and deb. adjd., 1166; deb. rsmtd., 1167; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; deb. adjd., 1204; deb. rsmtd., 1226; 2° agreed to (Y. 111, N. 63) 1277; M. for Com., 1336; in Com., 1385, 1388, 1444, 1475, 1568, 1608, 1646, 1680, 1712, 1745, 1782, 1824, 1856, 1895, 1915, 1956, 1983, 2052, 2065, 2086, 2104, 2139, 2172, 2210, 2241, 2274, 2301, 2321, 2345, 2360, 2393 (vol. iii), 2757, 3052, 3062; on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Charlton) neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) 3053; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 3058; neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Watson) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Mulock) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062; Amt. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; Amt. (Mr. Burpee) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063; Amt. (Mr. Trow) 3063; neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064; Amt. (Mr. Armstrong) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064; Amt. (Mr. Somerville, Brant) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. McCraney and Innes) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. Cameron [Middlesex] and Langelier) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066; Amts. (Messrs. Lister and Cameron, Huron) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3067; Amts. (Messrs. Weldon and Fairbank) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; Amts. (Messrs. Paterson [Brant] and Gillmor) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3069; Amts. (Messrs. Holton and Fisher) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3 m. h., 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072; 3° of B., 3072 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 40.)
- BILL (No. 104) To amend the sections of Acts therein mentioned relating to the constitution of the Treasury Board.—(Sir Leonard Tilley.)**
 1°, 630 (vol. i); 2°, in Com., and 3°*, 1670 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 47.)
- BILL (No. 105) Respecting the Bank of British Columbia.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**
 1°, 631; 2° 894 (vol. ii); in Com. and 3°*, 2396 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 83.)
- BILL (No. 106) For the relief of Alice Elvira Evans.—(G) from the Senate.—(Mr. Edgar.)**
 1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 39.)
- BILL (No. 107) For the relief of George Louis Emil Hatfield.—(D) from the Senate.—(Mr. Kilvert.)**
 1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (vol. i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 38.)
- BILL (No. 108) To amend the Act to encourage the construction of Dry Docks, by granting assistance on certain conditions to Companies constructing them.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**
 1°, 693 (vol. i); 2° and in Com., 894; 3°*, 895 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 5.)
- BILL (No. 109) Respecting Real Property in the North-West Territories.—(A) from the Senate.—(Sir Hector Langevin.)**
 1°*, 742 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 110) To incorporate the Rock Lake and Souris and Brandon Railway Company.—(Mr. McDougald, Pictou.)**
 1°*, 742 (vol. i); 2°*, 873 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 111) To amend the Consolidated Railway Act, 1879, and amendments thereto.—(Mr. Mulock.)**
 1°, 742 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 112) Further to amend "The Canada Temperance Act, 1878."—(Mr. Gigault.)**
 1°, 743 (vol. i).
- BILL (No. 113) Respecting Proof of Entries in Books of Account kept by Officers of the Crown.—(M) from the Senate.—(Mr. Chapleau.)**
 1°*, 964 (vol. ii); 2°, 2397; withdn., 2398; 2°, 2465; in Com., 2466; 3°*, 2497 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 48.)
- BILL (No. 114) To comprise in one Act a limitation of the Share and Loan Capital of the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(J) from the Senate.—(Mr. Kilvert.)**
 1°*, 783; 2°*, 816; in Com. and 3°, 1352 (vol. ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 30.)
- BILL (No. 115) To amend an Act to incorporate the Sisters of Charity of the North-West Territories.—(I) from the Senate.—(Mr. Desjardins.)**
 1°*, 832; 2°*, 873; in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 35.)

- BILL (No. 116) To amend the Act respecting the Indemnity to the Members of both Houses of Parliament.—(Mr. *Farrow*.)
1° 813 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 117) Respecting the Commercial Bank of Windsor.—(Sir *Leonard Tilley*.)
1°*, 832; 2°, 1671; Order dschgd. and B. ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1677 (vol. ii); in Com. and 3°*, 2396 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- BILL (No. 118) Further to amend the Acts relating to Weights and Measures.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
Res. prop., 832; in Com. and 1°* of B., 837; 2° and in Com., 1672; 3°*, 1680 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 64.)
- BILL (No. 119) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Inspection of Gas and Gas Meters.—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
Res. prop., in Com. and 1° of B., 837 (vol. ii); 2°, 2419; in Com. and 3°*, 2439 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 69.)
- BILL (No. 120) To give effect to an Agreement made by the Department of Public Works for the Sale and transfer of the Dundas and Waterloo Road.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)
Res. prop., 451 (vol. i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 892 (vol. ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 2396 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 121) To amend the Act 45 *Vic.*, chap. 41, respecting the Sale of Railway Passenger Tickets.—(Mr. *Patterson, Essex*.)
1°*, 927 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 122) Respecting Agricultural Fertilizers.—(Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*.)
Res. prop., 936; in Com. and 1°*, 939; M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1320 (vol. ii); 2°, 2476; in Com., 2478; 3°*, 2497 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 68.)
- BILL (No. 123) Further to amend an Act intituled: "An Act respecting offences against the person."—(S) *from the Senate*.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°*, 1037 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2767; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767; 3°*, 2768 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- BILL (No. 124) To restrict and regulate Chinese Immigration into the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)
1°, 1037 (vol. ii); withdn., 3023 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 125) For the Prohibition of Spirituous Liquors.—(Mr. *Beaty*.)
Res. prop., 1040; 1°* of B., 1063 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 126) To provide for the fitting representation of Canada at the Colonial and Indian Exhibition to be held in London in the year 1886.—(Mr. *Fope*.)
Res. prop., 451 (vol. i); in Com., 892; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 1064 (vol. ii); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 2399 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- BILL (No. 127) Further to amend "An Act respecting Insolvent Banks, Insurance Companies, Loan Companies, Building Societies and Trading Corporations."—(N) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Edgar*.)
1°, 1094 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 128) To make further provision respecting summary proceedings before Justices and other Magistrates.—(L) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°*, 1130 (vol. ii); Order for 2° transferred to Govt. Orders, 2420 vol. iii; 2° m., 2827; 2° and in Com., 2829 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 129) To amend an Act respecting "The Central Prison for the Province of Ontario."—(P) *from the Senate*.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°*, 1226 (vol. ii); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 2402 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 79.)
- BILL (No. 130) Respecting the Revised Statutes of Canada.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°, 1226 (vol. ii); Order for 2° dschgd., and B. withdn., 2402 (vol. iii).
- BILL (No. 131) "For the better Preservation of the Peace in the vicinity of Public Works," and the Acts in amendment thereof.—(O) *from the Senate*.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°*, 1278 (vol. ii); 2° m. and in Com., 2824; 3°*, 2854 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 80.)
- BILL (No. 132) To amend the Act 43 *Vic.*, chap. 29, respecting the navigation of Canadian Waters, and to enable the Governor in Council to suspend from time to time certain provisions of the said Act.—(Mr. *McLelan*.)
Res. prop. and in Com., 1278; 1°* of B., 1279 (vol. ii); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2899 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 133) Further to amend "The Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882."—(Mr. *McLelan*.)
Res. prop., 1279; in Com. and, 1°* of B., 1280 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2399; 3°*, 2421 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- BILL (No. 134) Respecting "The Liquor License Act, 1883."—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
1°, 1281 (vol. ii); 2° m., 2400; 2°*, 2402 (vol. iii); in Com., 2768, 2894; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2958; 3°*, 2961 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- BILL (No. 135) Further to amend "The General Inspection Act, 1874."—(Mr. *Costigan*.)
Res. (Chief Inspector) prop., 1306; in Com., 1307; conc. in and 1°* of B., 1320 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2548; 3°, 2555 (vol. iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- BILL (No. 136) To amend the Criminal Law of Canada.—(Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*.)
1°, 1335 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 137) To make further provision respecting Pawnbrokers.—(R) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Small*.)
1°*, 1474 (vol. ii).
- BILL (No. 138) For the relief of George Branford Cox.—(H) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. *Cameron, Huron*.)
1° on a div., 1473; 2° on a div., 1566; in Com. and 3° on a div., 1723 (vol. ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- BILL (No. 139) To amend the Act in relation to the Library of Parliament.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
Res. prop., 1658; in Com., 1666; 1°* of B., 1670 (vol. ii); 2°, 2402 (vol. iii); in Com., 2759; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 65) 2763; 3° on same div. reversed, 2763 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 45.)

- BILL (No. 140) Respecting the North-West Mounted Police Force.—(T) *from the Senate*.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.) 1°*, 1670 (vol. ii); 2° and in Com., 2772; 3° m., 2832; 3°, 2833 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 54.)
- BILL (No. 141) Respecting the Administration of Justice, and other matters, in the North-West Territories.—(V) *from the Senate*.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.) 1°*, 2345; Res. prop., 2531 (vol. iii); Res. in Com., 2926; 2° of B., 2934; M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; in Com. on B., 2961; M. for consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Mills) neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3000; deb. adjd., 3002; Order for rsmng. adjd. deb., 3427; Amt. neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 51.)
- BILL (No. 142) Respecting Canned Goods.—(U) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Costigan.) 1°*, 2345; 2°, 2439; in Com., 2534 (vol. iii), 2767; 3°*, 2767 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 63.)
- BILL (No. 143) Respecting the Adulteration of Food, Drugs, and Agricultural Fertilizers.—(W) *from the Senate*.—(Mr. Bowell.) 1°*, 2356; 2°, 2466; in Com., 2467, 2541; Res. (remuneration of Analysts) prop., 2497; in Com., 2541, 2542 (vol. iii), 2751; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751; 3° of B., 2751 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 67.)
- BILL (No. 144) To authorize the augmentation of the North-West Mounted Police.—(Sir John A. Macdonald.) Res. prop., 994 (vol. ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2402; in Com., 2415; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2421; 1°* of B., 2430 (vol. iii); 2° and in Com., 2770; 3° m., 2820; 3° on a div., 2822 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 53.)
- BILL (No. 145) To authorize the raising, by way of Loan, of certain sums of money for the Public Service.—(Mr. Bowell.) Res. prop., 2391; M. for Com. on Res., 2461; in Com., 2463; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2523; 1°* of B., 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2526 (vol. iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 43.)
- BILL (No. 146) To amend "The Consolidated Inland Revenue Act, 1883."—(Mr. Costigan.) Res. prop., 2421; M. for Com. on Res., 2526; in Com., 2528; 1°* of B., 2529; 2° m., 2935; 2°*, 2536 (vol. iii); in Com., 2968; 3°, 3002; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3435 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 62.)
- BILL (No. 147) To authorize the grant of certain subsidies in land for the construction of the Railways therein mentioned.—(Sir Hector Langevin.) Res. prop., 782 (vol. ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2440; in Com., 2461, 2483, 2497; M. to conc. in Res., 2533; 1°* of B., 2534 (vol. iii); 2° m., 2770, 2854; in Com., 2855; Order for 3° read, Amts. (Mr. Blake) 2890; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; Amts. (Mr. Blake) neg. on same div., 2894; 3°*, 2894 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 60.)
- BILL (No. 148) To amend the Act respecting the appointment of a Harbor Master at the Port of Halifax.—(Mr. McLellan.) Res. prop., 2421; in Com., 2522; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 2534 (vol. iii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2772 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 78.)
- BILL (No. 149) For granting to Her Majesty the sum of \$1,700,000 required for defraying certain Expenses now being incurred in connection with the Troubles in the North-West Territories.—(Mr. Bowell.) Res. and 1°*, 2559; 2° and in Com., 2855; 3°*, 2894 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 42.)
- BILL (No. 150) To authorize the advance of a certain sum to the Harbor Commissioners of the Harbor of Three Rivers.—(Mr. Bowell.) Res. prop., 2497; Res. in Com., 2555 (vol. iii); 1°* of B., 2751; 2° m., 2934; in Com., 2935; 3°*, 2957 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 76.)
- BILL (No. 151) Respecting the Ocean Mail Service.—(Mr. Carling.) Res. prop., 2440; Res. in Com., 2555 (vol. iii); M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2751; M. to conc. in Res., 2754; 1° of B., 2757; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (vol. iv).
- BILL (No. 152) To amend the Consolidated Militia Act, 1883.—(Mr. Caron.) 1°, 2853; 2° m., 3045; 2° and in Com., 3046; 3°*, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 72.)
- BILL (No. 153) Further to amend the Acts respecting the Candian Pacific Railway, and to provide for the completion and successful operation thereof.—(Mr. Pope.) Res. prop., 2420 (vol. iii); M. for Com., 2559; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; in Com., 2724; M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2858; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2858; Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2859; in Com., 2859; on M. to conc. in Res. Amt. (Mr. Charlton) 2860; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2861; Amt. (Mr. Vail) 2861; in Com., 2862; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Casey) 2862; neg. (Y. 55, N. 91) 2863; Amt. (Mr. Davies) 2863; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 2863; neg. (Y. 55, N. 89) 2864; Amt. (Mr. Mills) 2864; Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865; Amt. (Mr. Watson) 2865; neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868; 1° of B., 2868; 2° m., 3024; 2° and in Com., 3031; 3° m., 3293; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 57.)
- BILL (No. 154) Further to amend the Act relating to the Culling and Measurement of Timber in the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Costigan.) Res. prop., 2419; M. for Com. on Res., 2475 (vol. iii); 1°, 2° and in Com., 3043; 3°*, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 65.)
- BILL (No. 155) For increasing the yearly subsidy to the Province of Manitoba, and for other purposes therein mentioned.—(Mr. Bowell.) Res. prop., 2420 (vol. iii); M. for Com., 2775; in Com., 2789, 2823; further Res., 2889; in Com., 2924; 1°* of B., 2926; 2° and in Com., 3047; 3°, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 50.)

- BILL (No. 156)** To restrict and regulate Chinese Immigration into the Dominion of Canada.—(Mr. *Chapleau*.)
Res. (Chinese interpreter) prop., 2421 (vol. iii); in Com. on Res., 3023; prop. Res. (poll tax, &c.) 2497; M. for Com. on Res., 3002; in Com., 3023; 1°* of B., 3323; 2° and in Com., 3050; 3°, 3075 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 71.)
- BILL (No. 157)** To amend the several Acts relating to Duties of Customs and Excise.—(Mr. *Bowell*.)
1°, 3250; 2°*, 3434; in Com. and 3°*, 3435 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- BILL (No. 158)** To authorize the granting of further subsidies to and making further provision for the construction and efficient operation of the Railways therein described.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)
Res. prop., 2531 (vol. iii); M. for Com. on Res., 2971; in Com., 2974; M. to conc. in Res., 3250; 1°* of B., 3293; 2° m., 3380; in Com., 3380-3399; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. *Kirk*) 3401; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 79) 3404; 3°*, 3404 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- BILL (No. 159)** For facilitating the navigation of the River St. Lawrence, in and near the harbor of Quebec.—(Mr. *McTean*.)
1°*, 3293; Order for 2° read., 3436; 2° m., Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 6 m. h., neg., 3470; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 77.)
- BILL (No. 160)** Respecting a grant of land to the Militia on service in Manitoba and the North-West.—(Mr. *Caron*.)
Res. prop., 3321; M. for Com., 3376; in Com., 3377; 1°* of B., 3380; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 73.)
- BILL (No. 161)** To provide for the salaries and superannuation and travelling allowances of certain Judges of certain Provincial Courts.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)
Res. prop., 3293; M. for Com. on Res., 3375; in Com. and 1°* of B., 3395; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3436 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 56.)
- BILL (No. 162)** To provide a Salary for an additional County Court Judge in the Province of Manitoba.—(Sir *John A. Macdonald*.)
Res. prop., 3395; in Com. on Res., 3435; 1°* of B., 3436; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- BILL (No. 163)** For granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money required for defraying certain expenses of the Public Service, for the years ending respectively the 30th June, 1885, and the 30th June, 1886; and for other purposes relating to the Public Service.—(Mr. *Bowell*.)
1°*, 2°, 3°*, 3470 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- BILL (No. 164)** To authorize the granting of the subsidies therein mentioned in aid of the construction of certain Railways.—(Mr. *Pope*.)
Res. prop., 3457; M. for Com., 3470; in Com., 3472; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3473 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- BILL (No. 165)** To continue for a limited time the Act therein mentioned.—(Sir *Hector Langevin*.)
1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3458 (vol. iv). (48-49 *Vic.* c. 52.)
- BILLS ASSENTED TO, 1516 (ii), 3475 (iv).**
- Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes Acts**
Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. *Smyth*). 1°*, 46 (i).
- Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes Acts.**
Amt. B. No. 46 (Mr. *Gigault*). 1°. 147 (i).
- BILL, MR. S. J. R., AND SAWDUST LAW: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 14 (i).**
- BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, N.S., MANAGEMENT OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).**
- BINGHAM, LIEUT.-COL., DEPRIVATION OF COMMAND: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).**
- BLACK ROD, GENTLEMAN USHER: Messages summoning Commons to Senate, 1 (i), 1516 (ii), 3475 (iv).**
- BOLDUC, CAPT. LUDGER, RESIGNATION OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 29 (i).**
- BOLTON, STAFF COMMANDER, AND DEPT. OF MARINE AND FISHERIES: M. for Rep. of Auditor-General, &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 135; DISPUTE WITH MR. TILTON: M. for Ret.* 312 (i).**
- BONDED MACHINERY IN USE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3320 (iv).**
- BONDS GOVT., DISAPPEARANCE FROM DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3371 (iv).**
- BONUSES GRANTED TO RYS., MEMORIALS, &C., RESPECTING: M. for copies* (Mr. *Fleming*) 1443 (ii).**
- BONUSES TO RYS. IN ONT., PETS. FOR RELIEF OF: M. for copies (Mr. *Wilson*) 356 (i).**
- Books of Account. See "PROOF OF ENTRIES."**
- BOOTS FOR THE TORONTO MILITIA CORPS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).**
- BORAX: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).**
- BOUNDARIES:**
- ALASKA AND B. C.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*) 705 (i).
- BRITISH COLUMBIA'S EASTERN: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Mills*) 533 (i).
- ONTARIO'S NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 216.
- CLAIMS TO COUNTRY NORTH OF HEIGHT OF LAND: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 51 (i).
- IMPERIAL LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 51, 115 (i), 2854, 2998, 3321; (remarks) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3437 (iv).
- NORTHERN, RES. OF GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 1132 (ii).
- PROPOSALS TO PARLT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 567 (i).
- WESTERN BOUNDARY, ARGUMENT BEFORE P. C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Rykert*) 430 (i).
- BOUNTY ON MANUFACTURES OF IRON: M. for copies of O. C., &c.* (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).**
- BOUNTY TO FISHERMEN, PAYMENT OF, IN GUYSBOROUGH, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2751 (iv).**
- BOUNTY TO FISHING VESSELS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 98 (i).**
- BOUBINOT'S, MR., WORK: Scarcity of copies in Library (remarks) 40 (i).**
- BRADLEY, W. INGLES, SERVICES OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 479 (i).**

BRANCH LINES, C.P.R., EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmnts.*
(Mr. *Blake*) 147; Ques., 694 (i).

BRANDON, POSTMASTER AT, SALARY AND ALLOWANCES: Ques.
(Mr. *Lister*) 2029 (iii).

BRANDON TO MOOSE JAW, C.P.R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*)
964 (ii).

Brantford, Waterloo and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s
Incorp. B. No. 59 (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*). 1°*, 170;
2°*, 281; in Com. and 3°*, 567 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 20.)

BRAS D'OR LAKES, FISH CAUGHT AND BOUNTY PAID: M. for
Ret.* (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 1443 (ii).

BRAS ST. NICHOLAS, DEEPENING OF: M. for copies of Pet.*
(Mr. *Langelier*) 312 (i).

BRAVERY, DISTINCTIVE, REWARDS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*)
2359 (iii).

BREAKWATERS. See "MARINE" and "PUBLIC WORKS."

BREWERS AND DISTILLERS, COMPENSATION TO: prop. Res. (Mr. *Kranz*)
236; Deb. (Mr. *Wells*) 236; (Mr. *Orton*) 238;
(Mr. *Sproule*) 241; (Mr. *Fisher*) 242; on Amt.: (Mr. *Foster*)
243, 247; (Mr. *Jamieson*) 252; (Mr. *Fairbank*)
253 (i).

BRIDGES AND TRESTLES ON C.P.R.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Edgar*)
100 (i).

Bridges, Booms, &c., in Nav. Waters Act Amt.
B. No. 101 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 605 (i); 2°
m., 893; 2°* and in Com., 894; 3°*, 895 (ii). (48-49
***Vic.*, c. 6.)**

Bridge, Fredericton. See "ST. JOHN RIVER BRIDGE."

BRITISH COLUMBIA:

AGENT AND CONTINGENCES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3908 (iv).

ALASKA AND B. C. BOUNDARY: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Gordon*)
703 (i).

BARRACK HUTS, ERECTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).

BUOYS IN VICTORIA AND NANAIMO HARBORS: Ques. (Mr. *Baker,*
***Victoria*) 479 (i).**

CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. See "GENERAL HEADING."

CHINESE COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 29, 211 (i).

CHINESE IMMIGRATION. See general heading and B. 156.

CIVIL SERVICES EMPLOYÉS IN B.C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Baker, Victo-*
***ria*) 1442 (ii).**

DEEP-WATER FISHERIES OFF COAST: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*)
3073 (iv).

DISCOVERY ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).

EASTERN BOUNDARY, COR.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Mills*) 533 (i).

ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 743 (i);
in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv). See B. 7.

EXPENDITURE FOR RAILWAYS IN B.C.: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. *Vanasse*)
964 (ii).

FISHERIES INSPECTOR, APPOINTMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*)
694 (i).

IMMIGRANTS SETTLED IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 189 (i).

INDIAN RESERVE LANDS: M. for copies of Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Baker,*
***Victoria*) 1443 (ii).**

MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES REP.: Remarks (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 594 (i).

METLAKATLA INDIAN TROUBLES: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Shake-*
***speare*) 304 (i).**

PENITENTIARY, SUSPENSION OF RULES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*)
823 (ii).

PORT MOODY AND SAVONA'S FERRY: Ques. (Mr. *Homer*) 146 (i).

PORT MOODY DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 816 (ii).

PUBLIC RESERVES AND "FORE-SHORE" RIGHTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Baker,*
***Victoria*) 703 (i).**

SATUMA ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).

RY. BELT ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 290 (i).

BRITISH COLUMBIA—Continued.

RY. LANDS IN B.C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).

"SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Baker,*
***Victoria*) 831 (ii).**

TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 743
(i); in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).

TELEGRAPH CABLE ACROSS JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS: M. for Ret.*
(Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).

U.S. AND VICTORIA MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (iv).
[See also "DOMINION LANDS," "INDIANS," &c.]

BRITISH MEDICAL ACT AND AMTS.: M. for copies of Cor., &c.*
(Mr. *Bergin*) 33 (i); Rets. respecting (remarks), 939 (ii).

BROCKVILLE, WESTPORT AND SAULT STE. MARIE RY. CO.'S
SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3457; in Com., 3473
(iv).

BROKERAGE AND COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).

BROOKLYN, N.S., BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS:
Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 478 (i).

BROSSEAU & LISABELLE, CUSTOMS BROKERS, FRAUDS, &c., BY:
Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).

BUCKRAM; in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (ii).

BUDGET, THE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 76, 149,
211; Remarks (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 211; (Annual Stmnt.)
313. [For Deb. see "WAYS AND MEANS."]

Building Societies. See "INSOLVENT BANKS."

BUOYS IN LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*)
479 (i), 1914 (iii).

BUOYS IN VICTORIA AND NANAIMO HARBORS: Ques. (Mr. *Baker,*
***Victoria*) 479 (i).**

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE, ESTABLISHMENT OF A: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*)
76 (i).

BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, SOUNDINGS, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Robertson,*
***Hastings*) 533 (i).**

BURGESS, A. M. See "DOMINION LANDS."

BURGLARY, &c. See Bs. 71 and 136.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE. See "GOVT. BUSINESS."

BYE-ELECTIONS SINCE 1878: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).

CABINET REPRESENTATION FOR B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Shakes-*
***peare*) 235 (i).**

CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*)
351 (i).

CALGARY AND ROCKY MOUNTAINS, COST OF C. P. R. BETWEEN:
M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).

CALLANDER AND PORT ARTHUR, COST OF C. P. R. BETWEEN:
M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).

CALLANDER AND PORT ARTHUR, COST OF CONSTRUCTION AND
EQUIPMENT: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).

CAMERON, Mr. D. M.: Election sustained on Judge's Rep.
on Controverted Election, 1 (i).

CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE CO., RECEIPTS AND EX-
PENDITURES OF LIQUIDATORS, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *Amyot*)
303 (i).

CANADA AND ANTWERP STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION: in Com. of
Sup., 2943 (iv).

CANADA AND GERMANY STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION: in Com. of
Sup., 2945 (iv).

CANADA AND JAMAICA CONFEDERATION: M. for copies of
Cor. (Mr. *Burpee*) 505 (i).

- CANADA ATLANTIC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458 (iv).
- CANADA CENTRAL RY., BONUSES TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 86 (i).
- Canada Co-operative Supply Association B. No. 81 (Mr. Curran). 1°*, 349; 2°*, 428; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 31.)
- CANADA N.W. LAND Co., STOCK INVESTED IN BY C.P.R.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- CANADA SHIPPING Co. AND I.C.R. FREIGHT RATES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 144 (i).
- Canada Southern Ry. Co. and Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.'s B. No. 9 (Mr. Bergin). 1°*, 40; 2°*, 57; in Com. 245; 3°*, 281 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 15.)
- CANADA SOUTHERN RY. MAIL SERVICE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wigle) 120 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 65 (Mr. McCarthy). 1°, 235 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 67 (Mr. Baker, Victoria). 1°, 246 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 88 (Mr. Townshend), 1°*, 362 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 92 (Mr. Jamieson). 1°, 448; Ques. and M. to fix a day for 2°, 713 (i); 2° m., 949; Amt. (Mr. Ives) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109) 954; 2° agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; in Com., 954; 3° m., 1045; Amt. (Mr. Weldon) to recom., 1045; in Com., 1046; Amt. (Mr. Bourbeau) to recom., 1047; in Com., 1047; on M. to conc., Amt. (Mr. Burpee) 1047; neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050; on M. for 3°, Amt. (Mr. Townshend) to recom., 1050; in Com., 1050; Amt. (Mr. Hickey) to recom., 1051; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 64) 1054; Amt. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to recom., 1059; neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062; Amt. (Mr. Macdonald, King's) to recom., neg., 1062; Amt. (Mr. Gigault) to recom., neg., 1062; 3°, 1063 (ii); M. (Sir Hector Langevin) to consdr. Sen. Amts., 2600; consdn. of Sen. Amts., 2644; (Amt.) 2645; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; (Amt.) 2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 108) 2651; (Amt.) neg. (Y. 75, N. 90) 2552; Amts., 2653-2657; Amt. (Mr. Small) 2660; neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2670; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Victoria) 2674; neg., 2675 (iv).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 99 (Mr. Bourbeau). 1°, 605 (i).
- Can. Temp. Act, 1878, Amt. B. No. 112 (Mr. Gigault). 1°, 743 (i).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT, 1878:
- CERTIFICATES OF LIQUOR SOLD UNDER IN N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Kirk) 147 (i).
- LIQUOR CERTIFICATES GRANTED UNDER IN HALTON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCraney) 67; PROSECUTIONS UNDER AND DRUGGISTS' LICENSES: Ques., 1806 (ii), 3320 (iv).
- MEMORIALS, &c., RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. Kranz) 448 (i).
- PETITIONS RESPECTING: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 533 (i).
- QUEBEC ACT, WORKING OF UNDER: M. for Cor. (Mr. Bergeron) 307 (i).
- QUES. (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 363 (i).
- REVENUE DERIVED FROM SALE OF LIQUOR: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Rykert) 313 (i).
- SUPREME COURT CASE: M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 45 (i).
- VOTINGS UNDER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fisher) 121 (i).
- CANADIAN AGENT AT PARIS, APPOINTMENT OF, &c.: M. for Papers (Mr. Bergeron) 928 (ii).
- [See "FABRE, MR."]
- CANADIAN CONTINGENT FOR THE SOUDAN: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 563 (i).
- CANADIAN FISHERIES: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. Mulock) 55 (i).
- C. P. R. Co's. Acts Amt. B. No. 153 (Mr. Pope). Res. prop., 2420 (iii); M. for Com., 2559; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; in Com., 2724; M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2858; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2858; Amt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 2859; in Com., 2859; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Charlton) 2860; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2861; Amt. (Mr. Vail) 2861; in Com., 2862; on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Casey) 2862; neg. (Y. 55, N. 91) 2863; Amt. (Mr. Davies) 2863; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 2863; neg. (Y. 55, N. 89) 2864; Amt. (Mr. Mills) 2864; Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865; Amt. (Mr. Watson) 2865; neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868; 1° of B., 2868; 2° m., 3024; 2° and in Com., 3031; 3° m., 3293; agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 57.)
- Canadian Pacific Employés Relief Association Incorp. B. No. 75 (Mr. Gault). 1°*, 313; 2°*, 490 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 23.)
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. LOAN B. 153 (Mr. Pope): prop. Res., 2420; M. for Com. (Annual Stmt.) 2559; Deb. (Mr. Chapleau) 2565; (Mr. Blake) 2586; (Mr. Ives) 2622; (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2630; Amt. 2643; (Mr. Charlton) 2676; (Mr. McCarthy) 2688; (Mr. Davies) 2692; (Mr. Foster) 2702; (Mr. McMullen) 2708; (Mr. Ross) 2712; (Mr. Dawson) 2719; (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 2720; Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; on M. for 2° of B. (Mr. Edgar) 2024 (iii).
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY:
- ADVANCES TO Co. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1305 (ii).
- AGREEMENT BY Co. TO TERMS OF RES.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1915 (iii).
- ALLOWANCES TO CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).
- AMENDED PLANS AND PROFILES, R.C.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 362 (i).
- AMOUNTS DUE TO CONTRACTORS AND NON-PAYMENT BY Co.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 533.
- AVALANCHES IN THE SELKIRK RANGE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 394 (i).
- BRANCH LINES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 694 (1).
- BRANDON TO MOOSE JAW: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Watson) 964 (ii).
- B. C. SECTIONS, WORK ON: M. for Rep., &c. (Mr. Blake) 204 (i).
- CALLANDER AND FORT ARTHUR, COST AND EQUIPMENT: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- CASUALTIES ON MAIN LINE AND BRANCHES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Mitchell) 226 (i).
- CHANGE IN ARRANGEMENTS, COR. BETWEEN Co. AND GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 695 (i), 1744, 1913, 2029 (iii).
- COMPLETION OF LINE WEST OF WINNIPEG, DATES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Watson) 964 (ii).
- CONNECTION WITH ONTARIO SYSTEM, OFFERS TO CONSTRUCT LINES: M. for copies* (Mr. Mulock) 532* (i), 1444 (ii); Ques., 569 (i).
- CONNECTION WITH QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) (iii).
- CONSTRUCTION FROM WINNIPEG TO 615 MILES WEST, COST: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 226.
- CONSTRUCTION NEAR LYTTON, B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Blake) 225 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION ON THE FRASER: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 204 (i).

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Continued.

- CONSTRUCTION, PORT ARTHUR AND WINNIPEG: M. for Stmt. of sums paid to Co. (Mr. Casey) 123 (i).
- CONTRACTORS, &C., NON-PAYMENT OF BY Co.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 533 (i).
- CURVES, GRADES AND TANGENTS: M. for Ret.* 67; Ques. (Mr. Blake) 632, 694, 744 (i), 888 (ii), 2239 (iii).
- DEBT, FLOATING AND UNSECURED: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 219 (i), 1677 (ii).
- EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 816 (i).
- EARNINGS, GROSS AND NET, AND EXPENSES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 61 (i).
- EASTERN SECTION, ESTIMATED COST: Ms. for copies of Estimate (Mr. Edgar) 299, 300, 302 (i).
- EASTERN SECTION, WESTERN DIVISION, ESTIMATES: M. for copies (Mr. Edgar) 299 (i).
- EMPLOYÉS, NAMES OF, SALARY, FEE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 56 (i).
- EMPLOYÉS RELIEF ASSOCIATION. See B. 75.
- ENGINEERS' SALARIES: in Com. of Sup., 3417 (iv).
- EXPENDITURE, COST OF EQUIPMENT, SUMS PAID FOR EXTENSION, &C.*: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 147 (i).
- EXPENDITURE TO COMPLETE GOVT. CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1130 (ii).
- EXTENSION TO QUEBEC, PAPERS, &C.: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1677 (ii), 2239 (iii).
- FORTY-MILE BELT IN B.C.: Memo. read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1983 (iii).
- GAPS ON, NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR: Explanation (Mr. Bowell) 838 (ii).
- GOVT. MORTGAGE, CHANGES IN RELATION TO: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 36 (i).
- GOVT. SECTIONS IN B. C., WORKING OF, BY CONTRACTORS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 632 (i).
- HOMESTEADS WITHIN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 567 (i).
- IMMIGRATION TO MAN. AND N.W., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. AND CO. M. for copies* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 147 (i).
- INTEREST PAID TO GOVT. BY Co. ON LOANS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 350 (i), 1677 (ii), 1955 (iii).
- INTEREST, PAYMENT OF BY Co.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1677 (ii).
- LABORERS' WAGES, PAYMENT OF, ON CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 290 (i).
- LAND AREA IN 48-MILE BELT ACCEPTED BY Co.: Stmt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 782 (ii).
- LAND GRANT ACCEPTED BY Co., ACRES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 568, 744 (i); Stmt. (Sir Hector Langevin) 862.
- LAND GRANT AND LAND GRANT BONDS: Ms. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 92, 100 (i).
- LANDS REJECTED BY Co. OUTSIDE RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 927 (i).
- LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 57 (i).
- LOAN: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 29 (i); payment of interest on, 1131 (ii).
- LOAN \$30,000,000, PAYMENT ON ACCOUNT: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1130 (ii).
- LOCATION AND LANDS SET APART, &C.: M. for Maps* (Mr. Blake) 46 (i).
- LOCATION OF LINE IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2239 (iii).
- NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING Co., POSITION OF: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- NORTH SHORE LINE SUBSIDY: M. for Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
- PLANS AND PROFILES, AMENDED: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 382 (i).
- PORT MOODY AND SAVONA'S FERRY, EXTENSION OF TIME: Ques. (Mr. Homer) 146 (i).
- PORT MOODY WHARF AND FREIGHT SHED: M. for plans, &c. (Mr. Blake) 295 (i).
- POSTAL AND TRANSPORT SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1744 (iii).
- PROGRESS ESTIMATES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 235; Ques. (Mr. Blake) 188; for Feb., 429 (i).
- RAILS FOR GOVT. SECTION, B. C.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1914 (iii).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES: M. for Summts.* (Mr. Blake) 100 (i).
- RELIEF OF Co. BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 350 (i).
- RESERVE OF \$960,000 FOR EXTENSION TO QUEBEC: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. Laurier) 533 (i).

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—Continued.

- RETURNS RESPECTING, NUMBER AND COST: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Hesson) 481 (i); Remarks (Mr. Blake) 782, 1565 (ii), 3371 (iv).
- ROLLING STOCK ON WESTERN DIVISION, CHANGE IN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Edgar) 302 (i).
- ROLLING STOCK, PAYMENT OF DUTIES ON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 888 (ii).
- ROUNDHOUSE ON PRIVATE PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2080 (iii).
- ROUTE, ROLLING STOCK, RECEIPTS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).
- SECTION B., AWARD OF \$34,179.17 CREDITS IN PUBLIC ACCTS.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 114 (i).
- SECTION B., AWARD TO CONTRACTORS: M. for copy of Case submitted to Arbitrators (Mr. Casey) 131 (i).
- SECTION B., AWARD TO CONTRACTORS: (Mr. Casey) Ques., 78; M. for copy of Rep. of Judge Clark, 132 (i).
- SECTION B., ARBITRATION, EVIDENCE TAKEN: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 112; M. for copies, 206 (i).
- SECTION B., CASE SUBMITTED TO ARBITRATION: M. for copy (Mr. Casey) 206 (i).
- SECTION B., COPY OF CLAIM PUT IN BY CONTRACTORS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 134 (i).
- SECTION B., ENGINEERS' REPORT ON RE-MEASUREMENT, &C.; M. for Ret. (Mr. Casey) 121 (i).
- SECTION B., OPINION OF COUNSEL AS TO BINDING CHARACTER OF AWARD: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 77 (i).
- SHAREHOLDERS AND STOCK: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Blake) 503 (i).
- SHORT LINE ROUTE TO MARITIME PROVINCES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 33 (i).
- ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION TO QUEBEC: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. Laurier) 533 (i).
- STOCK SOLD FORMERLY PLEDGED FOR A LOAN: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 45 (i).
- SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 3296 (iv).
- SUBSIDY TO THE NORTH SHORE LINE: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
- SUMS PAID OR ADVANCED TO Co. AS INTEREST OR SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1677 (ii).
- TARIFF RATES FOR PASSENGERS, &C., WEST OF WINNIPEG: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Watson) 964 (i).
- TERMINUS ON ATLANTIC OCEAN, SURVEYS OF SEVERAL PROPOSED LINES: M. for Reps. of Engineers (Mr. Lesage) 38 (i).
- TIMBER DUES TO GOVT. BY Co.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 479 (i).
- TOWN SITES, SALES OF: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).
- TRAIN SERVICE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).
- TRESTLES AND BRIDGES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Edgar) 100, 105 (i).
- VAN HORNE, MR., REPORT OF: M. for copy (Mr. Blake) 208 (i).
- VERNON SMITH'S REP. OF SURVEY: M. for copies (Mr. Lesage) 294 (i).
- WESTERN TERMINUS, PLAN OF PROPOSED ROUTE: M. for copy (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- WINNIPEG TO BRANDON, &C., COMPLETION OF MAIN LINE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Watson) 964 (i).
- CANADIAN VOYAGEURS, NAMES, &C.: M. for Stmt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 210 (i).
- CANAL FROM GRAVENHURST BAY TO RIVER SEVERN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Cockburn) 202 (i).
- CANALS. See "SUPPLY," &c.
- Canned Goods B. No. 142 (Mr. Costigan). 1°*, 2345; 2°, 2439; in Com., 2534 (iii), 2767; 3°*, 2767 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 63.)
- CANNED GOODS, LAW RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Gault) 57 (i).
- CAPE BRETON:
- BOUNTY PAID ON FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. McDougall) 1443 (ii).
- CAPE BRETON RY.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2239 (iii); in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).
- CLAIMS UNDER TERMS OF CONFEDERATION: prop. Res. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 607 (i).
- LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS: Ques. (Mr. Dodd) 289 (i).

CAPE BRETON—Continued.

- ROACHE, M., AND PILOTAGE COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3427 (iv).
 TELEGRAPH SYSTEM ON ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 78 (i).
 VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION AND RET. OF MEMBER, 1 (i).
CAPE ST. IGNAKE, STATION AT: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
CAPE TORMENTINE RAILWAY, CONNECTION WITH: Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 2997 (iv).
CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH RY., PAYMENT TO CONTRACTORS FOR CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 694 (i).
CAPITAL ACCOUNT, EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 45 (i).
CARLTON, EVACUATION OF, REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
Carriers by Land B. No. 5 (Mr. *Coughlin*). 1°*, 29; 2° m., 102 (i).
Carriers by Land B. No. 13 (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°*, 40; 2° m., 254, 282; Amt. (Mr. *Curran*) 6 m. h., 285; neg. (Y. 64, N. 74) and 2°*, 289 (i).
CARON, CLOVIS, SALARY AND EXPENSES AS FISHERY OVERSEER: Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,* 532 (i).
CARPET MATS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (ii).
CASCUMPEO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 479 (i).
CASUALTIES ON G. T. R. AND C. P. R. AND BRANCHES: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 226; on I. C. R. (Mr. *Weldon*) 100 (i).
CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN AGENCY: M. for copy of Rep. (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).
CAVALRY SCHOOLS. See "MILITIA."
CENSUS IN MANITOBA AND NORTH-WEST: Ques. (Mr. *Farrow*) 149 (i).
Census, Man., N.W.T., &c., B. No. 21 (Mr. *Pope*). 1° of B. and Res. prop., 46; M. for Com. on Res., 74; in Com. 75; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 125; Res. agreed to and 2° of B., 126; in Com., 171; consdn. m. and Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 212; neg. on a div., 212; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to recom., 213; neg. (Y. 62, N. 120) 215; Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) to recom., 215; neg. on a div., 215; 3°*, 215 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 3*).
Central Bank of N.B. B. No. 40 (Mr. *Temple*). 1°*, 125; 2°*, 180 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 939 (ii). (48-49 *Vic., c. 11*).
CENTRAL ONT. RY. Co's. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458; in Com., 3473 (iv).
Central Prison of Ont. Act Amt. B. No. 129 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1226 (ii); 2°, in Com. and 3°* 2402 (iii). (48-49 *Vic., c. 79*).
CERTIFICATES OF LIQUOR GRANTED IN CO. OF HALTON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67 (i).
CHAINS, IRON OR STEEL: in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
CHANGE OF NAMES IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 2359 (iii).
CHAPLEAU, SHERIFF, COMMUNICATIONS FROM, re OUTBREAK: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
CHARLINGH POST OFFICE, APPOINTMENT OR REMOVAL OF POSTMASTER, &c.: M. for Papers (Mr. *Blake*) 708 (i).
CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 2359 (iii).

- CHENEVERT, J. A., EMPLOYMENT OF BY PUB. WORKS DEPT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 429 (i).
CHERRIER, GEO. E., INDIAN AGENT AT CAUGHNAWAGA, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).
CHINA AND PORCELAIN WARE: in Com. on Ways and Means 847 (ii).
CHINESE COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 29, 211; presented (Mr. *Chapleau*) 234 (i).
CHINESE COMMISSION, ROOMS RENTED AND PAYMENT OF SECRETARY: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 567 (i).
CHINESE COMMISSION: M. for copy of Commission, Names of Commissioners, salary, &c. (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 505, 632 (i).
CHINESE IMMIGRATION: Deb. on prop. Res. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 3002; (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 3011; (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 3013; (Mr. *Gordon*) 3022; (Mr. *Homer*) 3022 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Restriction B. No. 124 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 1037 (ii); withdn., 3023 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Restriction B. No. 156 (Mr. *Chapleau*). Res. (Chinese Interpreter) prop., 2421 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3023; prop. Res. (Poll Tax, &c.) 2497; M. for Com. on Res., 3002; in Com., 3023; 1°* of B., 3323; 2° and in Com., 3050; 3°, 3075 (iv). (48-49 *Vic., c. 71*).
Civil Service Acts Amt. B. No. 31 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°, 101; Res. prop., 210; Res. (Letter Carriers) in Com., 270; Res. (C. S. Examiners, &c.) in Com., 273, 281 (i); conc. m., 889; conc. in, 892; 2° of B. m., 1095; 2° and in Com., 1097-1130, 1281; 3° m., 1282; Amt. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3 m. h., 1282; neg. (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286; Amt. (Mr. *Casey*) to recom., 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) to recom., 1294; neg. (Y. 58, N. 104) 1296; Amt. (Mr. *Davies*) to recom., 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1301; Amt. (Mr. *Lister*) to recom., neg. on same div., 1303; Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) to recom., 1303; neg. on same div., 1304; 3° on a div., 1304 (ii); M. to conc. in Senate Amts., 1823, 2396 (iii). (48-49 *Vic., c. 46*).
CIVIL SERVICE VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3053 (iv).
CHOLERA, PRECAUTIONS AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 568 (i).
CHURCH POINT AND TROUT COVE PIERS, ENGINEERS REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Vail*) 54 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMT. B.: Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 28 (i).
CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYÉS IN B.C., NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).
CLAIMS OF CONTRACTORS OF SEC. B. See "C. P. R."
CLAIMS, &c., OF HALF-BREEDS (Mr. *Blake*). See "HALF-BREEDS."
CLAIM OF STAFF COMMANDER BOLTON. See "BOLTON."
CLAIMS OF MAN.: Mess. from His Ex., 202 (i). See B. 155.
CLARK, G. M. K. (JUDGE) SUMS PAID TO FROM 1879 TO '84: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 697; Ques., 235 (i).
CLARK, JUDGE, REP. re AWARD SEC. B. See "C.P.R."
CLARKE'S CROSSING, ARRIVAL OF TROOPS AT: Telegrams read (Mr. *Caron*) 1205 (ii).

- CLEARING VESSELS WITHOUT HARBOR MASTER'S CERTIFICATE:** Ques. (Mr. *Paint*) 862 (ii).
- CLERK OF THE CROWN IN CHANCERY:** Lists of Vacancies; Writs issued, and New Members returned, 1, 113 (i); 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).
- CLERKS OF WORKS.** See "PUBLIC WORKS."
- CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS:** in Com. of Sup., 2906 (iv).
- CLOVER POINT, B.C., TELEGRAPH CABLE:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii);
- COAL ENTERED EX-WAREHOUSE, FREE, OR FOR EXPORTATION:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 100 (i).
- COAL, SPRING HILL MINES:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 533 (i).
- COAL LANDS, SALES AND LEASES:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i). See "DOMINION LANDS."
- COAL, PURCHASE OF FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS, QUANTITY AND VALUE:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Kirk*) 313 (i).
- COAL, TENDERS TO SUPPLY FOG-WHISTLES, &c., IN BAY OF FUNDY:** M. for copies (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
- COFFIN'S ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, PROTECTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1915 (iii).
- COLLINS, J. E., SUMS PAID TO FOR SERVICES:** M. for Ret., (Mr. *McMullen*) 699 (i).
- Colonial and Indian Exhibition B. No. 126** (Mr. *Pope*). Res. prop., 451 (i); in Com., 892; Res. conc. in and 1° of B., 1064 (ii); 2°, in Com. and 3°, 2399 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 44.)
- COLONIZATION Co.'s MODIFICATION OF AGREEMENTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2241 (iii).
- COLORED LABELS FOR FRUIT:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- Commercial Bank of Windsor B. No. 117** (Sir *Leonard Tilley*). 1°, 832; 2°, 1671; Order dschgd. and B. ref. to Com. on Banking and Commerce, 1677 (ii); in Com. and 3°, 2396 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 84.)
- COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH JAMAICA:** Ques. (Mr. *Laurier*) 2854 (iv).
- COMMITTEES:**
- BANKRUPTCY:** M. for Sp. Com. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 47; Mess. from His Ex. referred to Com., 102 (i).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.:** M. for Com. to supervise, 28 (i).
- LIBRARY:** M. for Joint Com. of both Houses, 36 (i).
- SELECT STANDING:** M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2; M. for Com. to prepare lists, 27; Lists presented, 30; conc. in, 32; Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- COMMISSIONERS ON CHINESE DIFFICULTY IN B. C.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i). See "CHINESE."
- COMMISSIONER TO ENGLAND.** See "HIGH COMMISSIONER."
- COMMISSION, I. C. R.** See "ROBERTSON, J. D."
- COMMISSION ON HALF-BREED CLAIMS.** See "HALF-BREEDS."
- COMMONS.** See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- COMMUNICATION WITH IMP. GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).
- COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I. (Str. *Lansdowne*):** in Com. of Sup., 927.
- COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES:** Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 3321 (iv).
- COMPANIES:**
- AMHERST AND P. E. I. RY. Co.'s B.:** M. to introd. (Mr. *Townsend*) 349 (i).
- BRANTFORD, WATERLOO AND LAKE ERIE RY. Co.** See B. 59.
- CALGARY, EDMONTON AND ATHABASCA LANDING RY. Co.** See B. 78.
- COMPANIES—Continued.**
- CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE Co.'s LIQUIDATION:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
- CANADA CO-OPERATIVE SUPPLY ASSOCIATION.** See B. 81.
- CANADA SOUTHERN RY. Co., &c.** See B. 9.
- CANADIAN PACIFIC EMPLOYEES RELIEF ASSOCIATION.** See B. 75.
- COLONIZATION Co.'s AGREEMENTS, PETITIONS, &c.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i); Ques., 1678 (ii), 2441 (iii).
- DOMINION GRANGE MUTUAL FIRE INSURANCE ASSOCIATION.** See B. 55.
- DOMINION DRAINAGE Co.** See B. 28.
- ERIE AND NIAGARA RY. Co.** See B. 9.
- FORT MACLEOD RANCHE TELEGRAPH Co.** See B. 80.
- FREDERICTON AND ST. MARY'S RY. BRIDGE Co.** See B. 50.
- GREAT WESTERN AND LAKE ONT. SHORE JUNCTION RY. Co.** See B. 38.
- HALIFAX STEAM NAV. Co., MONIES PAID TO:** M. for copies of Repts. &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HAMILTON, GUELPH AND BUFFALO RY. Co.** See B. 77.
- HAMILTON PROVIDENT AND LOAN SOCIETY.** See B. 114.
- HURON AND ONT. SHIP CANAL Co.** See B. 69.
- INSURANCE Co.'s, LOAN Co.'s AND BUILDING SOCIETIES.** See B. 66.
- INTERNATIONAL COAL Co.** See B. 51.
- INTERNATIONAL FERRIES.** See B. 17.
- KOOTENAY RY. Co. OF B.O.** See B. 83.
- LAKE ERIE, ESSEX AND DETROIT RIVER RY. Co.** See B. 24.
- LONDON LIFE INSURANCE Co.** See B. 76.
- MANITOBA CENTRAL RY. Co.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 862 (ii).
- MANITOBA AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. Co. OF CANADA.** See Bs. 74 and 147.
- ONT. PACIFIC RY. Co.** See B. 72.
- PORT CREDIT HARBOR Co., REPORTS MADE TO GOVT.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 124 (i).
- PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE AND LAKE OF THE WOODS RY. AND NAV. Co.** See B. 63.
- QU'APPELLE AND LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND STMBT. Co.** See B. 147.
- RICHELIEU AND ONT. NAVIGATION Co.** See B. 61.
- RIVER ST. CLAIR RY., BRIDGE AND TUNNEL Co.** See B. 8.
- ROCK LAKE, SOURIS AND BRANDON RY. Co.** See B. 110.
- ROYAL CANADIAN INSURANCE Co.** See B. 43.
- RUSH LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RY. AND NAV. Co.** See B. 79.
- SAULT STE. MARIE BRIDGE Co.** See B. 52.
- SOUTH SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY RY. Co.** See B. 37.
- WEST ONT. PACIFIC RY. Co.** See B. 94.
- WINNIPEG AND PRINCE ALBERT RY. Co.** See Bs. 82 and 91.
- WOOD MOUNTAIN AND QU'APPELLE RY. Co.** See B. 23.
[See Bs. 147, 158 and 164.]
- CONALLY, CAPT.** See "DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE."
- CONCURRENCE.** See "SUPPLY."
- CONSOLIDATED FIVE PER CENT. LOAN:** M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
- CONSOLIDATED FUND, RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURE:** M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- Congregational Missionary Societies' Confirmation B. No. 54** (Mr. *Abbott*). 1°, 170; 2°, 259; in Com. and 3°, 490 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 34.)
- Consolid. Inland Revenue Act Amt. B. 146** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 2421; M. for Com. on Res., 2526; in Com., 2528; 1° of B., 2529; 2° m., 2935; 2°, 2536 (iii); in Com., 2968; 3°, 3002; M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., 3435 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 62.)
- Consolid. Insurance Act Amt. B. No. 20** (Sir *Leonard Tilley*). 1°, 46; 2°, 126 (i); in Com., 2430; Order for 3°, 2532; deb. adjd., 2533 (iii); ref. back to Com., 2768; 3°, 2770 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 49.)
- Consolid. Militia Act Amt. B. No. 152** (Mr. *Caron*). 1°, 2853; 2° m., 3045; 2° and in Com., 3046; 3°, 3075 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 72.)

- Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 30** (Mr. *Wells*). 1°, 101 (i).
- Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 35** (Mr. *Bergeron*). 1°*, 113 (i).
- Consolid. Ry. Act, 1879, Amt. B. No. 111** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 742, (i).
- CONSOLID. OF THE STATUTES, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 32 (i).
- CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CAN. TEMP. ACT. See "LUGHRIN."
- CONTRACTS FOR PRINTING SINCE 1867: M. for copies* (Mr. *Rykert*) 246 (i).
- CONTINGENCIES, DEPTL.: in Com. of Sup., 914, 916, 921, 923, 925, 927 (ii).
- Controverted Elections Acts Amt. Bill No. 98** (Mr. *Mulock*). 1°, 605 (i).
- CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS. See "ELECTIONS" and respective Districts; also "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- COPYRIGHT, LAW OF: prop. Res. respecting (Mr. *Edgar*) 708 (i).
- CORRESPONDENTS DISMISSED FROM CAMP. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W."
- CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).
- CORNWALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2997 (iv).
- CORPUS CHRISTI, ADJMT. FOR: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2301 (iii).
- COSTE, LOUIS AND EUGÈNE, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 1131 (ii)
- COTTON BED-QUILTS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- COTTON YARNS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES' SALARIES: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 3075 (iv).
- County Court Judge, Man., Salary Provision B. No. 162** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 3395; in Com. on Res., 3435; 1°* of B, 3436; 2°* in Com. and 3°*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 55.)
- Court of Claims for Canada B. No. 93** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 449 (i); prop. Res., 777 (ii); Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 2439 (iii).
- Court of Ry. Commissioners B. No. 12** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1°, 40 (i).
- Cox, Geo. Branford, Relief B. No. 138** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1° on a div., 1473; 2° on a div., 1566; in Com. and 3°, on a div., 1723 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 85.)
- Criminal Law Amt. B. No. 57** (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 170 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Assault and Battery) B. No. 42** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 125; 2°m., 218; deb. adjd., 219 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Burglary, &c.) B. No. 71** (Mr. *Robinson, Hastings*). 1°, 270 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Burglary, &c) B. No. 136** (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*). 1°, 1335 (ii).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Disorderly Houses) B. No. 56** (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°, 170 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Law of Evidence) B. No. 6** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 29; 2° m., 176; consdn. resmd., 180; Amt. (Mr. *Tupper*) 6 m. h., 182; neg. (Y. 55, N. 87) 187; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 187; in Com., 496; Amt. (Mr. *Amyot*) to recom., neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504; 3°*, 616 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Seduction, &c.) B. No. 123** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 1037 (ii); 2° and in Com., 2767; 3° m., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767; 3°*, 2768 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 82.)
- Criminal Law Amt. (Seduction, &c.) B. No. 27** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°, 76; 2° m., 619 (i).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Summary Convictions) B. No. 41** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°, 125; 2°, 892 (ii).
- Criminal Law Amt. (Summary Proceedings) B. No. 128** (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 1130 (ii); Order for 2° transferred to Govt. Orders, 2420 (iii); 2° m., 2827; 2° and in Com., 2829 (iv).
- Criminal Law Amt. (unguarded Holes in the Ice) B. No. 22** (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*). 1°*, 57; 2°, 131; in Com., 150; Order dschgd. and ref. to Sel. Com., 496 (i).
- CRIMINAL LAWS OF CANADA, 1869-1871, PUBLICATION OF IN FRENCH: Ques. (Mr. *Gigault*) 246 (i).
- CRIMINAL LIBEL. "See SAUNDERS AND WOOD."
- CRIMINAL STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (ii).
- CRITICISMS OF PRESS AS TO CAUSE OF DISTURBANCES IN THE NORTH-WEST, AND SLUR UPON FRENCH MEMBERS COMMANDING BATTALIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 887 (ii)
- CROZIER, SUPT., REP. OF *re* INDIAN SYMPATHY WITH HALF-BREEDS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- Cruelty to Animals Prevention B. No. 47** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 147 (i).
- CULLERS, SUPERVISOR OF. See "SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS."
- Culling and Measuring Timber Acts Amt. B. No. 154** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 2419; M. for Com. on Res., 2475 (iii); 1°, 2° and in Com., 3043; 3°*, 3075 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 65.)
- CUMBERLAND: Vacancy in the Representation, Warrant issued and Return of Member to represent, 1 (i).
- Customs and Excise Duties Acts Amt. B. No. 157** (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°, 3250; 2°*, 3434; in Com. and 3°*, 3435 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 61.)
- CUSTOMS AND EXCISE:
- ANIMAL CHARCOAL, IMPORTATIONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Stairs*) 533 (i).
- APPRAISER AND INLAND REV. COLLECTOR AT SUMMERSIDE: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- BEE-TROOT SUGAR, IMPORTATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 744 (i).
- BONDED MACHINERY IN USE: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 3320 (iv).
- BROUSEAU & LISABELLE, FRAUDS BY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).
- COLLECTIONS IN ALGOMA: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Dawson*) 39 (i).
- CUSTOMS AND EXCISE DUTIES. See B. 157.
- CUSTOMS AND EXCISE RECEIPTS FOR JUNE: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3073 (iv).
- DETECTIVES OR POLICE IN N S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 889 (ii).
- DRAWBACKS ON MANUFACTURED EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
- DUTIES, COLLECTION OF UNAUTHORISED: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 427 (i).
- DUTIES, IMPOSITION OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 1443 (ii).
- DUTY ON GRAIN, ABOLITION OF: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 64 (i).

CUSTOMS AND EXCISE—Continued.

- EXCISE DUTIES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 3394; conc., 3470 (iv).
 EXCISE REVENUE FOR 6 MONTHS, 1884-85: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 290 (i).
 EXCISE REVENUE FOR MAY, 1884 AND 1885: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2531 (iii).
 EXPORT DUTY ON OAK, PINE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1442 (ii).
 FINES EXACTED, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
 FLOUR AND CORNMEAL, INCREASED DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 148 (i).
 FLOUR, CORN, &c., IMPORTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 56 (i).
 FRENCH CANADIAN EMPLOYÉS IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1914; (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).
 IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
 MACKENZIE, J. L., VIOLATION OF CUSTOMS LAWS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).
 MACKINLEY, A. & W., SCHOOL BOOKS ENTERED UNDER VALUE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).
 MONTREAL, SEIZURES AT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).
 PORT MULGRAVE AS A SUB-PORT: M. for Papers (Mr. *Kirk*) 2750 (iv).
 PRISON MANUFACTURES, IMPORTATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2169 (iii).
 RAILS, IMPORTATION OF BY G.T.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1568 (ii).
 RICE, INCREASED DUTIES ON: Ques. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 695 (i).
 RICHIBUCTO AND KINGSTON PORTS, CUSTOMS BUSINESS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1442 (ii).
 RIDGETOWN AS A PORT OF ENTRY, PETS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Casey*) 532 (ii).
 SCHOOL BOOKS CONSIGNED BY NELSON & SON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wallace*) 1443 (ii).
 SEIZURES AT N.S. PORTS OF ENTRY: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Stairs*) 532 (i).
 SPIRITS TAKEN OUT OF BOND: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3371; Stmt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 3395 (iv).
 ST. CROIX COTTON MILLS, PAYMENT OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 632 (i).
 TORONTO, SEIZURE OF SCHOOL BOOKS AT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).
 WHEAT AND FLOUR DUTIES, MEMORIALS: M. for copies* (Mr. *Pater-son, Brant*) 532 (i).
 WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTS AND EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Pater-son, Brant*) 138 (i).
 WHEAT, FLOUR, CORNMEAL AND CORN, DUTIES IN N.S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 533 (i).
 WINES, SPIRITS, ALE, &c., IMPORTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rykert*) 313 (i).
 WINNIPEG, SEIZURES AT: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Pater-son, Brant*) 293 (i); M. for Ret.* 1443 (ii).
 [See "WAYS AND MEANS."]
 CUTLERY: in Com. on Ways and Means, 845 (ii).
 DAMASK OF COTTON: in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (ii).
 DAMS AT LAKEFIELD AND YOUNG'S POINT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1130 (ii).
Davis, Amanda Esther, Relief B. No. 84 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1° on a div., 226; M. to fix day for 2° agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 226; 2° on a div., 567; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 37*)
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP: M. (Mr. *Bowell*) for Sel. Com., 28; First Rep. presented (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 32; M. to conc. in Second Rep., 40; Delay in distributing Daily Issue to Newspapers, 595; Delay in distributing French Translation, 746 (ii); Ms. to conc. in Third Rep., 2168 (iii), 3359; Omissions from, 3249, 3474; M. to conc. in Fourth Rep., 3458; in Com. of Sup., 2765, conc., 3372 (iv).
 DEBT OF THE DOMINION. See "CAPITAL ACCOUNT."

- DEBT OF CANADA, FLOATING AND UNFUNDED: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
 DEBT, FLOATING AND UNSECURED, OF C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 219 (i), 1677 (ii).
 DEBT OF NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING Co. TO C.P.R.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 145.
 DE CHENE, CAPT. A. M., ENQUIRY RESPECTING: M. for copies of Complaint* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
 DEEPENING OF BRAS ST. NICHOLAS: M. for copies of Pets., (Mr. *Langelier*) 312 (i).
 DEEP-WATER FISHERIES OFF COAST OF B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 3073 (iv).
 DELANEY, GOWANLOCK AND OTHER PRISONERS, RESCUE OF: Telegram from Gen. Middleton (read) 2357 (iii).
 DEPTL. CLERKS, DELAY IN PAYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
 DEPTL. CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 914-927 (ii).
 DEPOSITS, GOVT. See "BANKS AND BANKING."
 DEPUTY SPEAKER: M. appointing Malachy Daly, Esq., (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 72 (i); SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3351, 3358 (iv). See B. 26.
 DESAULNIERS, MR. A. L.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
 DESPATCHES, OFFICIAL, RESPECTING ENGAGEMENTS IN THE N.W., 2169, 2199 (iii).
 DESPATCHES. See "MIDDLETON, GENL."
 DETECTIVES, CUSTOMS, IN N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 889 (ii).
 DEWDNEY, LIEUT.-GOV., COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 DIGBY PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).
 DINGMAN, M. A. See "INDIANS."
 DISALLOWANCE OF PROVINCIAL ACTS: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 52 (i).
 DISCOVERY ISLAND, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE ON: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).
 Disorderly Houses, B. No. 56 (Mr. *Ouimet*). 1°*, 170 (i).
 DISPUTE BETWEEN MR. TILTON AND STAFF COMMANDER BOLTON: M. for Rep. of Auditor Genl. (Mr. *McMullen*) 135; M. for Ret.* 312 (i).
 DISPUTED BOUNDARIES OF ONT., IMPERIAL LEGISLATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 51, 115 (i); 2854, 2998, 3321; on M. for Com. of Sup., 3437 (iv).
 DISPUTED TER., INDIAN TITLE TO, INFORMATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 594 (i).
 DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.:
 ANDRÉ FATHER, LETTER FROM, IN JAN., 1883: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 ARMS, DESCRIPTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 814 (ii). —
 ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES OF MILITIAMEN: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 894 (ii).
 ASSISTANCE TO SETTLERS THROUGH REBELLION: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 2854 (iv).
 BATOCHÉ, CAPTURE OF, RUMORED INDIGNITIES COMMITTED BY VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Mr. *Dejardins*) 2998; Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 3425 (iv).
 BATOCHÉ, ENGAGEMENT AT, DESPATCH RESPECTING: Read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1380 (ii).

DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.—Continued.

- BATTLE OF BATOCHÉ, TELEGRAM FROM GENL. MIDDLETON, GIVING DETAILS: Read (Mr. Caron) 1822; second despatch, 1835 (iii).
- BIG BEAR, RELEASE OF PRISONERS BY: Tel. read (Mr. Caron) 2750 (iv).
- CARRIAGE OF WAR SUPPLIES BY AMERICAN RAILWAYS, 839 (ii).
- CHAPLEAU, SHERIFF, COMMUNICATIONS FROM, *re* OUTBREAK: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- CIVIL SERVICE VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Mr. Edgar) 3043 (iv).
- CLARK'S CROSSING, ARRIVAL OF TROOPS AT: Telegrams read (Mr. Caron) 1205 (ii).
- COMPENSATION FOR LOSSES: Ques. (Mr. Ross) 3321 (iv).
- CORRESPONDENTS, DISMISSAL OF FROM CAMP: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1608 (ii).
- COST OF EXPEDITION: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 1678 (ii).
- CROWFOOT, COMMUNICATION FROM: Read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1038 (ii).
- CROZIER, SUPT., REP. OF, *re* INDIAN SYMPATHY WITH HALF-BREDS: Ques. (Mr. Blake), 3425 (iv).
- DREWDRY, GOV. COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- DUMAS, MICHEL, APPOINTMENT OF AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- DUMONT, GABRIEL: EXTRADITION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2358; FERRY LICENSE GRANTED TO: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- DUCK LAKE, ENGAGEMENT AT: Telegram read and Despatch of Troops, 790 (ii).
- DUCK LAKE, REP. OF FIGHT AT: Ques. (Mr. Trow) 1743 (iii).
- EXPENSES. *See* B. 149.
- FORT PITT, DISASTER AT: Confirmation of News (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1281: Tel., 1301 (ii).
- FREE TRANSPORT OF BODIES OF VOLUNTEERS KILLED: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2029 (iii).
- FROG LAKE, MASSACRE AT: Stmt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 994 (ii).
- FUNERAL EXPENSES OF ACHILLE BLAIS: Ques. (Mr. Langlier) 2169 (iii).
- GATLING GUNS FOR USE OF TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. Robertson, Hastings) 813 (ii).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS IN THE N.W., COMMUNICATIONS WITH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- GRANDIN, BISHOP, COMMUNICATION FROM: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3321, 3423 (iv).
- HALF-BREED COMMISSION: Letter read from Mr. Street (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1607; work of (remarks) 1566 (ii).
- HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION IN 1884: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- IMP. GOVT., COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1744 (iii).
- INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS IN THE FIELD: Prop. M. (Mr. White, Cardwell) 813 (ii).
- INDIANS AT FT. QU'APPELLE, LOYALTY OF: Telegram read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1320 (ii).
- INDIANS AT TOUCHWOOD: Telegram read (Mr. Caron) 1566 (ii).
- INSURGENTS, DISPOSITION OF, BY GENL. MIDDLETON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2169 (iii).
- ISBISTER, JAMES, APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- LEDUC, FATHER, AND MR. MALONEY, COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVERNMENT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- LUXURIES FOR THE VOLUNTEERS, FORWARDING OF: Remarks, 968 (ii).
- MEMORIALS, &c., RESPECTING GRIEVANCES, ANSWERS TO: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- MIDDLETON, GENL., INSTRUCTIONS ISSUED TO, RESPECTING INSURGENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2169 (iii). *See* "MIDDLETON" FOR DESPATCHES.
- MONTREAL GARRISON ARTILLERY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1566 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE OFFICERS, REPS. FROM OF ENGAGEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, RES. *re* HALF-BREED CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- OFFICIAL DESPATCHES RESPECTING ENGAGEMENTS, 2169 (iii), 2999 (iv).
- PRINCE ALBERT AND ST. LAURENT SETTLEMENTS, REPS. OF MESSRS. RUSSELL AND ALDOUS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- PRINCE ALBERT COLONIZATION CO.'S LAND, SETTLERS AND SQUATTERS IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).

DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.—Continued.

- ORGANIZATION OF COMPANIES IN THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1474; Remarks (Mr. Watson) 816 (ii).
- OTTER'S, COL., MARCH TO BATTLEFORD: Remarks (Mr. Caron) 1386 (ii).
- OUIMET'S, COL., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Remarks (Mr. Caron) 1167, 1205 (ii).
- PILLAGE OF HOUSES OF HALF-BREDS BY VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. Langlier) 2169 (iii).
- PERSONAL EXPLANATION (Mr. Caron) 966; Remarks, 968 (ii).
- PETITIONS AND RES., &c., HALF-BREDS AND SETTLERS CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- POUNDMAKER AND OTHER INDIANS, DESPATCH FROM GENL. MIDDLETON ANNOUNCING CAPTURE: Read (Mr. Caron) 2139 (iii).
- POUNDMAKER, SKIRMISH WITH: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 1646; Telegram from Herchmer: Read (Sir John A. Macdonald) 1649 (ii).
- PRISONERS, SURRENDER OF, BY POUNDMAKER: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2085 (iii).
- PRISONERS HELD FOR TRIAL: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3449 (iv).
- QU'APPELLE HALF-BREDS, REP. OF MR. WALSH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- RAID ON HOUSES AT BATTLEFORD: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald) 889 (ii).
- RELIEF OF DESTITUTE FAMILIES (remarks) 3321.
- RELIGIOUS RITES REFUSED PRISONERS: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 2998 (iv).
- RESCUE OF MRS. DELANEY, GOWANLOCK AND OTHER PRISONERS: Telegram from Genl. Middleton read (Mr. Caron) 2357 (iii).
- REWARDS FOR BRAVERY: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 2358 (iii).
- RIEL, CAPTURE OF, TELEGRAM FROM GENERAL MIDDLETON: Read (Mr. Caron) 1895 (vol. iii).
- RIEL'S PROPOSAL TO ACCEPT MONEY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
- RIEL, TRIAL OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2358 (iii).
- RIVER LOT CLAIMS, SETTLEMENT OF, MR. PEARCE'S LETTER RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- ST. LAURENT, LAND AND SURVEYS OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- ST. LOUIS DE LANGEVIN, PET. FROM SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- SCHMIDT, ANSWER TO LETTER OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- SCOTT'S, COL., BATTALION: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 1064 (ii).
- STONEY INDIAN RISING: Stmt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 863 (ii).
- SURVEYS OF RIVER LOTS AT ST. ALBERT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424; mode of (Ques.) 3424 (iv).
- TACHÉ, ARCHBISHOP, COMMUNICATION FROM *re* HALF-BREDS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- TRIAL OF PRISONERS: Remarks (Mr. Laurier) 3440 (iv).
- TROOPS, MOVEMENTS OF, 838, 872, 887; Telegram from Col. AMYOT, 1328 (ii).
- VÉGREVILLE, FATHER, COR. WITH MR. DEVILLE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- VICTORIA RIFLES, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Curran) 1983 (iii).
- VOLUNTEERS, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2029, 2170 (iii); in Com. on Res., 3370 (iv).
- VOTE OF THANKS TO GENL. MIDDLETON AND VOLUNTEERS: (Mr. Caron) 3459; Res., 3463 (iv).
- WANT OF CONFIDENCE RES. *See* "WAYS AND MEANS."
- WAR SUPPLIES, CARRIAGE OF, BY AMERICAN RAILWAYS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 836 (ii).
- WILLIAMS, COL., DEATH OF: Remarks (Mr. Caron) and Tel. read from Genl. Middleton, 3073 (iv).

[*See* "HALF-BREDS," "DOMINION LANDS," &c.]

DIVISIONS:

- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE N.W.T. B. 141 (Sir John A. Macdonald): on M. to conc. in Res., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 37, N. 67) 2957; on M. for consn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Mills) neg. (Y. 37, N. 79) 2968; on M. for 3^d, Amt. (Mr. Mills) 3000; neg. (Y. 35, N. 89) 3433 (iv).
- ADULTERATION OF FOOD, DRUGS, &c. B. 143 (Mr. Costigan): on M. to conc. in Amts. from Com. of W., Amt. (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 42, N. 60) 2751 (iv).

DIVISIONS—Continued.

ANIMALS, INFECTIOUS, &c., DISEASES AFFECTING B. 44 (Mr. Pope): on M. for 3^o, Amts. to recom. (Mr. Sutherland, Oxford) 1321; agreed to (Y. 131, N. 16) 1324; (Mr. Mulock) 1324; neg. (Y. 54, N. 90) 1327; (Mr. Catudal) 1327; neg. (Y. 58, N. 89) 1328; (Mr. Casey) 1328; neg. (Y. 54, N. 94) 1332; (Mr. Armstrong) 1332; neg. (Y. 50, N. 88) 1334; (Mr. Davies) neg. (Y. 50, N. 84) 1334 (ii).

BREWERS AND DISTILLERS, COMPENSATION TO: Prop. Res. (Mr. Kranz) 236; Amt. (Mr. Fisher) agreed to (Y. 105, N. 74) 253 (i).

CANADA TEMP. ACT, 1878, AMT. B. 92 (Mr. Jamieson): on M. for 2^o, Amt. (Mr. Ives) 951; neg. (Y. 17, N. 109) 954; 2^o agreed to (Y. 108, N. 15) 954; on M. to conc. in Amts. from Com., Amt. (Mr. Burpee) 1047; neg. (Y. 49, N. 86) 1050; on M. for 3^o, Amts. to recom. (Mr. Hickey) 1051; agreed to (Y. 68, N. 64) 1054; (Mr. White, Cardwell) 1059; neg. (Y. 39, N. 78) 1062 (ii); on consdn. of Sen. Amts., Amt. (Mr. Jamieson) 2645; neg. (Y. 75, N. 84) 2647; Amt., 2648; neg. (Y. 54, N. 108) 2651; Amt. neg. (Y. 75, N. 90) 2652; Amt. (Mr. Small) 2660; neg. (Y. 78, N. 86) 2670 (iv).

C. P. R. CO.'S ACTS AMT. B. 153 (Mr. Pope): on M. for Com. on Res., Amt. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2643; neg. (Y. 51, N. 100) 2723; on M. to rec. rep. of Com. on Res., Amts. (Mr. Charlton) 2860; neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 2861 (Mr. Casey) 2862; neg. (Y. 55, N. 91) 2863; (Mr. Laurier) 2863; neg. Y. 55, N. 89) 2864; (Mr. Weldon) 2864; neg. (Y. 53, N. 89) 2865; (Mr. Watson) 2865, neg. (Y. 51, N. 93) 2868; 3^o agreed to (Y. 77, N. 45) 3294 (iv).

C. P. R. TRESTLES AND BRIDGES: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Edgar) 100; Amt. (Mr. McLelan) agreed to (Y. 101, N. 54) 112 (i).

CENSUS OF MAN., N.W.T., &c., B. 21 (Mr. Pope): on consdn. of B., Amt. to recom. (Sir Richard Cartwright), 213; neg. (Y. 62, N. 120) 215 (i).

CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE'S RULING: Appeal (Mr. Edgar) from decision to House; Ruling sustained (Y. 78, N. 46) 1513 (ii); (Mr. Cameron, Huron) Ruling sustained (Y. 67, N. 41) 1924 (iii).

CIVIL SERVICE ACTS AMT. B. 31 (Mr. Chapleau): on M. for 3^o, Amt. 3 m.h. (Mr. Mitchell) 1282; neg. (Y. 67, N. 112) 1286; Amts. to recom. (Mr. Casey) 1291; neg. (Y. 59, N. 107) 1293; (Mr. Blake) 1294; neg. (Y. 58, N. 104) 1296; (Mr. Davies) 1297; neg. (Y. 57, N. 103) 1301; (Messrs. Lister and Mulock) 1303; neg. on same div. (ii).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (LAW OF EVIDENCE) B. 6 (Mr. Cameron, Huron): on M. for 2^o, Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. Tupper) 182; neg. (Y. 55, N. 87) 187; on M. for 3^o, Amt. to recom. (Mr. Amyot) neg. (Y. 34, N. 76) 504 (i).

CRIMINAL LAW AMT. (OFFENCES AGAINST THE PERSON) B. 123 (Sir John A. Macdonald): on M. for 2^o, Amt. (Mr. Charlton) raising age of consent in girls, neg. (Y. 58, N. 72) 2767 (iv).

DAVIS, AMANDA ESTHER, RELIEF B. 84 (Mr. White, Cardwell): M. to fix day for 2^o agreed to (Y. 86, N. 61) 226 (i).

DEBATES, OFFICIAL REPS.: on M. (Mr. White, Cardwell) to conc. in Third Rep., Amt. (Mr. Tasse) 3685; neg. (Y. 18, N. 127) 3689; Amt. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 3361; neg. (Y. 63, N. 82) 3369; Amt. (Mr. Hickey) neg. (Y. 53, N. 91) 3370 (iv).

EXCHANGE BANK, GOVT. ADVANCES TO: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) censuring Govt., 363; neg. (Y. 59, N. 118) 394 (i).

FACTORIES REGULATION, &c., OF LABOR B. 85 (Mr. Bergin): on M. to same adjd. deb., Amt. to substitute B. 92 (Can. Temp. Act) 940; agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (ii).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B. 103 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 2^o, Amt (Sir Richard Cartwright) 1137; neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) 1166; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; 2^o agreed to (Y. 111, N. 63) 1277; on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. Charlton) neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) 3053; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058; (Mr. Weldon) 3058; neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060; (Mr. Watson) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. Mulock) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062; Amts. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; (Mr. Burpee) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063; (Mr. Trow) 3063; neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064; (Mr. Armstrong) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064; (Mr. Somerville, Brant) neg.

DIVISIONS—Continued.

(Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; (Messrs. McCraney and Innes) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; (Messrs. Cameron [Middlesex] and Langelier) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066; (Messrs. Lister and Cameron, Huron) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3067; (Messrs. Weldon and Fairbank) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; (Messrs. Paterson [Brant] and Gillmor) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3069; (Messrs. Holton and Fisher) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070; on M. for 3^o, Amt. 3 m. h. (Mr. Mills) 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072 (iv).

HALF-BREED GRIEVANCES: Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 756; (Y. 57, N. 122) 771 (i); Res. (Mr. Blake) censuring Govt., 3110; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213 (iv).

HATZFELD, GEO. LOUIS EMIL, DIVORCE B. 107 (Mr. Kilvert): 2^o agreed to (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (i).

LAND GRANTS TO RYS. B. 147 (Sir Hector Langevin) on Order for 3^o, Amts. (Mr. Blake) 2890; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; further Amts. (Mr. Blake) neg. on same div., 2894 (iv).

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT B. 139 (Sir John A. Macdonald) on M. for 3^o, Amt. (Mr. Laurier) neg. (Y. 51, N. 85) 2763; 3^o on same div. reversed, 2763 (iv).

PATENT ACT, 1873, AMT. B. 25 (Mr. White, Renfrew) 2^o m., 266; neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (i).

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2868; neg. (Y. 42, N. 79) 2889 (iv).

REPRESENTATION OF THE N. W. T. IN PARLT.: Res. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404; neg. (Y. 35, N. 77) 3408 (iv).

SHORT LINE RY., MONTREAL TO ATLANTIC: Prop. Res. (Mr. Laurier) 189; M. to adjn. deb. agreed to (Y. 104, N. 49) 200 (i).

SPEAKER, DEPUTY, APPOINTMENT B. 26 (Sir John A. Macdonald): on Prop. Res., Amt. to ref. to Sel. Com. (Mr. Blake) 70; neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72 (i).

SUBSIDIES, FURTHER, TO RYS. B. 158 (Sir Hector Langevin): on M. to conc. in Amts. from Com. of W., Amts. (Mr. Kirk) 3401; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403; (Mr. Blake) neg. (Y. 43, N. 78) 3404; Amt. (Mr. Laurier) 3057; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. Langelier) 3266; neg. (Y. 39, N. 101) 3292; (Mr. Lesage) 3292; neg. (Y. 38, N. 101) 3292; Amt. (Mr. Langelier) neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 2292 (iv).

SUPREME COURT APPELLATE JURISDICTION LIMITATION B. 3 (Mr. Landry, Montmagny): 2^o m., 151; neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (i).

WASHINGTON TREATY AND RECIPROCITY: Res. (Mr. Davies) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 995; neg. (Y. 58, N. 98) 1023 (ii).

DIVORCE:

COURT, CREATION OF A: Ques. (Mr. Farrow) 77 (i).

COX, GEORGE BRANFORD. See B. No. 142.

DAVIS, AMANDA ESTHER. See B. No. 84.

EVANS, ALICE ELVIRA. See B. No. 106.

EVIDENCE IN CASES: Remarks (Mr. Jackson) 428 (i).

HATZFELD, GEORGE LOUIS EMIL. See B. No. 107.

TERRY, FAIRY EMILY JANE. See B. No. 97.

DODGE, BRENTON, OF KENTVILLE, N.S., DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Moffat) 1442 (ii).

DOMINION AND PROVINCIAL FRANCHISES, DESPATCH FROM MR. FIELDING: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2170 (iii).

"DOMINION ANNUAL REGISTER," PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. McCraney) 1443 (ii).

DOMINION BUILDINGS IN CHARLOTTETOWN, CONSTRUCTION OF: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 1039 (ii).

DOMINION DAY, SITTING OF THE HOUSE ON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2773 (iv).

Dominion Drainage Co.'s incorp. B. No. 28 (Mr. Haggart). 1^o*, 88; 2^o*, 113 (i); M. for Com., 1007; deb. adjd., 1008; M. for Com., 1386 (ii); in Com. and 3^o*, 3053 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 95.)

DOMINION EXHIBITION: in Com. of Sup., 1026 (ii).

Dominion Grange Mutual Fire Insurance Association B. No. 55 (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1°*, 170; 2°*, 246 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1210 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 93.)

DOMINION LANDS:

AGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).
 AGRICULTURAL, TIMBER, PASTURE AND MINERAL LANDS AND TOWN SITES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).
 BELL & KAVANAGH LAND CLAIMS: M. for copies of O. C. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 479 (i).
 COAL LANDS, SALES AND LEASES: M. for Stmtt.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).
 DUMONT'S LOT ON THE SASKATCHEWAN: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii).
 FORESTS, PROTECTION OF, J. H. MORGAN'S REP.: M. for copies (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).
 FRAUDS, &c., IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915, 2170 (iii).
 FRAUDS AND IRREGULARITIES IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915, 2170 (iii).
 GRAZING LAND LEASES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).
 HOMESTEADS WITHIN RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 479 (i).
 INDIAN LANDS ACQUIRED BY GOVT. IN ONT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 632 (i).
 INDIAN LANDS SOLD IN VIGER AGENCY: M. for Stmtt.* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).
 INDIAN LANDS UNSOLD IN CO. OF PEEL: M. for List (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).
 INDIAN LANDS UNSOLD IN TP. OF TORONTO: M. for List* (Mr. *Fleming*) 147 (i).
 INDIAN LANDS UNSOLD IN TRAFALGAR: M. for List* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).
 INDIAN RESERVES IN B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 703 (i); Purchase of by Govt.: M. for copies of Cor., &c.,* 1443 (ii).
 ISLANDS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE, LEASE OF, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 147 (i).
 LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 92. See B. 147.
 LANDS IN RY. BELT, B.C., AND HOMESTEAD ACT: Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 289 (i).
 LAND SALES, RECEIPTS ON ACCOUNT OF: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2854 (iv).
 LAND SALES, &c., SOUTH OF 24-MILE BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 2530 (iii).
 LANDS SOLD OR LEASED FOR TIMBER, LOGS, &c.: M. for Stmtt.* (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 40 (i).
 MINING AND TIMBER LANDS NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Mills*) 68 (i).
 MORGAN, J. H., APPOINTMENT AS FORESTRY COMMISSIONER: M. for O.C., &c.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).
 PATENTS ISSUED TO SETTLERS IN PRINCE ALBERT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 964 (ii).
 PLANS AND SURVEYS OF ST. LAURENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).
 PRINCE ALBERT COLON. CO.'S TOWNSHIP SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
 PRINCE ALBERT, CLAIMS OF SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii), 2358 (iv).
 QU'APPELLE VALLEY FARMING CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 816 (ii).
 RY. LANDS IN B.C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443.
 REVENUE FOR SEVEN MONTHS, 1884-85: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 299 (i).
 RICHELIEU COUNTY, DOM. PROPERTIES: M. for Stmtt.* (Mr. *Massue*) 147 (i).
 RIVER LOT CLAIMS, N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).
 SALES FOR 1884-85: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3072 (iv).
 SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
 SIMPSON, G. A., GOVT. LAND AGENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 57 (i).
 SQUATTERS IN QU'APPELLE VALLEY: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 205 (i).
 SURVEYS AND PLANS, BATTLEFORD AND EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2357 (iii).
 SURVEYS AND EXAMINATION OF RETURNS: in Com. of Sup., 3344 (iv).

DOMINION LANDS—Continued.

ST. ALBERT RIVER LOTS, SURVEYS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).
 ST. LAURENT, SURVEYS OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).
 TIMBER DUES IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2240.
 TIMBER LICENSES OR BERTHS IN B.C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 210 (i).
 TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 30, 121 (i), 863 (ii).
 [See also "HALF-BREEDS" and "INDIANS."]
 DOMINION LICENSE ACT, WORKING OF: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 307 (i).
 DOMINION NOTES, ISSUE AND REDEMPTION: in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
 DOMINION RIFLE ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).
 DOMINION PROPERTIES IN COUNTY OF RICHELIEU: M. for Stmtt.* (Mr. *Massue*) 147.
 DOMINION STEAMERS. See "MARINE," "SUPPLY," &c.
 DOMINION SUBSIDIES TO THE PROVS.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Aymot*) 303 (i). See "SUBSIDIES."
 DOUTRE, J., re HALIFAX COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).
 DRAWBACKS ON MANUFACTURED EXPORTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
 DRAWBACK ON SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 100 (i).
 DREDGES, TUGS, AND SCOWS, BUILDING OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 53 (i).
 DREDGES, TUGS, BARGES, &c., ON RED RIVER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).
 DRILL PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2910 (iv).
 DRILL SHED AT QUEBEC, TENDERS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).
 DRUGGISTS' LICENSES UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT: Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 1306 (ii).
 Dry Docks, Encouragement of Construction, B. No. 108 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°, 693 (i); 2° and in Com., 894; 3°*, 895 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 5). See B. 7.
 DRUGS. See "ADULTERATION."
 DUCK: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).
 DUCK LAKE, ENGAGEMENT AT, REP. OF: Telegrams read (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 790; Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1567 (ii); (Mr. *Trow*) 1743 (iii).
 DUMAS, MICHEL, APPOINTMENT OF AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE FOG-HORN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).
 DUMONT, EXTRADITION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2358 (iii).
 DUMONT, GABRIEL, FERRY LICENSE GRANTED TO: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 DUNDAS AND WATERLOO MACADAMIZED ROAD, SALE OF BY GOVT.: M. for copies of Papers, &c. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).
 Dundas and Waterloo Road Sale and Transfer B. No. 120 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 451 (i); conc. in and 1°* of B., 892 (ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 2396 (iii).
 DUNDAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 290 (i).

- DUTIES, COLLECTION OF UNAUTHORIZED:** Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 427 (i).
- DUTIES, IMPOSITION OF, IN OLD PROV. OF CANADA:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 1443 (ii).
- DUTIES OF CUSTOMS AND EXCISE.** See "CUSTOMS."
- DUTY ON GRAIN, ABOLITION OF:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
- DUTIES ON FISH EXPORTED TO THE U.S.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (i).
- DUTIES ON HAY, COR. BETWEEN CANADA AND U.S.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Irvine*) 443 (i).
- DUTIES COLLECTED ON WHEAT, FLOUR, &c., IN N.S.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 533 (i).
- DYNAMITE, LEGISLATION RESPECTING:** Ques. (Mr. *Farrow*) 57 (i).
- EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES, C.P.R.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 816 (ii).
- EARTHENWARE AND STONWARE:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (ii).
- EARNINGS, C.P.R., MAIN LINE AND LEASED LINES:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- EASTER, ADJMT. FOR:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 713 (i); M. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 888 (ii).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RY., EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES:** Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 148; M. FOR STMT.* 313 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3384 (iv).
- EASTERN SECTION C.P.R., QUANTITIES, &c., ENGINEERS' ESTIMATES:** M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 299, 302 (i).
- EDGAR, MR. J. D.:** Certificate and Election and Return of, 1.
- EDUCATION OF INDIANS AND HALF-BREEDS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Kirk*) 1443 (ii).
- EDMONTON AND SASKATCHEWAN LAND CO.'S AGENT:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii); Tp. Surveys, 2171 (iii).
- EGYPT.** See "VOYAGEURS."
- ELECTION EXPENSES:** in Com. of Sup., 3451 (iv).
- Election of Members Acts Amt. B. No. 14** (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°, 41 (i).
- ELECTIONS, CONTROVERTED:**
- LENNOX: Judge's Rep. and Certificate, 1.
 - LEVIS: Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i).
 - NORTHUMBERLAND: Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i).
 - SOULANGES: Judgment of Supreme Court, 1.
 - WEST MIDDLESEX: Judge's Rep. and Judgment, 1.
- ELECTIONS SINCE GENERAL ELECTION, 1878:** Date of certificates, date of receipt, issue of Speaker's warrants, receipt, &c., M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- Electoral Franchise.** See "FRANCHISE."
- ELGIN COUNTY JUDGE, CASE OF:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 93 (i).
- ELGIN STATION, L'ISLET, ERECTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 148 (i).
- ELGIN.** See "REFUND OF BONUSES."
- EMERSON, TOWN OF, GOVT. AID TO:** Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 148; M. for copies of Claims, &c.,* 448 (i).
- Employment of Prisoners.** See "PRISON LABOR."
- Employment of Women and Children in Factories B. No. 2** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°, 29; Order for 2° dachgd, 362 (i). See B. 85.
- EQUIPMENT OF THE 90TH BATTALION:** Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 2854 (iv).
- Erie and Niagara Ry. Co.** See "CANADA SOUTHERN."
- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK, LENGTH OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 743; SUBSTITUTION OF GRANITE FOR SANDSTONE: Ques., 743 (i). See B. 7.
- ESSEX CENTRE TO KINGSVILLE HARBOR RY. SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458 (iv).
- ESTIMATES, THE, FOR 1885-86, PRESENTED:** (Mr. *Bowell*) 289 (i); Suppl., 3359; Further Suppl., 3423; Suppl. for 1884-85, 2820 (iv).
- ETCHEMIN RIVER LINE, SURVEY OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 350 (i).
- Evans, Alice Elvira Relief B. No. 106** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 39).
- EXCHANGE BANK, GOVT. ADVANCES:** Res. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) censuring Govt., 295, deb. rsmd., 363; (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 367, 391; (Mr. *Holton*) 368; (Mr. *Casgrain*) 369; (Mr. *Mulock*) 370; (Mr. *Ives*) 372; (Mr. *Blake*) 373; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 380; (Mr. *Davies*) 384; (Mr. *Macmaster*) 387; (Messrs. *Lister and McMullen*) 390; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 392; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 393 (i).
- EXCHANGE BANK OF CANADA, GOVT. CLAIM AGAINST:** Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 89 (i).
- EXCISE DUTIES:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 3294; cond., 3470 (iv).
- EXCISE.** See "CUSTOMS."
- EXHIBITIONS.** See "ANTWERP," "COLONIAL" and "DOMINION."
- EVIDENCE IN CRIMINAL CASES:** Deb. on M. for 2° of B. 6 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 176; (Mr. *Tupper*) 180; on Amt. 6 m. h. (Mr. *Woodworth*) 182; (Mr. *Lister*) 184; (Mr. *Beaty*) 185; (Mr. *Fleming*) 186 (i). See B. 6.
- EVIDENCE IN DIVORCE CASES:** Remarks (Mr. *Jackson*) 428 (i).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., CANALS, &c., IN B. C., N. W. T. AND OTHER PROVINCES:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE ON ACCOUNT OF C. P. R.:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT:** M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 145 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON BRANCH LINES OF C. P. R., &c., COST OF EQUIPMENT, &c.:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Blake*) 147 (i).
- EXPENDITURE ON MAIN LINE BETWEEN CALLANDER AND PORT ARTHUR AND SELKIRK AND KAMLOOPS:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
- EXPENDITURE TO COMPLETE GOVERNMENT CONSTRUCTION ON C. P. R.:** Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1130 (ii).
- EXTENSION OF C. P. R. TO CANADIAN PORTS ON ATLANTIC, VERNON SMITH'S REP.:** M. for copies (Mr. *Lesage*) 294 (i).
- EXTENSION OF C. P. R. TO QUEBEC, PAPERS, &c.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 1677 (ii). B. 2239 (iii).
- Expense B.** See "N. W. T."
- EXPENSES OF ELECTION UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT:** in Com. of Sup., 3388 (iv).

- EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF THE GOVT., &C., IN ENGLAND OR ELSEWHERE:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*), 124 (i).
- Expiring Laws continuation B. No. 165** (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3458 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 52).
- Explosive Substances B. No. 95** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°*, 545 (i); 2°, 893; in Com., 1167; 3°, 1335 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 7).
- EXPORT DUTY ON OAK, PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1442 (ii).
- EXTRACT OF FLUID BEEF:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- EXTRADITION ARRANGEMENT, COR. BETWEEN GOVT. OF CAN. AND AMBASSADOR AT WASHINGTON:** M. for copies of O. C., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 147 (i).
- EXTRADITION OF DUMONT:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2358 (iv).
- EXTRADITION, DEMANDS FOR, AND PROCEEDINGS TAKEN:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- EXTRA-MURAL EMPLOYMENT.** See "PRISON LABOR."
- FABRE, MR., AGENT IN PARIS, REP. OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 290 (i); SALARY AND CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).
- Factories B. No. 85** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°*, 362 (i); 2° m., 873; deb. adjd., 886; M. to rsme. adjd. deb., 940; Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) to substitute B. (No. 94) Can. Temp. Act, 940; Amt. agreed to (Y. 86, N. 62) 948 (ii). See B. 2.
- FACTORY COMMISSION REP.** (Mr. *Blake*): Remarks, 455, 478 (i).
- FACTORY LABOR REGULATION:** Deb. on M. for 2° of B. 85 (Mr. *Bergin*) 873; (Mr. *Sproule*) 881; (Mr. *Mills*) 882; Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) to substitute Can. Temp. Act, 940; (Messrs. *Bergin* and *Ives*) 940; (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*) 941; (Mr. *Scriver*) 943; (Mr. *Foster*) 944; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 946; (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 946; (Mr. *Fisher*) 947; (Mr. *McNeill*) 948 (ii).
- Factory Labor, Regulation of, B. No. 2** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°*, 29; Order for 2° dschgd., 362 (i). See B. 85.
- FACTORY OPERATIVES, NUMBER EMPLOYED:** M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
- Federal Bank of Canada Capital Stock, B. No. 10** (Mr. *Small*). 1°*, 40; 2°*, 57; in Com. and 3°*, 428 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 9.)
- FEDERATION OF THE EMPIRE, PROPOSALS FOR:** Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 51 (i).
- FEEs FROM SETTLERS IN THE N. W. T.:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
- Ferries, International, B. No. 17** (Mr. *Patterson, Essex*). 1°*, 46; 2° m., 254; 2°*, 256 (i).
- FERTILIZERS.** See "AGRICULTURAL FERTILIZERS."
- FINANCE AND TREASURY BOARD:** in Com. of Sup., 901, 915 (ii).
- FINANCE MINISTER, HEALTH OF:** Ques. (Mr. *McGreevy*) 2497 (iii).
- FINANCES OF THE COUNTRY, CONDUCT OF:** Remarks (Mr. *Blake* and others) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (iv).
- FINANCIAL COMMISSIONER IN ENG.:** in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
- FINANCIAL INSPECTOR:** in Com. of Sup., 895 (ii).
- FINES, CUSTOMS, EXACTED AND DISPOSITION OF SAME, &C.:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
- Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 90** (Mr. *Mulock*) 1°, 426 (i).
- FISHERIES, DEPARTMENT OF:** in Com. of Sup., 910 (ii).
- FISHERIES:**
- ARRANGEMENTS WITH THE U.S.: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2980 (iv).
- BOUNTIES, CLAIMS PAID: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Fortin*) 56 (i).
- BOUNTY TO FISHING VESSELS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Burpee*) 98 (i).
- BOUNTY DISTRIBUTION: in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- BOUNTY PAID IN GUYSBOROUGH CO.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2751 (iv).
- BOUNTY PAID ON FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *McDougall*) 1443 (ii).
- CANADIAN FISHERIES, O.C., &C., RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Mulock*) 56 (i).
- CARON, C., FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,* 532 (i).
- COMMISSION, INCREASED REMUNERATION TO COUNSEL: in Com. of Sup., 3391; conc., 3396 (iv).
- DEEP-WATER FISHERIES OFF COAST OF B.C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 3073 (iii).
- EXTENSION OF ACT TO THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 51 (i).
- FISH-BREEDING: in Com. of Sup., 2953 (iv).
- FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES, BOUNTY PAID: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *McDougall Cape Breton*) 1443 (ii).
- FISHERIES EXHIBIT: in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
- FISH: in Com. on Ways and Means, 859 (ii).
- FISHING LICENSES IN LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 964 (ii).
- FISH INSPECTOR IN CITY OF ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 2997 (iv).
- FISH LADDERS IN LA HAVRE RIVER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2239 (iii).
- FISH TAKEN IN THE MIRAMICHI: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 295 (i).
- FISH WEIRS IN CO. OF CHARLOTTE, LICENSES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1444 (ii).
- FREE FISHING ALLOWED AMERICANS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3321 (iv).
- GAUVREAU, J., FISHERY OVERSEER, SALARY, &C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,* 532 (i).
- GREGORY, J. U., REP. OF ENQUIRY: M. for copies* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
- HALIFAX COMMISSION, INCREASED REMUNERATION TO COUNSEL: in Com. of Sup., 3390-3392; conc., 3396 (iv).
- INLAND FISHERIES OF ONT.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).
- INSPECTOR FOR B.C., APPOINTMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 694 (i).
- LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES: M. for Ret.,* 1444 (ii); Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 3073 (iv).
- LEASES AND LICENSES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 533 (i).
- LONG POINT FISHING GROUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 289 (i).
- MILLARD, COLLECTION OF FINES FROM: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1211 (ii).
- NEGOTIATIONS: Remarks (Mr. *Vail*) 3074 (iv).
- PROTECTION AFTER JULY: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 2359 (iii).
- PROTECTION IN THE N.W.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Hesson*) 700 (i).
- PROTECTION STEAMERS: in Com. of Sup., 2955 (iv).
- RIVERS AND STREAMS, RENTAL OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i); Ques., 2359 (iii).
- ROGERS' FISH LADDER, PURCHASE OR USE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 3073 (iv).
- ROGERS, W. H., BREACH OF SAWDUST LAW: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
- SALMON FISHING IN BATHURST HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2359 (iii).
- STARR, J. E., REMOVAL OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
- [See also "WASHINGTON TREATY."]
- FLAG TREATY BETWEEN U.S. AND SPAIN:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Vail*) 219; deb. (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 220; (Mr. *Blake* and Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 221; (Messrs. *Cartwright, Weldon* and *Davies*) 222; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 223; (Mr. *Mitchell*) 224; (Mr. *Mills*) 225.

FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLID. LOANS: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).

FLANNEL SHIRTS FOR THE MILITIA, CONTRACT FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1306 (ii).

FLOUR AND CORNMEAL, INCREASE OF DUTY ON: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 148 (i).

FLOUR, CORN AND CORNMEAL IMPORTED AND EXPORTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 56 (i).

FOG HORN ON DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).

FOG HORNS AND LETTER-BOX FRONTS, TENDERS FOR: M. for copies of advertisements, &c.* (Mr. *Langelier*) 313 (i).

FOOT AND CARRIAGE BRIDGE ON THE ST. JOHN RIVER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1443 (ii).

FOOT GREASE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).

FORESTRY COMMISSIONERS, APPOINTMENT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 187 (i).

FORESTS, PROTECTION OF, J. H. MORGAN'S REP.: M. for copies (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).

FORT FRANCIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3385 (iv).

Fort Macleod Rancho Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 80 (Mr. *Ives*). 1^o*, 349; 2^o*, 428 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1723 (ii); Sen. Amts. conc. in, 2357 (iii). (48-49 *Vic., c. 92.*)

FORT WILLIAM, ONT., INDIAN RESERVE, ROAD ON: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).

FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, TIMBER LICENSES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (iii).

FORTY MILE BELT IN B.C.: Memo. read (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1983 (iii).

FRANCE AND CANADA, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 825 (ii).

FRANCE AND QUEBEC, STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2938 (iv).

FRANCE AND QUEBEC, FORTNIGHTLY LINE, STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2936, 2942, 3041 (iv).

FRANCE, COMMERCIAL RELATIONS. See "HIGH COMMISSIONER."

FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS. See "PETITIONS."

Franchise, Electoral B. No. 103 (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1^o, 629 (i); Order for 2^o postponed, 1095; 2^o m., 1133; Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1137; neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) and deb. adjd., 1166; deb. rsmd., 1167; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 1171; neg. (Y. 54, N. 86) 1204; deb. adjd., 1204; deb. rsmd., 1226; 2^o agreed to (Y. 111, N. 63) 1277; M. for Com., 1336; in Com., 1385, 1388, 1444, 1475, 1568, 1608, 1646, 1680, 1712, 1745 (ii), 1782, 1824, 1856, 1895, 1915, 1956, 1983, 2052, 2065, 2086, 2104, 2139, 2172, 2210, 2241, 2274, 2301, 2321, 2345, 2360, 2393 (iii), 2757, 3052, 3062; on consdn. of B., Amt. (Mr. *Charlton*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 96) 3053; Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 3053; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. *McIntyre*) 3056; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3058; neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3060; (Mr. *Watson*) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. *Mulock*) neg. (Y. 46, N. 96) 3061; (Mr. *Langelier*) neg. (Y. 44, N. 95) 3062; Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) agreed to (Y. 114, N. 17) 3062; Amt. (Mr. *Langelier*) neg. (Y. 41, N. 92) 3063; Amts.

(Mr. *Burpee*) neg. (Y. 37, N. 89) 3063; (Mr. *Trow*) 3063; neg. (Y. 36, N. 88) 3064; (Mr. *Armstrong*) neg. (Y. 37, N. 87) 3064; (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. *McCraney* and *Innes*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3065; Amts. (Messrs. *Cameron [Middlesex]* and *Langelier*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3066; Amts. (Messrs. *Lister* and *Cameron, Huron*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3067; Amts. (Messrs. *Weldon* and *Fairbank*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3068; Amts. (Messrs. *Paterson [Brant]* and *Gillmor*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3069; Amts. (Messrs. *Holton* and *Fisher*) neg. (Y. 38, N. 87) 3070; on M. for 3^o, Amt. (Mr. *Mills*) 3 m. h., 3071; neg. (Y. 37, N. 88) 3072; 3^o of B., 3072 (iv). (48-49 *Vic., c. 40.*)

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL B., DEBATE:

ABBOTT, Mr.: in Com., "usufructuary," 1416 (ii); "revision of lists," 2345, 2350 (iii); "general provisions," 1448 (ii), 2352, 2355; "appeal," 2363 (iii).

ALLEN, Mr.: in Com., "person" (Indian) 1493 (ii); "qualifications," &c., 1853; "who shall not vote," 2166 (iii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr.: on M. for 2^o, 1272-1274; in Com., (woman suffrage) 1469; "tenant" (Amt.) 1481; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1506, 1542; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications, &c.," 1643 (ii), 1880-1882; (manhood suffrage) 1970; (Amt.) 2001; "registration," 2247, 2318; "revision of lists," 2433 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3064 (iv).

AUGER, Mr.: on M. for 2^o, 1238-1241; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452, 1456, 1458; "tenant" (Amt.) 1482; "person" (Indian) 1543; "actual value," 1597, 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1987, 1995, 2068; "registration," 2296 (iii).

BAIN, Mr. (*Wentworth*): in Com., "person" (Indian) 1535; "qualifications, &c.," 1709-1712 (ii), 1776-1779; (manhood suffrage) 1952-1954; (Amt.) 1993, 2052, 2082 (iii), 2758 (iv); "registration," 2252, 2280, 2289; "officers and duties," 2356 (iii).

BAKER, Mr. (*Victoria*): in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1587 (ii).

BEATY, Mr., junr.: in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1874-1880 (iii).

BERGIN, Mr.: in Com. (remarks) 2203; "qualifications," &c., 2085 (iii).

BLAKE, Mr.: on 1^o, 629 (i); on Order for 2^o being called (remarks) 1095; on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2^o, 1177-1192; in Com., "usufructuary," 1448, 1450, 1452, 1456, 1457; "person" (Indian) 1487, 1586; "farm," 1591 (ii); on disqualifying revising barrister, 2086; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104-2111, 2161, 2163; "registration," 2173, 2177, 2180, 2231, 2312; "revision of lists," 2346; "qualifications, &c.," 2395; "appeal," 2395 (iii); "preamble," 2759; on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3059 (iv).

BOWELL, Mr.: in Com., "actual value," 1596-1607; "occupant," 1483; "tenant," 1478-1480 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1995, 2061; "revision of lists," 2348; "appeal," 2361; "general provisions," 2344 (iii).

BURNS, Mr.: in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1809 (iii).

BURPEE, Mr.: in Com., "person" (Indian) 1522 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1810, 1987, 1991, 2001, (manhood suffrage) 1959, 2004, 2058, (Amt.) 2060, 2073, 2079; "who shall not vote" (Indians) (Amt.) 2120; "registration," 2251 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Weldon*) 3058; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3063 (iv).

CAMERON, Mr. (*Middlesex*): on M. for Com., 1373-1379 (ii); in Com., (woman suffrage) 1440; "person" (Indian) 1493; "qualifications, &c.," 1699-1707, 1890, 1895-1900, 1994, (Amt.) 1999, 2002, (manhood suffrage) 1973, 2061, (Amt.) 2071, 2073, 2077, 2084, 2085, 2395; "registration," 2193-2197, 2263; "who shall not vote," 2162, (Indians) 2149-2152, (Amt.) 2274, (Amt.) 2285, 2289, 2291; "appeal," 2395 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3066 (iv).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- CAMERON, Mr. (Victoria):** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1393; "tenant," 1477; "registration," 2180, 2230, 2233 (iii).
- CAMERON, Mr. (Inverness):** in Com. (woman suffrage) (correction *re* Indians) 1419; "qualifications, &c.," 1629-1632, 1836 (ii), 2395; "registration," 2278, 2283 (iii).
- CAMERON, Mr. (Huron):** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^o, 1138-1143; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1394, 1438; "owner," 1472; "tenant" (Amt.) 1475, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indian) 1502, 1527, 1580; "farm," 1591, 1592; "farmers' sons" (Amt.) 1594; "qualifications, &c.," 1692-1699 (ii), 1924-1931, 2074; "registration," 2216-2220, (Amt.) 2227, 2241, 2274-2277, 2281-2284, (Amt.) 2286, 2300, 2302-2305, 2313, 2317, 2319; "revision of lists," 2321, 2326-2329, 2332, 2345-2348; "general provisions," 2344, 2345, 2351-2354; "officers and duties," 2356, 2359; "appeal," 2360-2366; "offences," 2390 (iii).
- CARTWRIGHT, Sir Richard:** on M. for 2^o, 1134; (Amt.) 1137, neg. (Y. 59, N. 104) 1166; on M. for Com. (remarks) 1385; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1459; "tenant," 1479; "person" (Indian) 1573 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1817, 1915-1918, 1988, 1992, 1995, 2068, 2071, 2073, 2079, 2082, (Amt.) 2085; "registration," 2220-2223, 2232, 2279, 2281, 2285, 2288, 2297, 2299, 2300; "revision of lists," 2326, 2338, 2340, 2349; "general provisions," 2344, 2355; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2382 (ii).
- CASEY, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1263-1266; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1401-1408, 1459; "usufructuary," 1452, 1458; "owner," 1470; "tenant," 1477; "person" (Indian) 1496, 1528-1530, 1578, (Chinese) 1582, 1590; "farm," 1592; "actual value," 1596, 1604; "qualifications, &c.," 1739-1743 (ii), 1828; (Indians) 1837, (Amt.) 1845; (manhood suffrage) 1956-1959, 1988, 2052, 2061; (Amts.) 2064, 2070, 2079, 2080, 2394; on disqualifying barristers, 2086; "who shall not vote," 2086, 2093; "registration," 2254-2258, 2270, 2272, 2282, 2283, (Amt.) 2288, 2290, 2308-2310; "revision of lists," 2321, 2323, 2325, 2333, 2343; "general provisions," 2344, 2347, 2350; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2383-2385 (iii).
- CASGRAIN, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1384; (woman suffrage) 1395; "usufructuary," 1447; "person" (Indian) 1516, 1519, 1536, (Chinese) 1588; "farm," 1591; "qualifications, &c.," 1690-1692 (ii), (Amt.) 1791; "who shall not vote," 2099 (iii).
- CHAPLEAU, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2^o, 1171-1177; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590 (ii).
- CHARLTON, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^o, 1158-1160; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1390, 1439; "person" (Indian) 1503, 1523, (Chinese) 1587; "qualifications, &c.," 1608, (Amt.) 1623 (ii), 1770-1773, (Indians) 1850, 1864-1871, (manhood suffrage) 1947-1952; "registration," 2279, 2282, 2286, 2287, (Amt.) 2288, 2289, 2306-2308, (Amt.) 2317; "revision of lists," 2340, 2350; "general provisions," 2344, (Amt.) 2344; "appeal," 2363; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2377; "offences," 2290 (iii); on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 3053 (iv).
- COCKBURN, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1258; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1438 (ii).
- COOK, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1590 (ii); "registration," 2213-2216 (iii).
- COSTIGAN, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1990; "revision of lists," 2343 (iii).
- COURSOL, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1248; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1389 (ii).
- CURRAN, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1408; "qualifications, &c.," 1623-1626 (ii).
- DAVIES, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^o, 1153-1156; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1418, 1458; "tenant," 1476, 1478; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indians) 1576, (Chinese) 1583; "farm," 1592; "farmers' sons," 1594;

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- "qualifications, &c.," 1638-1643 (ii), 1824-1828, 1939-1945; (manhood suffrage) 1987, 1991, 1992, 1996, 2054, 2058, 2066-2069, 2071, (Amt.) 2072-2074, 2077; "who shall not vote," 2090, 2096, (Indians) 2157-2160, (Amt.) 2160; "registration," 2210, (Amt.) 2211, 2229, 2230, (Amt.) 2234, 2269, 2271-2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2281, 2286, 2287, 2289, 2291, (Amt.) 2292, 2301, 2313, 2316, (Amt.) 2318; "revision of lists," 2326, 2329, 2331, 2347; "general provisions," 2353; "appeal," 2361; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2378, 2389 (iii).
- DAWSON, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^o, 1160; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1408; "owner," 1473; "person" (Indian) 1486, 1491, 1492, 1521, 1569, (explanation) 1503 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1775, (manhood suffrage) 1979, (Indians) 2006-2008, 2012, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2123, 2149; "registration," 2248-2268, 2298; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2369, 2387 (iii); "preamble," 2758 (iv).
- DE ST. GEORGES, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1533 (ii).
- DESJARDINS, Mr.:** in Com., "usufructuary," 1451, 1455 (ii).
- DUPONT, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1234 (ii).
- EDGAR, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2^o, 1197-1200; in Com., (woman suffrage) 1399; "owner," 1473; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1553, (Chinese) 1582, 1584 (ii); "farm," 2393; "qualifications, &c." (manhood suffrage) 1968-1970, 1993, 2001, (Amt.) 2003, (Indian) 2012, 2053, 2066, 2080, 2394; "registration," 2282, 2289, 2305, 2312, 2316-2319; "revision of lists," 2330, 2331, 2334, 2337 (iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) to M. for 3^o, 3057 (iv).
- FAIRBANK, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1226; (woman suffrage) 1415; "person" (Indian) 1519, 1531; "actual value," 1605; (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1779, 1784; (manhood suffrage) 1971-1973, 1993, 1997, 2082; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2152; "revision of lists," 2338, 2342, 2348 (iii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068 (iv).
- FARROW, Mr.:** in Com., "tenant," 1482 (ii).
- FISHER, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1254-1258; "usufructuary," 1455; "tenant," 1479, 1482; "person" (Indian) 1504, 1538; "actual value," 1595, 1599, 1602, 1604, (Amt.) 1595; "qualifications, &c.," 1647-1654 (ii), 1804, 1994, 1996, 2080, (manhood suffrage) 1967; "who shall not vote," 2098, (Indians) 2116-2119; "registration," 2211, 2294 (iii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3070, (iv).
- FLEMING, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^o, 1146-1149; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1410; "usufructuary," 1457; "owner," 1473; "tenant" (Amt.) 1476, 1477, 1479; "person" (Indian) 1545 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1994, (Amt.) 1997, 2062, 2080; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2164; "registration," 2197-2199, 2298; "revision of lists," 2341 (iii).
- FOSTER, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^o, 1156-1158; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1568 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1819, 1822, 2001, 2055, 2057; "who shall not vote," 2089, 2098 (iii).
- GAULT, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1582; "qualifications, &c.," 1638 (ii).
- GIGAULT, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1245-1248 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1789 (iii).
- GILLMOR, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1226, 1269; "person" (Indians) 1534, (Chinese) 1585; "qualifications," 1707-1709 (ii), 1807, 1984, 1990, 1997, 2054, 2060, 2072, 2074; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2114-2116; "registration," 2258 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 3059; on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3069 (iv).
- GIROUARD, Mr.:** in Com., "usufructuary," 1446; "tenant," 1480 (ii).
- HACKETT, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1654-1657 (ii); "who shall not vote," 2095 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) to M. for 3^o, 3054-3056 (iv).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- HESSON, Mr.:** in Com., "farmers' sons," 1595; actual value," 1599, 1605 (ii), (explanation) 1752; "qualifications, &c.," 1987, 2059, 2081, 2082, 2084, 2085; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2133; "registration," 2246, 2283, 2295, 2305 (iii).
- HICKEY, Mr.:** "actual value," 1600 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1887-1890, 1989; "revision of lists," 2330; "registration" (Amt.) 2279 (iii).
- HOLTON, Mr.:** on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3070 (iv).
- HOMER, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1582 (ii).
- INNES, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1736-1739 (ii); "registration" (Amt.) 2279 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3065 (iv).
- IRVINE, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1544 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1814-1817; "who shall not vote," 2097 (iii).
- IVES, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1986-1988 (iii).
- JACKSON, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1342; "person" (Indian) 1538; "qualifications, &c.," 1712-1715 (ii).
- JENKINS, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1344 (ii); in Com. (manhood suffrage) 1981 (iii); on M. for 3^d (Amt.) 3053 (iv).
- KING, Mr.:** on M. for 2^d, 1261-1263; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1524 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1806; "who shall not vote" (Indian) 2164; "registration" 2266, 2285, (Amt.) 2285 (iii).
- KIRK, Mr.:** on M. for 2^d, 1259-1261 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1834, 2067, 2072, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (ii).
- LANDERKIN, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1353-1360; "tenant," 1482; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1539; "actual value," 1602 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Indians) 1845-1849, 1985, 1997, (Amt.) 2000, 2021, 2074; "registration of voters," 2267, 2301; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2385.
- LANDRY, Mr. (Kent):** in Com., "usufructuary," 1449; "person" (Indians) 1554; (Chinese) 1584, 1588 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1812, 2057 "who shall not vote," 2100; "registration," 2230, 2232, 2260 (iii); on (Amt.) (Mr. Weldon) to M. for 3^d, 3058 (iv).
- LANDRY, Mr. (Montmagny):** in Com., "qualifications, &c." 1635, 1637 (ii).
- LANGELLER, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1364-1373; in Com., (woman suffrage) 1388; "usufructuary," 1444, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1452, 1454, 1455, 1457; "tenant," 1475, (Amt.) 1476, 1480; "qualifications," 1632-1638 (ii), 1903-1908, 1984, 1996, 2064, 2067, 2070, 2394; "registration," 2185-2190, (Amt.) 2228; "revision of lists," 2331, 2333, 2342; "appeal," 2365; "officers and duties," 2388; "offences," 2390 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) to M. for 3^d (Amt.) 3062; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amts.) 3063, 3066 (iv).
- LANDEVIN, Sir Hector:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^d, 1137; in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 2085; "registration of voters," 2299 (iii).
- LAURIER, Mr.:** on M. for 2^d, 1167, (Amt.) 1171; in Com., "usufructuary," 1445, 1446, 1448, 1451, 1454, 1455, 1456; "tenant," 1480; "actual value," 1596, 1604; "parish," 1593; "qualifications, &c.," 1626-1629 (ii), 1984 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) to M. for 3^d, 3057; on Amt. (Mr. Fisher) to M. for consdn. of B., 3070 (iv).
- LISTER, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^d, 1150-1153; on M. for Com., 1344-1347, 1352; "qualifications, &c.," 1732-1736 (ii), 1980-1984, (Indians) 2009-2012, 2066, 2070, 2075; "who shall not vote," 2088, (Indians) 2153-2155; "registration," 2264, 2283, 2286, 2316; "revision of lists," 2324, 2338, 2343; general provisions," 2344; appeal," 2364; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2371 (ii); on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3066 (iv).
- MACDONALD, Sir John A.:** 2^d m., 1133; in Com., 1385; (woman suffrage), 1388, 1458; "owner," 1444, 1445, 1449, 1452, 1453, 1457; "tenant," 1475, 1481; "occupant," 1483; "person" (Indians) 1484, 1486, 1487, 1489, 1563, 1574 (ii), 2023 (iii); (Chinese) 1582, 1558; "farm," 1591; "parish,"

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- 1593; "farmers' sons," 1591; "actual value," 1596, 1600 (ii), "qualifications, &c.," 1937, 1983-1988, 1992-2003, 2053, 2060, 2062, 2064, 2085, 2079, 2080, 2394 (ii), 2757-2759 (iv); "disqualifying revising barrister," 2086; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2104, (Amt.) 2139; "registration," 2172, 2177-2180, 2228, 2231, 2241, 2244, 2269, 2273, 2279-2294, 2300, 2310-2319; "revision of lists," 2321, 2326-2335, 2339-2345; "general provisions," 2314, 2351, 2353-2356; "appeal," 2360-2365, 2395; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2370, 2373, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "farm," 2393 (iii); "preamble," 2758; M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 3052; on Amt. (Mr. McIntyre) to M. for 3^d, 3056 (iv).
- MACKINTOSH, Mr.:** on M. for 2^d, 1241-1245 (ii).
- MACMASTER, Mr.:** in Com., "revision of lists," 2324, 2343; "general provisions," 2352; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2380-2382, 2386 (iii).
- MCCALLUM, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1871, 1964-1996; "registration," 2258, 2272, 2283, 2284; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2373, 2383 (ii).
- MCCRANEY, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1410; "person" (Indian) 1541 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1773-1775 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3065 (iv).
- MCINTYRE, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1790 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) to M. for 3^d (Amt.) 3058; neg. (Y. 50, N. 95) 3058 (iv).
- McMULLEN, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. Laurier) to M. for 2^d, 1200-1204; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1395; "tenant," 1476, 1477, 1479; "qualifications, &c.," 1685-1690 (ii), 1853, 1856, 1860, (manhood suffrage) 1961-1964, 1992, 1995, 2000, (Amt.) 2052, 2059, 2063, 2067, 2070, 2075, 2080, 2082; "who shall not vote," 2100, (Indians) 2135-2137; "registration," 2190-2193; "revision of lists," 2296; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2386; "farm," 2393 (iii).
- McNEILL, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1412 (ii); "qualifications, &c." 2073 (iii).
- MILLS, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^d, 1161-1166; in Com., 1388, (woman suffrage) 1391, 1458; "usufructuary," 1449, 1453, 1454, 1455; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1477; "occupant," 1483; "farm," 1591 (ii), 2393 (iii); "person" (Indians) 1484, (Amt.) 1485, 1507, 1568, (Chinese) 1583, 1589; "city," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1599, 1605 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1747, 1761, (Indians) 1849, 1910-1913, 1934-1937; (manhood suffrage) 1964-1987, (Indians) 1976, 1988, 1991-2003, 2004-2006, 2053, 2056, 2060, 2063, 2065-2069, 2072, 2075, 2078-2083, 2085, 2394 (iii), 2758 (iv); "disqualifying revising barrister," 2086; "who shall not vote" (Amt.) 2087, (Indians) 2149, 2160; "registration," 2181-2185, 2229, 2233, (Amt.) 2227, 2243, 2266, 2270, 2273, 2280, (Amt.) 2282, 2285, 2287, 2288, 2293, 2300, 2315, 2316, 2318; "revision of lists," 2322, 2325, 2332, 2336, 2340-2343, 2345-2349; "general provisions," 2353, 2354; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indians) 2373-2376, 2387, 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390; "appeal," 2361, 2364, 2366, 2396; "preamble," 2759 (iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3051; in Com., 3052, 3062; on M. for 3^d (Amt.) 3052; on Amt. (Mr. Jenkins) 3054; on Amt. (Mr. Weldon) 3059; on M. for consdn. of B., on Amt. (Mr. Holton) 3070; (Amt.) 3 m. h., 3071 (iv).
- MITCHELL, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to M. for 2^d, 1145, (explanation) 1149; in Com., "person" (Indians) 1577, (Chinese) 1582 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1807, (Amt.) 1938; (manhood suffrage) 1959, 1980, (Amt.) 1987, 1991, 2069, 2073 (iii).
- MULOCK, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1379, 1384, (woman suffrage) 1421, 1426-1430; "owner," 1473; "tenant," 1482; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1520, 1524; "actual value," 1607; "qualifications, &c.," 1715-1723 (ii), 1852, 1887; (manhood suffrage) 1978, (Amt.) 1985, 1992, 2000, 2053, (Amt.) 2064, 2069, 2064, 2070, (Amt.) 2072, 2073, 2076; "who shall

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- not vote" (Indians) 2137; "registration," 2223-2227, 2248, 2272, 2286, 2287, 2291, 2300, 2302, 2317; "revision of lists," 2322, 2327, 2329, 2331, 2335, 2340, 2349; "general provisions," 2354; "appeal," 2360, 2363; "officers and duties" (Indians) 2372 (iii); "preamble," 2758; on Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) to M. for 3^o (Amt.) 3061; on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; in Com., 3052; on M. for 3^o (Amt.) 3052 (iv).
- PAINT, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1991, 2072, 2077, 2078; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2166 (iii).
- PLATT, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1336-1341, (woman suffrage) 1439; "person" (Indian) 1525; "actual value," 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1784-1789; (manhood suffrage and Indians) 1977; "revision of lists," 2343; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2127-2129 (iii).
- PATERSON, Mr. (Brant):** on M. for Com., 1360-1364; in Com., "person" (Indian) 1489, 1492, 1671, 1574 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1793-1798, 1800-1804, 1931, (manhood suffrage) 1981, 2004, (Indian) 2013-2019, 2056, 2059, 2074, 2079, 2084; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2123-2127, 2162; "registration," 2259-2263, 2199-2205, 2269, 2273, 2279, 2283, 2285, 2291, 2298, 2300, 2315, 2318; "revision of lists," 2337; "officers and duties," 2356, (Indian) 2367-2369, 2376, 2387; "appeal," 2367; "offences, 2391 (iii); on M. to refer back to Com., 3052; on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068; on M. to conc. in Amts., 3071 (iv).
- PATTERSON, Mr. (Essex):** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1986 (iii).
- RINFRET, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1506, 1538; "qualifications, &c.," 1880-1883 (ii).
- ROYAL, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1390 (ii).
- RYKERT, Mr.:** in Com., "usufructuary," 1450; "tenant," 1477 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1761-1770, 2002, 2058; "revision of list," 2342 (iii).
- SHAKESPEARE, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1391; "person" (Chinese) 1583, 1591 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Indians and Chinese) 1974 (iii).
- SOMERVILLE, Mr. (Brant):** on M. for 2^o, 1269-1272; in Com., "woman suffrage," 1441; "person" (Indian) 1549 (ii); "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2129-2133; "registration," 2276, 2291, 2296 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3065 (iv).
- SPOULE, Mr.:** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492, 1551; "actual value," 1598; "qualifications, &c." (Indians) 1850, 2012, 2073; "registration," 2248; "appeal," 2361, 2366; "officers and duties," 2388, 2389; "offences," 2390 (iii).
- STAIRS, Mr.:** on Amt. (Mr. *McIntyre*) to M. for 3^o, 3057 (iv).
- TASCHEREAU, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1236; in Com., "usufructuary," 1447 (ii).
- TASSE, Mr.:** in Com., "who shall not vote," 2093, 2097 (iii).
- TAYLOR, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 2061 (iii).
- TEMPLE, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 2054, 2058, 2084; "revision of lists," 2341 (iii).
- TROW, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage), 1460; "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1596 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 1908, 2056, 2073, 2076; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2133, (Amt.) 2163; "registration," 2240, 2280; "revision of lists," 2343 (iii); on M. for consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3063 (iv).
- TOWNSHEND, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1249-1254; in Com. (Amt.) (woman suffrage) 1388; agreed to, 1442 (vol. ii).
- TUPPER, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1643, 1832, 2250 (iii).
- VAIL, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1274-1277; in Com., "farmers' sons," 1594; "actual value," 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Amt.) 1829-1832, 1990, 1994, 1999-2002, 2084, 2085, 2394; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2165; "registration," 2190, 2249, 2278, (Amt.) 2280, 2288, 2294, 2316 (iii).
- WALLACE, Mr.:** on M. for Com., 1341; in Com., "tenant," 1477, 1478; "person" (Indian) 1491; "actual value," 1602, 1604 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," 2002, 2068, 2083 (iii).

FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL, B.—Continued.

- WATSON, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1274; in Com. (woman suffrage) 1468; "person" (Indian) 1492, 1522, 1542; "occupant," 1484; "actual value," 1606 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (Indians) 1853, (Amts.) 1933, 1990, 1992, 2008, (Indian) 2088; "registration," 2268, 2295; "revision of lists," 2344 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) to M. for 3^o (Amt.) 3061 (iv).
- WELDON, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2^o, 1149; in Com., "usufructuary," 1452; "owner," 1472; "tenant," 1478; "person" (Indian) 1493, (Chinese) "farm," 1592; "parish," 1593; "farmers' sons," 1595; "actual value" (Amt.) 1596, 1600; "qualifications, &c.," 1727-1731 (ii), (Amt.) 1805; "registration," 2253, 2277, (Amts.) 2278, 2282, 2283, 2286, 2288, 2289, 2291, 2297, 2310, 2316; "revision of lists," 2323, 2328, 2339, 2341, 2343, 2349 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. *Jenkins*) to M. for 3^o (Amt.) 3058; on consdn. of B. (Amt.) 3068 (iv).
- WHITE, Mr. (Cardwell):** on Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) to M. for 2^o, 1192-1197 (ii); "qualifications, &c.," (manhood suffrage) 1945, 1996, (Indian) 2019; "registration," 2245, 2283 (iii).
- WHITE, Mr. (Hastings):** in Com., "person" (Indian) 1492 (ii); "qualifications, &c." (manhood suffrage and Indians) 1983, 2008, 2087; "who shall not vote," 2088, 2092, (Indians) 2155-2157 (iii).
- WHITE, Mr. (Renfrew):** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1996 (iii).
- WILSON, Mr.:** in Com. (woman suffrage) 1417; "occupant," 1484; "person" (Indian) 1515, 1536; "qualifications, &c.," 1723-1727 (ii), 1901, (manhood suffrage) 1960, 1986, 1989, 2060, 2068, 2073, 2077; "who shall not vote" (Indians) 2120-2122; "registration," 2205-2207, 2265, 2287; "appeal," 2362, 2367 (iii).
- WOOD, Mr. (Westmoreland):** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1731 (i).
- WOODWORTH, Mr.:** on M. for 2^o, 1228-1234; in Com., "person" (Chinese) 1584 (ii).
- WRIGHT, Mr.:** on Amt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) to M. for 2^o, 1143 (ii).
- YEO, Mr.:** in Com., "qualifications, &c.," 1647 (ii).
- [For QUES. OF ORDER, &c., &c., See "ORDER," "PRIVILEGE," and "PROCEDURE."]
- FRASER, D. M., AND DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE, COR. BETWEEN: M. for copies* (Mr. *Robertson Shelburne*) 533 (i).**
- Fredericton and St. Mary's Ry. Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 50 (Mr. *Temple*). 1^o*, 170; 2^o*, 289 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 873; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (ii). (48-49 *Vic., c. 26*.)**
- FREE FISHING ALLOWED AMERICAN FISHERMEN: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 3321 (iv).**
- FREEMAN, J. N., AND SAWDUST LAW IN N.S.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).**
- FREE TRANSPORT OF BODIES OF VOLUNTEERS KILLED: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii).**
- FRENCH CANADIANS IN CUSTOMS DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1914; (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).**
- FRENCH CANADIANS, REPATRIATION OF, SCHEME: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).**
- FUEL FOR SETTLERS IN THE N.W.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).**
- FUNERAL EXPENSES OF ACHILLE BLAIS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2169 (iii).**
- Gas and Gas Meters Inspection Acts Amt. B. No. 119 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., in Com. and 1^o of B., 837 (ii); 2^o, 2419; in Com. and 3^o*, 2439 (iii). (48-49 *Vic., c. 69*.)**

- GAS COKE**: in Com. on Ways and Means, 783 (ii).
- GATINEAU RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458 (iv).
- GATLING GUNS FOR USE OF TROOPS IN N.W.**: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 813 (ii).
- GAUDET, MR. A.**: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
- GAUVREAU, JULES, SALARY AND EXPENSES AS FISHERY OVERSEER**: Ques. (Mr. *Blondeau*) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,* 532 (i).
- General Inspection Act, 1874, Amt. B. 135** (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. (Chief Inspector) prop., 1306; in Com., 1307; conc. in and 1^o* of B., 1320 (ii); 2^o and in Com., 2548; 3^o, 2555 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 66.)
- GENEVA GIN AND BRANDY**: in Com on Ways and Means, 3224, 3229 (iv).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY**: in Com. of Sup., 3346 (iv).
- GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF THE DOM., MANAGEMENT OF**: Ques. (Mr. *Hall*) 114 (i).
- GLAMIS POST OFFICE, ENQUIRY RESPECTING**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1131 (ii).
- GLUCOSE SYRUP**: in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
- GOLD RESERVE, GOVT.**: M. for copies of Cor. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 351; Stmt. (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 361 (i).
- GOODS IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION**: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- GOODWIN, GEORGE**: See "TRENT VALLEY CANAL."
- GOSSELIN, EUGÈNE, RECORD IN THE MATTER OF**: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 703, 704 (i).
- GOVT. AGENTS IN THE N.W.T., FEES FROM SETTLERS**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
- GOVT. BONDS, DISAPPEARANCE OF, FROM VAULTS**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3371 (iv).
- GOVT. BUSINESS**: Remarks, 211, 595 (i), 1744 (ii), 2996, 3293, 3427, 3444 (vi).
- GOVT. DEPOSITS IN BANKS**: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 29 (i).
- GOVT. EMPLOYÉS ALONG LINE OF C.P.R.**: M. for names, &c.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i).
- GOVT. EMPLOYÉS IN B. C.**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).
- GOVT. LOANS**: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- GOVT. MEASURES, PRECEDENCE**: on Thursdays after Ques. by Members, 451; on Wednesdays after Routine, 965; on Mondays after Ques. by Members, 1336; Ms. to take in Saturdays, 1824 (iii), 3246, 3459 (iv).
- GOVT. MORTGAGE ON C.P.R., CHANGES IN RELATION TO**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 36 (i).
- GOVT. NOTES IN CIRCULATION**: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS IN THE N.W., COMMUNICATIONS WITH**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- GOVT. OF THE N.W.T.**: in Com. of Sup., 3243 (iv).
- GOVT. PROPERTIES IN CO. OF RICHELIEU**: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Massue*) 147 (i).
- GOVT. PRINTING AND ADVERTISING**: Remarks (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3033-3039 (iv).
- GOVT. RYS., RETURN TICKETS ON**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 706 (i).
- GOVT. RIGHTS TO WATER LOTS ON RIVERS**: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 2238 (iii).
- GOVT. SECTIONS OF C. P. R. IN B. C., WORKING OF, BY CONTRACTORS**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 632 (i).
- GOVT. STEAMERS**. See "MARINE" and "SUPPLY."
- GOVT. YARDS IN MONTREAL**: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 57 (i).
- GOVERNOR GENERAL**:
- COMMONS, SUMMONING OF, TO SENATE, 2 (i), 3475 (iv).
- SPEECH FROM THRONE ON OPENING OF PARLT., 2; Reply to Address, 113 (i).
- SPEECH FROM THRONE PROROGUING PARLT., 3475 (iv).
- GOV. GENL.'S SECRETARY, LETTER FROM, re Royal Assent to Bills, 1514 (ii); from Deputy, re Prorogation, 3473 (iv).**
- GOV. GENL.'S SECRETARY'S OFFICE**: in Com. of Sup., 898 (ii).
- GRADES AND CURVES ON C.P.R. AS FAR AS CONSTRUCTED, EXCLUSIVE OF LINE FROM FOOT OF ROCKY MTS. TO KAMLOOPS**: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).
- GRADES AND CURVES ON LINE FROM FOOT OF ROCKY MTS., &C.**: M. for Stmt. and Plan* (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- GRADES, CURVES AND TANGENTS ON C.P.R.**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 632, 694, 744 (i), 888 (ii), 2239 (iii).
- GRANDIN, BISHOP, COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3423 (iv).
- GRANT, ALPIN, POSITION OF, UNDER GOVT.**: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 429 (i).
- GRANT, G. (MILITIA DEPT.) SUPERANNUATION OF**: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2531 (iii).
- GRANT OF \$1,700,000 FOR N. W. EXPENSES**: in Com. on Ways and Means, 2532, 2559 (iii).
- GRAND PILES TO LAKE ST. JOHN RY. SUBSIDY**: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458 (iv).
- GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY**:
- ACCIDENTS AND CASUALTIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 226 (i).
- DOUBLE TRACK BETWEEN MONTREAL AND TORONTO, ASSURANCE, &C., GIVEN TO GOVT.: M. for copy, &c. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 143 (i).
- IMPORTATION OF RAILS: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1568 (ii).
- MAIL SERVICE, TORONTO AND OTTAWA: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 816 (ii).
- RETURN, IMPERFECT, PRESENTED BY MR. HICKSON: Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 860, 862; Ques. 1278 (ii).
- RETURNS REQUIRED UNDER ACT OF 1879, &C., MILES OF MAIN LINE, &C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 229 (i).
- RETURNS, ENQUIRIES FOR: (Mr. *Mitchell*) 566, 602 (i), 860, 964, 1278 (ii), 2393 (iii), 3000, 3395 (iv).
- STOCKHOLDERS LIST, RET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 28, 101, 350; Remarks, 113 (i), 2210 (iii).
- M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 234.
- ANSWER OF MR. HICKSON: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 927 (ii).
- ACTION OF MR. HICKSON: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 1094 (ii).
- ENFORCEMENT OF ORDER OF HOUSE: Ques. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 3426 (iv).
- GRADUATES OF ROYAL MIL. COL.**: M. for Ret. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 313 (i).
- GRAIN, &C, ABOLITION OF DUTY ON**: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
- GRANTS OF DOMINION LANDS**. See "LAND GRANTS," &C.
- GRAVENHURST BAY AND RIVER SEVERN CANAL**: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 56, 202 (i).
- GRAVING DOCK, ESQUIMALT, B.C.** See "ADVANCES TO PROVINCES."
- GRAZING LAND LEASES, GEOGRAPHICAL POSITION, &C.**: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).

- GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paint*) 78 (i).
- GREAT VILLAGE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS, COLCHESTER, N. S.: M. for Stmt. in detail*(Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 67 (i).
- Great Western and Lake Ont. Shore Junction Ry. Co.'s B. No. 38 (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*). 1°*, 125; 2°*, 179; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 18.)
- GREGORY, J. U., REP. OF ENQUIRY MADE BY, re FISHERIES: M. for copies* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
- GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).
- GRENVILLE, SOUTH, ELECTION: Ret. of Member, 3072 (iv).
- GREY. See "REFUND OF RY. BONUSES."
- GUAY, MR.: Returned as Member elect for Levis, 1385 (ii).
- GUERIN, LISTER, REP. OF SURVEY OF IMPROVEMENTS ON THE OTTAWA RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1040 (ii).
- GUNS USED IN THE FIGHT WITH POUNDMAKER: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
- GUILLET, MR.: unseated on judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i); Returned and took seat 1192 (ii).
- HALF-BREEDS:
- CLAIMS OF FRENCH AT ST. LAURENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).
 - CLAIMS OF UNENUMERATED (MAN.): Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1743, 3428 (iv).
 - CLAIMS RECOGNIZED AND REJECTED BY COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169 (iii).
 - CLAIMS, &c., in N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1474 (ii).
 - COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. *Royal*) 1566; sittings of: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567; claims recognized and rejected by: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169 (iii).
 - DUMAS, M., APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 - DUMONT, G., AND FERRY LICENSE: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 - GRIEVANCES, DUTY OF GOVT.: M. for adjmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 2030 (iii); Memorials, Answers to: Ques (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv) See "WAYS AND MEANS."
 - INDIAN SYMPATHY WITH: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 - ISBESTER, APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 - MINORS (MAN.) CLAIMS PREFERRED AND REJECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169; temporarily absent: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1743; unenumerated, 1743 (iii), 3426, 3428 (iv).
 - NORTH-WEST COUNCIL, RES. re CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 - PETITIONS, &c., ON HALF-BREEDS AND SETTLERS' CLAIMS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
 - PLOTS ON THE SASKATCHEWAN: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
 - QU'APPELLE, REP. OF MR. WALSH: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
 - RESERVES AND HOMESTEADS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
 - RESUMÉ OF EVENTS SINCE 1878: Res. in Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. *Blake*) 3075 (iv).
 - SCHMIDT, L., ANSWER TO LETTER OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv); Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915 (iii).
 - SCRIP: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567, 1914 (iii).
 - SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS AND UNDISTURBED OCCUPATION: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- [See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W."]
- HALIFAX STEAM NAVIGATION Co., MONEYS PAID BY GOVT. TO: M. for copies of Reps., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HALTON. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT," "INDIANS, &c."
- Hamilton, Guelph and Buffalo Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 77 (Mr. *Kilvert*). 1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 22.)
- Hamilton Provident and Loan Society B. No. 114 (Mr. *Kilvert*). 1°*, 783; 2°*, 816; in Com. and 3°, 1352 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 30.)
- HARBORS IN GUYSBOROUGH COUNTY, RE-SURVEY OF: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 51 (i).
- Harbor Commissioners of Three Rivers, Advance to, authorization B. No. 150 (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 2497; Res. in Com., 2555 (iii); 1°* of B., 2751; 2° m., 2934; in Com., 2935; 3°*, 2957 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 76.)
- Harbor Master, Halifax, Appointment of, Act Amt. B. No. 148 (Mr. *McLelan*). Res. prop., 2421; in Com., 2522; Res. conc. in and 1°* of B., 2534 (iii); 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2772 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 78.)
- HARBORS. See "MARINE" and "PUBLIC WORKS."
- HARDWARE AND SUPPLIES FURNISHED DEPT. MARINE AND FISHERIES AT HALIFAX: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i); Ques., 1914 (iii).
- HARDWARE AND RY. SUPPLIES, PURCHASE OF BY DEPT. OF RYS. AND CANALS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1442 (ii); Ques., 1915 (iii).
- Hatzfeld, Geo. L. E., Relief B. No. 107 (Mr. *Kilvert*). 1° on a div., 672; 2° (Y. 87, N. 40) 694 (i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 38.)
- HAY DUTIES. See "DUTIES."
- HEALTH OFFICERS. See "INSTRUCTIONS."
- HEALTH STATISTICS: in Com. of Sup., 2766 (iv).
- HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COST OF: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).
- HENEY, JOHN, GOVT. PROPERTY OCCUPIED BY: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 3426 (iv).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER:
- AMOUNTS PAID ON ACCOUNT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 210 (i).
 - COMMERCIAL RELATIONS BETWEEN FRANCE AND CANADA: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 825 (ii).
 - COR. re ANTWERP INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION: M. for copies (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
 - IMPERIAL FEDERATION, COR. BETWEEN AND GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 51 (i).
 - IN COM. OF SUP.: 3386 (iv).
 - INSTRUCTIONS TO, RESPECTING IMMIGRATION: Ques. (Mr. *Mackintosh*) 290 (i).
 - OFFICE OF: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 44 (i).
 - PAYMENTS, CLAIMS, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 44 (i).
 - REP. AND DESPATCHES TO GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
 - SALARY AND POSITION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HOLLAND, GEO. AND ANDREW, SERVICES AS REPORTERS AND SHORT-HAND WRITERS: M. for Stmt.*(Mr. *Auger*) 147 (i).
- HOMESTEADS WITHIN THE RY. BELT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 479, 567 (i).
- HOOP IRON: in Com. on Ways-and Means, 807 (ii).
- HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION TO N. W. IN 1884: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- HORSES FOR TROOPS IN N. W., PURCHASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 1306 (ii).
- HOUSE FURNISHING HARDWARE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 848 (ii).
- HOUSE OF COMMONS:
- ACCOMMODATION FOR MEMBERS: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 49 (i).
 - ANNUAL REGISTER, MORGAN'S: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).
 - BLACK ROD: Mess. from Gov. Genl., 2 (i), 1516 (ii), 2475 (iii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—Continued.

- COMMISSIONERS, REP. *re* STAFF: presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2497: Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 2750; increased expenditure under: in Com. of Sup., 3449; conc., 3470 (iv).
- COMMITTEES, EXTRA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2795 (iv).
- CONTINGENCIES: in Com. of Sup., 2796 (iv).
- DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP.: M. for Com. to supervise, 28 (i). *See* general heading.
- ELECTION EXPENSES, RETURNING OFFICERS, MONTREAL: in Com. of Sup., 3451 (iv).
- FRANCHISE, ELECTORAL. *See* "FRANCHISE."
- GRENVILLE, SOUTH, ELECTION: Ret. of Member elect, 3072 (iv).
- HACHÉ, JACQUES, GRATUITY TO: in Com. of Sup., 3450 (iv).
- INCREASED INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS: in Com. of Sup., 3470 (iv).
- INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS ABSENT THROUGH SICKNESS: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3473 (iv). *See* B. 116.
- INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE: prop. M. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 812 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from. His Ex., 40 (i).
- LENNOX ELECTION: Judge's Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- LÉVIS ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 593 (i).
- LIBRARY: M. for Joint Com., 36; Mr. Bourinot's work: scarcity of copies, 40; Office of Librarian: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 41 (i).
- MEMBERS' INDEMNITY ACT AMT. *See* B. 116.
- MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 133 (i), 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).
- NEW MEMBERS, RETURN OF, 1, 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).
- NORTHUMBERLAND ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 593 (i).
- OFFICIAL REP. *See* "DEBATES."
- OPENING: Communication from Gov. Gen. by Black Rod, 1; Speech from the Throne, 2 (i).
- PRINTING COM.'S SECOND REP.: M. to conc. in (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 149 (i); SEVENTH REP., 1822 (iii); NINTH REP., 3293; TENTH REP., 3393 (iv).
- PRINTING, PAPER AND BOOKBINDING: in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii), 2798 (iv).
- PROROGATION: Communication from Deputy of Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 3473; Speech from the Throne, 3475 (iv).
- ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1516 (ii), 2475 (iv).
- SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 991 (ii).
- SELECT STANDING COMS.: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2; M. for Com. to prepare Lists, 27; Lists presented, 30; conc. in, 32; Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- SENATE, COMMONS SUMMONED TO BY MESS., 1 (i), 3475 (iv).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS, EXTRA EXPENSES: in Com. of Sup., 2795 (iv).
- SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE: Irregularity in meeting: Remarks, 2996 (iv); M. to meet at 1 o'clock, 1744 (iii); M. for two sittings each day, 3459 (iv).
- SOCIÉTIÉS ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- SPEAKER, DEPUTY, SALARY: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).
- STAFF, COMMISSION ON REORGANISATION: Rep. presented (Mr. *Speaker*) 2497 (iii); Ques. (Mr. *Fisher*) 2750; increased expenditure under: in Com. of Sup., 3449; conc., 3470 (iv).
- STATIONERY, &c., USED: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 290 (i).
- VACANCIES, NOTIFICATION OF (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- VENTILATION OF THE CHAMBER: Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2676 (iv).
- WEST MIDDLESEX ELECTION: Judge's certificate and Rep. read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1 (i).
- WRITS OF ELECTION: Warrants issued for, 1, 599 (i).
- HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, SUPPLIES FURNISHED TO: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 783 (ii); in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).
- HUGHES, D. J. CHARGES AGAINST: Ques. (Mr. *Wilson*) 77; M. for copies of Papers and Cor., 98 (i).
- HURON AND ONT. SHIP CANAL Co.'s B. No. 69 (Mr. *Tyrwhitt*). 1^o*, 269; 2^o*, 428 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1007; Sen. Amts. conc. in, 1386 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 27.)

HURON AND SUPERIOR, LAKES, SURVEYS OF: in Com. of Sup., 3244 (iv).

Ice, Unguarded Openings, &c. *See* B. 22.

IMMIGRATION:

- ALLAN LINE, PAYMENTS FOR ASSISTED PASSAGES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 567 (i); M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
- BUILDINGS AT LEVIS: Ques. (Mr. *Belleau*) 89 (i).
- CHINESE, REP. OF COMMISSIONERS: presented (Mr. *Chapleau*).
- MAN. AND N. W., COR. BETWEEN C.P.R. CO. AND GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Blake*) 147 (i).
- OFFICE AT QUEBEC, EMPLOYÉS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*).
- PAUPER IMMIGRANTS, TURKISH: Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3475 (iv).
- PRINTING AND ADVERTISING: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 202 (i).
- REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS, SCHEMÉ: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- SETTLERS IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 189 (i).
- DOM. DURING 1884: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).
- MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).
- MAR. PROVS: Ques. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 148 (i).
- N. W.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- SHEDS AT MEDICINE HAT: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 350 (i).
- IMMIGRANT PATIENTS IN QUARANTINE: in Com. of Sup., 3358 (iv).
- IMITATION PRECIOUS STONES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (ii).
- IMPERIAL GOVT., COMMUNICATION WITH, *re* DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).
- IMPERIAL FEDERATION, COR. BETWEEN HIGH COMMISSIONER AND GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 51 (i).
- IMPORTATION OF PRISON MANUFACTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Platt*) 2169 (iii).
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, DISTINGUISHING PRODUCTS OF CANADA: M. for Rep.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- IMPROVED RIFLED ORDNANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS, DEPT. OF., REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i); in Com. of Sup., 901 (ii), 3410 (iv).
- INCREASED DUTY ON FLOUR: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 744 (i).
- INDIANTOWN AND BOYSTOWN RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3453 (iv).
- Indemnity to Members Act. Amt. B. No. 116 (Mr. *Farrow*). 1^o, 813 (ii).
- INDEMNITY TO MEMBERS. *See* "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- INDIANS:
- ADVANCEMENT ACT OF 1884, APPLICATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Cockburn*) 77 (i).
- B. C., COR. BETWEEN GOVT. OF CAN. AND B. C.: M. for copies (Mr. *Mills*) 863 (ii).
- CHEBRIER, G. E., AGENT AT CAUGHNAWAGA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).
- EDUCATION OF, IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Kirk*) 1443 (ii).
- FORT WILLIAM RESERVE: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (ii).
- IN COM. OF SUP. *See* "SUPPLY."
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS AT QU'APPELLE, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2922 (iii).
- LANDS IN TP. OF TORONTO: M. for List* (Mr. *Fleming*) 147 (i).
- LANDS IN VIGER AGENCY: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).
- LEBEL, A., AGENT ACTING WITHOUT SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1211 (ii).

INDIANS—Continued.

- MANITOBA AGENCY, MANAGEMENT, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Charlton*) 61 (i).
- METLAKATLA, TROUBLES AT: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).
- RESERVE LANDS IN B. C., PURCHASE OF, BY GOVT.: M. for copies of Cor., &c.* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- RESERVES AND HOMESTEADS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- RESERVE, VICTORIA ARM, B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1211 (ii).
- RIISING OF THE STONIES: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 863 (ii).
- SCHOOLS IN B. C., ESTABLISHMENT OF: M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1413 (ii).
- SCHOOLS IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 568 (i).
- SUPERINTENDENTS, OFFICE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 88 (i).
- SUPPLIES IN THE N. W., TENDERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
- SYMPATHY WITH HALF-BREEDS IN N. W. T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
- TITLES IN ONT. ACQUIRED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 632 (i).
- TITLE TO DISPUTED TERRITORY: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 594 (i).
- TRAFALGAR, LANDS UNSOLD: M. for List* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).
(See "DOM. LANDS," "DISTURANCE IN THE N. W.," &c.)
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS AT QU'APPELLE AND HIGH RIVER: conc., 2922.
- INDUSTRIES OF CANADA, COMMISSION RESPECTING: M. for copy of Com., O. C., Cor., &c., and also Rep., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
- Infectious or Contagious Diseases.** See "ANIMALS."
- INLAND FISHERIES OF THE DOM., QUEEN vs. ROBINSON: M. for copy of Judgment of Supreme Court (Mr. *O'Brien*) 229 (i).
- INLAND REVENUE, DEPT. OF: Rep. presented (Mr. *Costigan*) 28; in Com. of Sup., 901, 916 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR AT SUMMERSIDE, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- Inland Revenue.** See "CONSOLIDATED."
- INSOLVENCY AND BANKRUPTCY: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) for Sel. Com., 47; Mess. from His Ex., 101; M. to ref. Pts. to Sel. Com., 125 (i).
- Insolvency B. No. 32** (Mr. *Billy*). 1^o, 101 (i).
- Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, Loan Co.'s, &c., B. No. 66** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1^o, 235 (i).
- Insolvent Banks, Insurance Co.'s, Loan Co.'s, &c., B. No. 127** (Mr. *Edgar*). 1^o, 1094 (ii).
- Insolvent Debtors, Distribution of Assets B. No. 4** (Mr. *Curran*). 1^o, 29; 2^o*, 619 (i); M. to transfer to Govt. Orders, 1280; agreed to, 1281 (ii); Order dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (iii).
- Insolvents, Discharge of past, B. No. 34** (Mr. *Beaty*). 1^o*, 113 (i).
- Insolvents' Estates Equitable Distribution B. No. 33** (Mr. *Beaty*). 1^o*, 113 (i).
- Inspection Act.** See "GENERAL."
- INSPECTION OF BANKS, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 51 (i); prop. Res., 81 (i).
- INSPECTION OF FACTORIES, RES. RESPECTING, ON ORDER FOR COM.: Remarks (Mr. *Bergin*) 606 (i).
- INSPECTORS OF PUBLIC WORKS, RET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 606 (i).
- INSPECTORS OR CLERKS OF WORKS, PERSONS EMPLOYED AS: M. for Stmt. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 139 (i).

INSTRUCTIONS TO GENL. MIDDLETON RESPECTING INSURGENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2169 (iii).

INSTRUCTIONS TO HEALTH OFFICERS IN N.B., AND QUARANTINE REGS.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1443 (ii).

INSURANCE:

- CANADA AGRICULTURAL: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
- CONSOLIDATED INSURANCE ACT, 1877. See B. 20.
- DOMINION GRANGE MUTUAL FIRE. See B. 55.
- INSOLVENT CO'S. See Bs. 66 and 127.
- LONDON LIFE INSURANCE CO. See B. 76.
- ROYAL CANADIAN INSURANCE CO. See B. 43.
- SUPERINTENDENCE OF: in Com. of Sup., 2957; conc. 2958 (iv).

INSURRECTION. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W." &c.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

- CASUALTIES TO TRAINS FROM COLLISIONS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 100 (i).
- COAL CARRIED FROM SPRING HILL MINES*: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 533 (i).
- COMMISSION RESPECTING CLAIMS AGAINST: M. for copies of O. C., &c.* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 100 (i).
- COMMISSION, SECRETARY TO, APPOINTMENT: M. for copy of O. C.* (Mr. *Rykert*) 187 (i).
- CONSTRUCTION TO INDIANTOWN: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 744 (i), 816 (ii).
- COST OF EQUIPMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 816 (ii).
- COST OF WORKING: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 202 (i).
- EARNINGS AND WORKING EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3073 (iv).
- EQUIPMENT, VALUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 888 (ii).
- FREE PASSES AND REDUCED FARE TICKETS: Ms. for Ret. (Mr. *Gillmor*) 234; (Mr. *McMullen*) 505 (i).
- FREIGHT AND PASSENGER EARNINGS, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies*) 1442 (ii).
- FREIGHT RATE ARRANGEMENTS BETWEEN CAN. SHIPPING CO. AND THE BEAVER LINE: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).
- PLANTE, J. B., CLAIM OF, FOR HORSES KILLED: M. for copies (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 147 (i).
- PULLMAN CARS, COR. RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Weldon*).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 1744 (iii).
- RECEIPTS AND EXPENSES: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1744, 1914 (iii).
- REVENUE AND WORKING EXPENSES: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 101 (i).
- ROBERTSON, J. D., CLAIM OF, re EXPROPRIATION OF FACTORY, &c.: M. for Papers, &c.* (Mr. *Mills*) 1443 (ii).
- ROLLING STOCK, PURCHASE, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 101 (i).
- RY. CROSSING ON MILL ST.: MEMORIALS, &c.:* M. for copies (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
- RY. SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1442 (ii).
- SALE OF TICKETS ON CHATHAM BRANCH: Ques. (Mr. *Edgar*) 2238 (iii).
- SIMARD, M. J., REP. RECOMMENDING PAYMENT TO G. LAVOIE FOR LAND DAMAGES: M. for copies (Mr. *Langelier*) 1443 (ii).
- WIRE FENCES, CONTRACTS MADE BY GOVT.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Weldon*) 532 (i).
- INTEREST PAID TO GOVT. BY C.P.R. CO. ON LOANS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 350 (i), 1677 (ii), 1955 (iii).
- INTERIOR DEPTL. REP.: Appeal to Members to speak louder (Mr. *Mitchell*) 49 (i).
- INTERIOR, DEPT. OF, REP.: presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i); in Com. of Sup., 915, 968 (ii), 2764, 3408; col. c., 3433 (iv).
- INTERIOR, DEPT. OF, RECEIPTS: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 54 (i).
- INTERIOR, ALLEGED FRAUDS AND IRREGULARITIES IN DEPT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1915, 2170 (iii).

- INTERIOR, MINISTER OF, ABSENCE OF: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1131 (ii).
- INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION: Mess. from His Ex., 40 (i).
- INTERNATIONAL COAL CO.'S B. NO. 51 (Mr. Desjardins). 1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 567 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 29.*)
- INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION. See "ANTWERP."
- INTERNATIONAL FERRIES B. NO. 17 (Mr. Patterson, Essex). 1°*, 46; 2° m., 254; 2°*, 256 (i).
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS, TRAFFIC IN, B. NO. 70 (Mr. Small). 1°, 270 (i).
- INTOXICATING LIQUORS. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT," and "LIQUOR LICENSE ACT."
- IRON, BOUNTIES ON MANUFACTURES OF: M. for copies of O.C. &c.* (Mr. Blake) 100 (i).
- ISBESTER, J., APPOINTMENT AS FARM INSTRUCTOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- ISLANDS IN RIVER ST. LAWRENCE, LEASE OF, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 147 (i).
- ISSUE AND REDEMPTION OF DOM. NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- JACKSON. See "HALF-BREEDS."
- JENKINS, MR.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- JOINT COMMISSION, SURVEYS BETWEEN B.C. AND ALASKA: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Gordon) 705 (i).
- JONES, L. K., APPOINTMENT AS SEC. TO I. C. R. COMMISSION: M. for copies of O.C. (Mr. Rykert) 187 (i).
- JONES, W. H. (SEC. OF STATE'S DEPT.) SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2530 (iii).
- JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS, CABLE ACROSS, COST: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1443 (ii).
- JUDGE CLARK, REP. OF, *re* CLAIMS SECTION B.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 78; M. for copy, 132 (i).
- JUDGE HUGHES, OFFICIAL CONDUCT OF: Ques. (Mr. Wilson) 77; M. for Ret., 98 (i).
- JUDGE MEREDITH, RESIGNATION OF: M. for copy (Mr. Laurier) 43 (i).
- JUDGES IN N. B., APPOINTMENT FOR YEAR'S CIRCUIT: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 563 (i).
- JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS. See B. 161.
- JUDICIAL REFORM IN THE N. W. T., PETITIONS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1306 (ii).
- JUDICIARY OF MAN. See B. 162.
- JUDICIARY OF QUEBEC. See "SUPERIOR COURT."
- JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY SUPREME COURT: M. for copies, &c. (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 533 (i).
- JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 985 (ii).
- JUSTICES OF THE PEACE. See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- JUSTICES OF THE PEACE, SUMMARY PROCEEDINGS BEFORE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1211 (ii). See B. 128.
- JUTE CLOTH: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- JUSTICE, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 898, 914 (ii).
- KAVANAGH, J. C. See "DOMINION LANDS."
- KEEWATIN DISTRICT: EXPENSES OF GOVT.: in Com. of Sup., 3244 (iv).
- KENTVILLE, N.S., DISMISSAL OF COLLECTOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. Moffatt) 1442 (ii).
- KIMBER, R. E. See "BLACK ROD."
- KINGSTON HARBOR PREVENTIVE OFFICERS' CLAIMS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1442 (ii).
- KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 985 (ii).
- KINGSTON. See "MARKET BATTERY" and "TÊTE DU PONT."
- KITS SERVED OUT TO THE MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1568 (ii).
- KOOTENAY RY. CO., B. C., INCORP. B. NO. 83 (Mr. Small). 1°*, 349; 2°*, 545 (i).
- La Banque du Peuple B. NO. 53 (Mr. Girouard). 1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 8.*)
- LABORERS' WAGES, PAYMENT OF, ON C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 290 (i).
- Lake Erie, Essex and Detroit Riv. Ry. Co.'s B. NO. 24 (Mr. Patterson, Essex). 1°*, 67; 2°*, 113; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 21.*)
- LAKEFIELD AND YOUNG'S POINT DAMS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1130 (ii).
- LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES, PERMITS GRANTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mulock) 1444 (ii); legislation respecting (Ques.) 3073 (iv).
- LAKE TÉMISCAMINGUE, MESSRS. PERLEY & GUERIN'S REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. White, Renfrew). 1040 (ii).
- LAND AND SURVEYS OF ST. LAURENT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
- LAND AREA IN THE 48-MILE BELT ACCEPTED BY C.P.R. CO.: Stmt. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 782; Stmt. (Sir Hector Langevin) 862 (ii).
- LAND BOARD AT WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 3345 (iv).
- LAND CLAIMS IN N.W.T., DUTIES OF MR. RUSSELL: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2358 (iii).
- LAND COMPANY AGENT. See "EDMONTON."
- LAND GRANT ACCEPTED BY C.P.R. CO., NUMBER OF ACRES: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 568, 744 (i).
- LAND GRANT AND LAND GRANT BONDS C.P.R., PRESENT POSITION OF: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Blake) 100 (i).
- LAND GRANTS AND LAND GRANT BONDS TO RAILWAYS IN MAN. AND N. W.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Blake) 92 (i).
- Land Grants to Rys. in the N.W.T. B. NO. 147 (Sir Hector Langevin). Res. prop., 782 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2440; in Com., 2461, 2483, 2497; M. to conc. in Res., 2533; 1°* of B., 2534 (iii); 2° m., 2770, 2854; in Com., 2855; Order for 3° read, Amts. (Mr. Blake) 2890; neg. (Y. 46, N. 86) 2893; Amts. (Mr. Blake) neg. on same div., 2894; 3°*, 2894 (iv). (48-49 *Vic., c. 60.*)
- LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1039 (ii).
- LAND RESERVES OF B.C.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 703 (i).
- LAND SALES OR SETTLEMENT IN N.W., SOUTH OF 24-MILE BELT: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 2530 (iii).
- LANDS IN RY. BELT IN B.C. AND HOMESTEAD ACT: Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 289 (i).

- LANDS NORTH AND WEST OF LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).
- LANDS. See "DOMINION."
- LANDS REJECTED BY C.P.R. CO. IN RY. BELT: Stmt. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 965; outside Ry. Belt, Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 927 (ii).
- "LANSDOWNE," STEAMER, ENGINES AND BOILER: Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 189 (i); COMMUNICATION WITH P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 927 (ii).
- LANGELIER, MR. F.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- LAURIE, MAJ. GENL., MISSION OF, TO THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2997 (iv).
- LAVIS'S PATENT POLE AND MILITIA TENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2029 (iii).
- LAVOIE, GEO. See "I.C.R."
- Law of Evidence.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- LAW REPORTS, ONT.: in Com of Sup., 3351 (iv).
- LEDUC, FATHER, AND MR. MALONEY, COMMUNICATIONS WITH GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).
- LE FONDS POST OFFICE, ESTABLISHMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 816 (ii).
- LEBEL, ANTOINE, INDIAN AGENT ACTING WITHOUT SURETIES: Ques. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1211 (ii).
- LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judges Rep., warrant issued and return of Member, 1.
- LETTER CARRIERS. See "CIVIL SERVICE" B. 31.
- LETTER POSTAGE REDUCTION: Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 33; M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 291 (i).
- LETTER POSTAGE, REDUCTION OF: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 291 (i).
- LEVELS, GRADES, TANGENTS, &c., FROM SUMMIT OF ROCKIES TO MOODY: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 888 (ii).
- LEVIS CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i); Return of Member elect, 1385 (ii).
- Library of Parliament Act Amt. B. 139** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Res. prop., 1658; in Com., 1666; 1^o* of B., 1670 (ii); 2^o, 2402 (iii); in Com., 2759; 3^o m., Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) neg. (Y. 51, N. 65) 2763; 3^o on same div. reversed, 2763 (iv). (18-49 *Vic.*, c. 45.)
- LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT: M. for Joint Com., 36; Mr. Bourinot's Work: scarcity of copies, 40; Office of Librarian: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 41 (i); in Com. of Sup., 2796 (iv).
- LICENSE ACT, 1883, DECISION OF SUPREME COURT *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- LICENSE ACT, DOM., COMMISSIONERS UNDER: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Bergin*) 307 (i).
- LICENSE ACT, QUEBEC, WORKING OF: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 307 (i).
- LICENSE COMMISSIONERS IN ESSEX: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 606 (i).
- LICENSE COMMISSIONERS, BOARD OF, UNDER ACT OF 1883: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 46 (i).
- LICENSE INSPECTORS, PAY OF, UNDER ACT OF 1883: Ques. (Mr. *Gunn*) 1568 (ii).
- LICENSES, LAKE ERIE, FISHING, NAMES OF PERSONS GRANTED: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 964 (ii).
- LICENSES OR PERMITS TO CUT TIMBER, &c., APPLICATIONS FOR AND NOT GRANTED: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).
- LICENSES. See "DOMINION LANDS."
- LIEUT.-GOV. OF N.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 362 (i).
- LIEUT.-GOV. OF QUEBEC, OATH OF OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 479 (i).
- LIFE BOATS AND STATIONS: in Com. of Sup., 2947 (iv).
- LIFE SAVING APPARATUS IN C.B.: Ques. (Mr. *Dodd*) 289 (i).
- LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 142 (i).
- LIGHTHOUSES, &c. See "MARINE" and "PUBLIC WORKS."
- LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE: in Com. of Sup., 2951, 3250 (iv).
- LIGHTHOUSE AND FOG-ALARMS, CONSTRUCTION OF: in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).
- LIGHTHOUSE AT QUACO, MEMORIALS OR COR: M. for copies* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
- LIGHTSHIP AT LOWER TRAVERSE, WOOD SUPPLIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
- LINDSAY, D., DEPUTY COLLECTOR OF INLAND REVENUE, SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2531 (iii).
- LINGAN MINES, C.B., AIDING CIVIL POWER AT: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (iv).
- "LION," SEIZURE OF SCHOONER, IN N.S.: M. for copies of Rep., &c.* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
- LIQUOR CERTIFICATES IN CO. OF HALTON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, APPLICATION FOR AND LICENSES GRANTED, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 46 (i).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, Amt. B. No. 58** (Mr. *Foster*). 1^o, 170; 2^o m., 620; deb. adjd., 622 (i).
- Liquor License Act, 1883, B. No. 134** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1^o, 1281 (ii); 2^o m., 2400; 2^o*, 2402 (iii); in Com., 2768, 2894; 3^o m., Amt. (Mr. *Mulock*) 2958; 3^o*, 2961 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 74.)
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, BOARDS OF COMMISSIONERS UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 77 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, CONSTITUTIONALITY OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 429 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, REGULATIONS DIRECTING LICENSE FUND UNDER: Ques. (Mr. *Auger*) 76 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, PUTTING IN FORCE OF: in Com. of Sup., 3244 (iv).
- LIQUOR. See "CAN. TEMP. ACT," &c.
- LIQUORS, REVENUE DERIVED FROM IMPORTATION, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Rykert*) 313 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, SUPREME COURT JUDGMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Desjardins*) 29 (i).
- LIVERPOOL HARBOR, N.S., AUTOMATIC BUOYS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).
- LIVERPOOL OR LONDON, AND ST. JOHN, N.B., OR HALIFAX STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
- LOANS:
- ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVTS.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- ADVANCES TO PROVINCES. See B. 7.
- BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 113, 743 (i).
- CONTRACTED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1744, 1914 (iii).

LOANS—Continued.

- G.P.R. : \$30,000,000, PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1130; payment of interest on: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1131 (ii). See B. 153.
- DRY DOCKS, ENCOURAGEMENT. See B. 108.
- ESQUIMALT GRAVING DOCK. See B. 7.
- FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLID., RETIREMENT: M. for copies of O. C., &c. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
- FIVE PER CENT. LOAN SINKING FUND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2465 (iii).
- GOVT. LOANS: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2465 (iii).
- HARBOR MASTER OF HALIFAX. See B. 48.
- LOAN, RECENT, PROSPECTUS, ADVERTISEMENTS, &c.: M. for copies (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS.: APPLICATIONS FOR ADVANCES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- MONEY BORROWED BY GOVT. IN CANADA: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 743 (i); (Mr. *Charlton*) 1305 (ii).
- PUBLIC SERVICE. See B. 145.
- QUEBEC, ADVANCES ON ACCOUNT OF SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 235 (i).
- TEMPORARY LOANS TO GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 350 (i), 2530 (iii).
- THREE RIVERS HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See B. 150.
- £4,000,000 RECENTLY EFFECTED: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2998 (iv).
- Loans for the Public Service authorization B. No. 145** (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 2391; M. for Com. on Res., 2461; in Com., 2463; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2523; 1°* of B., 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 2526 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 43.)
- LOBSTER TRAPS AND SEA LOTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS. IN N. W. T.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 292 (i).
- LOCATION, &c., C.P.R., LAND SET APART, GRANTED, &c.: M. for Map (Mr. *Blake*) 46 (i).
- LOCATION OF C. P. R. IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2239 (iii).
- London Life Insurance Co.'s Amt. B. No. 76** (Mr. *Macmillan, Middlesex*). 1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°, 1723 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 94.)
- LONGLEY, G. C., COLLECTOR OF INLAND REV., SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2530 (iii).
- LONG SAULT AND LAKE TÉMISCAMINGUE RY. SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458.
- LONG POINT FISHING GROUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 289 (i).
- LONGUEUIL AND LÉVIS RY., SURVEY OF: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 429 (i).
- Lord's Day Observance.** See "SUNDAY EXCURSIONS."
- LOSSES AND EXPENSES THROUGH TROUBLES IN THE N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).
- LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, SUPPLY OF WOOD TO: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
- LUGHRIN, CHARLES H., AND SEC. OF STATE, COB. BETWEEN, re CANADA TEMP. ACT: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Burpee*) 1443 (ii).
- Lutheran Church.** See "SYNOD."
- LYNCH'S TREATISE ON BUTTER: in Com. of Sup., 3456 (iv).
- LYTTON, B.C., WORK ON C. P. R., NEAR: M. for information (Mr. *Blake*).
- MADUXNAKIK RIVER OBSTRUCTIONS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Irvine*) 443 (i).
- MACKINLEY, A. & W., OF HALIFAX, ENTRY OF SCHOOL BOOKS AT UNDERVALUATION: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).

- MAIL BAGS, FURNISHING OF: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 964 (ii).
- MAIL ROBBERIES IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 91 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE. See "POST OFFICE."
- MAIL SUBSIDIES. See "SUPPLY."
- MAIL TRAINS ON G. T. R., BROCKVILLE, ARRIVAL AND DEPARTURE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 816 (ii).
- MANILA HATS; in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (ii).
- MANITOBA:**
- BRANDON, POSTMASTER AT, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2029 (iii).
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY. See general heading.
- CENSUS: Ques. (Mr. *Farrow*) 149 (i). See B. 21.
- CLAIMS FOR A SUBSIDY: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 188 (i).
- CLAIMS SETTLEMENT. See B. 155.
- COUNTY COURT JUDGES: prop. Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 3395 (iv).
- CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT WINNIPEG: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 293 (i); M. for Ret.* 1443 (ii).
- EMERSON, TOWN OF, GOVT. AID TO: Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 148; M. for copies of Claims, &c.,* 448 (i).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
- INDIAN AGENCY, MANAGEMENT OF: M. for copy of Rep. of Commission (Mr. *Charlton*) 61; missing Ret. produced (Mr. *Speaker*) 67 (i).
- LAND BOARD AT WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 3315 (iv).
- MAIL ROBBERIES: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 91 (i).
- MAN, AND NORTH-WESTERN RY. Co. See B. 147.
- MAN. CENTRAL RY. Co.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 862 (i).
- MAN. SOUTH-WESTERN COLONIZATION RY. Co. See B. 147.
- PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 989 (i), 3351 (iv).
- ROUNDHOUSE AT SELKIRK: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2171 (iii).
- SESSION OF LEGISLATURE, 1884: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 862 (ii).
- SETTLERS: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 113 (i).
- TUG-BARGES, DREDGES, &c., ON RED RIVER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 984 (ii).
- [See also "DOMINION LANDS," "HALF-BREEDS," "INDIANS," &c.]
- Manitoba and North-Western Ry. Co. of Canada B. No. 74** (Mr. *Royal*). 1°*, 313; 2°*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1180 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 86.)
- MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT: Deb. on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 2775; (Mr. *Watson*) 2776; (Mr. *Ross*) 2777; (Mr. *Blake*) 2778; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2780; (Mr. *Mulock*) 2783; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 2783; (Mr. *Mills*) 2784; (Mr. *White, Hastings*) 2786; (Messrs. *Trow and Woodworth*) 2787; (Mr. *Fairbank*) 2789 (iv). See B. 155.
- Manitoba, Subsidy to, increased, B. No. 155** (Mr. *Bowell*). Res. prop., 2420 (iii); M. for Com., 2775; in Com., 2789, 2823; further Res., 2889; in Com., 2924; 1°* of B., 2926; 2° and in Com., 3047; 3°, 3075 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 50.)
- MANUFACTURED EXPORTS, DRAWBACKS ON: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
- MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES REP.: Information respecting B. C. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 594.
- MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *McLelan*) 113 (i); in Com. of Sup., 906, 922 (ii).
- MARINE:**
- ALLAN STEAMSHIP CO. AND CLAIM OF GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 148 (i).
- AUTOMATIC BUOYS IN LIVERPOOL HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).

MARINE—Continued.

- BAYFIELD BREAKWATER, EXTENSION : Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 77 (i).
 BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, MANAGEMENT : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
 BROOKLYN BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 478 (i).
 BUOYS IN VICTORIA AND NANAIMO HARBORS : Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).
 BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, SOUNDINGS : M. for copy of Rep. (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 1533 (ii).
 CAPE RACE LIGHT ; in Com. of Sup., 2952 (iv).
 CASCOMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS : Ques. (Mr. *Yeo*) 479 (i).
 COFFIN'S ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, PROTECTION : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1915 (iii).
 DIGBY PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884 ; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).
 DISCOVERY ISLAND, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).
 DREDGES, TUGS AND SCOWS : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 53 ; remarks (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 56 (i).
 DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE FOG-HORN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).
 FOG-WHISTLES IN BAY OF FUNDY, TENDERS FOR COAL : M. for copies* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 GREAT VILLAGE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS : M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 67 (i).
 HOSPITALS : in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
 HUDSON BAY EXPEDITION, SUPPLIES : Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 783 ; in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).
 "LANSDOWNE," STEAMER, ENGINE AND BOILER : Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 189 (i) ; COMMUNICATION WITH P. E. I. : Ques. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 927 (ii).
 LIFE-BOATS AND STATIONS : in Com. of Sup., 2947 (iv).
 LIFE-SAVING APPARATUS IN C.B. : Ques. (Mr. *Dodd*) 239 (i).
 LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 142 (i).
 LIGHTHOUSE AND COAST SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2950-2952, 3250 (iv).
 "LION," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF : M. for copies of Rep.* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE, WOOD SUPPLIES : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
 MASTERS AND MATES' EXAMINATION : in Com. of Sup., 2946 (iv).
 McISAAC'S POND AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE : Ques. (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 36 ; ENGINEERS' REFS. : M. for copies, 60 (i).
 METAGHAN RIVER PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).
 NARROWS, ST. LAWRENCE, LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 112 (i).
 NAVIGATION OF CANADIAN WATERS. See B. 132.
 "NEPTUNE," STEAMER, SUPPLIES : M. for copies of Accts. (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).
 NEW HARBOR AND INDIAN HARBOR BREAKWATERS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE : in Com. of Sup., 2945 (iv).
 PARSBOROUGH BREAKWATER, TENDERS : M. for copies (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 66 (i).
 PORT ARTHUR HARBOR : in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
 PORT MOODY DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR : Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 816 (ii).
 PORT ROWAN AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 297 (i).
 PORTS STANLEY AND BURWELL, HARBORS OF REFUGE : M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 64 (i).
 "QUEEN OF THE ISLES," STEAMER, EMPLOYMENT OF : Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1131 (ii).
 RED POINT HARBOR BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1039 (ii).
 RIVER ST. LAWRENCE NAVIGATION. See B. 159.
 SALMON POINT BREAKWATER : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).
 SATUMA ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE : Ques. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 479 (i).

MARINE—Continued.

- SAWDUST IN LA HAVRE RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 2239 (iii).
 SHINGLE SHAVINGS IN THE MERSEY RIVER : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1039 (ii).
 SHIPPING, REGISTRATION : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
 "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 831 (ii).
 SOMERVILLE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 57 (i).
 STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMT. See B. 133.
 STORES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i) ; Ques., 1914 (iii).
 TRACADIE BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE : M. for Stmt. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 147 (i).
 TUG-BARGES, DREDGE, &C., ON RED RIVER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).
 WATER AND RIVER POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
 WELLER'S BAY "RANGE LIGHTS" : M. for Cor. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).
 WHITE POINT BREAKWATER : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).
 WHITE POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS : Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).
 WRACKS AND CASUALTIES : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
Maritime Court of Ontario Jurisdiction B. No. 11 (Mr. *Allen*). 1^o*, 40 ; 2^o m., 127 ; 2^o*, 131 ; Order for Com. read, 215 ; in Com., 496 ; 3^o*, 616 (i).
 MARKET BATTERY, KINGSTON, LEASE OF PROPERTY : M. for copies of O. C., &c. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).
 MARTIN, JOHN, CONTINUATION OF PENSION TO WIDOW OF : M. for copies of Pets.* (Mr. *Curran*) 201 (i).
 MASKINONGÉ, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION : Warrant issued and Ret. of member, 1 (i).
 MASTERS AND MATES, EXAMINATION OF : in Com. of Sup., 2946 (iv).
 MATTAWA, MOUNTAIN RAPIDS, AND LONG SAULT, IMPROVEMENTS AT : Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1040 (ii).
 MEDALS FOR VOLUNTEERS WHO SERVED IN THE N.W. : Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 2274 (iii).
 MEDICINE HAT AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 351 (i).
 MEETING OF THE HOUSE, IRREGULAR TIME : Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2996 (iv).
 MEGANTIC : Return of Member to represent, 1 (i).
 MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION FOR : Remarks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 49 (i).
 MEMBERS' INDEMNITY, PAYMENT TO THOSE ABSENT THROUGH SICKNESS : Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3473 (iv).
 MEMBERS INTRODUCED, 1, 133 (i), 1192, 1385 (ii), 3150 (iv).
 MEMORIALS, &C., RESPECTING GRIEVANCES, ANSWERS TO : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).
 MEREDITH, CHIEF JUSTICE, RESIGNATION OF : M. for copy (Mr. *Laurier*) 43 (i).
 MESSAGES FROM HIS EXCELLENCY :
 ADDRESS, ANS. TO, 113 (i).
 CLAIMS OF MANITOBA, 202 (i).
 CHINESE COMMISSIONERS' REP., 234 (i).
 ESTIMATES, THE, 289 (i) ; Suppl. for 1884-85, 2820 ; Suppl. for 1885-86, 3359 ; Further Suppl. for 1885-86, 3423 (iv).
 BANKRUPTCY PETS., RES., &C., 101 (i).
 INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION, 49 (i).
 ALBANY, DECK OF, DEATH OF, THANKS OF QUEEN, 32 (i).
 GRANT OF \$700,000 FOR N.W. TROUBLES, 1064 (ii).
 GRANT OF \$1,000,000 FOR EXPENDITURE IN N.W., 2234 (iii).
 MIDDLETON, GENL., VOTE TO, 3470 (iv).
 PARLIAMENT : OPENING, 1 ; PROROGATION, 3475.
 WASHINGTON TREATY, COR. AND PAPERS, 3232 (iv).
 METAGHAN RIVER PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).

METLAKATLA INDIAN TROUBLES: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).

METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORIES: in Com. of Sup., 2956 (iv).
MIDDLETON, GENL., DESPATCHES FROM: 1822, 1835, 1895, 2139, 2357 (iii), 2750, 3073 (iv); Instructions to: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1306 (ii), 2169 (iii); Thanks of Parlt., 3457; Vote of \$20,000, 3470 (iv).

MILITIA:

A, B AND C BATTERIES: in Com. of Sup., 2914 (iv).
 ACTIVE MEMBERS, NUMBER: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 533 (i).
 AMMUNITION: in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).
 ARMS, DESCRIPTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Gault*) 814.
 ARGYLE HIGHLANDERS, PAYMENT OF ARREARS: Ques. (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 883; M. for Ret.,* 1444 (ii).
 BARRACKS AT LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
 BARBACK HUTS, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
 BATTERIES, TRANSFER OF: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 235 (i).
 BERGIN, SURGEON-GENL., SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1914 (iii).
 BLAIS, ACHILLE, FUNERAL EXPENSES: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2169 (iii).
 BOOTS FOR THE TORONTO CORPS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (ii).
 BRIGADE MAJORS' SALARIES, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).
 CANADIAN CONTINGENT FOR THE SOUDAN: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 568 (i).
 CLOTHING AND GREAT COATS: in Com. of Sup., 2903 (iv).
 DOM. ARTILLERY ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).
 DOM. RIFLE ASSOCIATION: in Com. of Sup., 2913 (iv).
 DRILL PAY, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2910 (iv).
 EQUIPMENT OF THE 90TH BATT.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 2854 (iv).
 EXPEDITION TO THE N.W., COST OF: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1678 (ii).
 FLANNEL SHIRTS, CONTRACT FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1306 (ii).
 GATLING GUNS FOR USE OF TROOPS: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 813 (ii).
 GRANT, G., SUPERANNUATION: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 2531 (iii).
 GUNS IN ACTION IN THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
 HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION TO THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3425 (iv).
 IMPROVED RIFLED ORDNANCE: in Com. of Sup., 2915 (iv).
 KITS SERVED OUT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1568 (ii).
 LAURIE, MAJOR GENL., MISSION TO THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2997 (ii).
 LAVIS' PATENT POLE AND MILITIA TENTS: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2029 (iii).
 MARTIN, J., PENSION TO WIDOW OF: M. for copies of Pet.* (Mr. *Curran*) 201 (i).
 MEDALS FOR VOLUNTEERS: Ques. (Mr. *McNeill*) 2274 (iii).
 MIDDLETON, GENL., DESPATCHES FROM, 1822, 1835, 1895, 2139, 2357 (ii), 2750, 3073 (iv).
 MIDDLETON, GENL., INSTRUCTIONS: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1306 (ii), 2169 (iii).
 MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES, NUMBER, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 313 (i).
 MILITARY COLLEGE GRADUATES IN THE MILITIA: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 1040 (ii).
 MILITARY BRANCH, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2889, 2893, 2903 (iv).
 MILITARY COLLEGE: in Com. of Sup., 2913; conc., 2932 (iv).
 MILITARY MAGAZINE AT ST. JOHN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 603 (i).
 MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS IN MAN. AND N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 862, 1474 (ii).
 MILITARY PROPERTIES, CARE OF: in Com. Sup., 2916 (iv).
 MILITARY STOREHOUSE, QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1039 (ii).
 MONTREAL GARRISON ARTILLERY: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1566 (ii).
 MOUNTED INFANTRY, WINNIPEG: in Com. of Sup., 3411 (iv).
 OFFICERS AND MEN, PAY, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 313 (i).
 O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copy of Rep. of Major-Genl. (Mr. *Casey*) 45 (i).
 OTTER'S, COL., MARCH TO BATTLEFORD: Remarks, 1386 (ii).
 OUIVET'S, COL., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Remarks, 1187, 1205 (ii).
 PENSIONS TO MILITIAMEN OF 1812: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Bourassa*) 101 (i).
 PENSIONS: in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).
 POWDER MAGAZINES AT FORT HOWE: Ques. (Mr. *Weldon*) 246 (ii).

MILITIA—Continued.

PROTESTANT VOLUNTEERS IN 65TH BATTALION; Remarks, 2998; Tel., 3094 (iv).
 REBELLION. See general heading "DISTURBANCE."
 REWARDS FOR BRAVERY: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 2359.
 SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC: M. for Papers (Mr. *Langelier*) 88 (i).
 SCOTT'S, COL., BATT.: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1064 (ii).
 TROOPS AT CLARKE'S CROSSING: Telegram, 1205 (ii).
 TROOPS, MOVEMENTS OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 238, 872; Tel., 1328 (ii).
 VETERANS OF WAR 1812: in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).
 ——— EXTENSION OF PENSIONS TO WIDOWS: Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 36 (i).
 VICTORIA RIFLES, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1983 (iii).
 VOLUNTEERS OF MIL. DIST. No. 9: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
 ——— TREATMENT OF HALF-BREEDS BY: Remarks, 2169 (iii).
 ——— KILLED, TRANSPORT OF BODIES: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii).
 ——— IN THE N.W. AND INTOXICATING LIQUOR: Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1131 (ii).
 ——— CORPS IN THE N.W. IN 1879: Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 816; Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1474 (ii).
 ——— OF 1837-38, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Res. (Mr. *Hickey*) 37 (i).
 ——— RECOGNITION OF SERVICES: Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 1563 (ii).
 VOTE OF THANKS, GEN. MIDDLETON AND VOLUNTEERS, 3459; Res., 3463 (iv).
 WAR SUPPLIES, CARRIAGE BY AMERICAN RYS.: Remarks, 839 (ii).
 WATERPROOF BLANKETS, PURCHASE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).
 WILLIAMS, COL., DEATH OF: Remarks and Telegram, 3073 (iv).
 [See also general heading "DISTURBANCE."]
Militia Acts. See "CONSOLIDATED."
 MILITIA AND DEFENCE, ANNUAL REP.: presented (Mr. *Caron*) 40 (i).
 MILITIA, DEPT. OF: in Com. of Sup., 898, 914 (ii), 2913 (iv).
Militia, Recognition of Services in the N.W. B. 160 (Mr. *Caron*). Res. prop., 3321; M. for Com., 3376; in Com., 3377; 1^o* of B., 3380; 2^o*, in Com. and 3^o*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 73)
 MILLARD, MR., FINES IMPOSED, COLLECTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1211 (ii).
 MILL ST., ST. JOHN, RY. CROSSING ON, MEMORIAL AND COB.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
 MINERAL WATERS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).
 MINING AND TIMBER LANDS, NORTH OF LAKES SUPERIOR AND HURON, OWNERSHIP OF: M. for O.C., &c. (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).
 MINISTER OF RYS., OFFICE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 41 (i).
 MINISTER OF INT., ABSENCE OF: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 964 (ii).
 MIRAMICHI RIVER, FISH CAUGHT IN: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Mitchell*) 295 (i).
 MISSION OF HON. MR. ROYAL: Attention of Govt. called to newspaper paragraph (Mr. *Blake*) 889 (ii).
 MISSION OF MAJOR GENL. LAURIE TO THE N.W.: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2^o 97 (iv).
 MODEL FARM, ESTABLISHMENT: in Com. of Sup., 3453 (iv).
 MONEY BORROWED BY GOVT. IN CANADA: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 743 (i).
 MONTREAL AND CHAMPLAIN JUNCTION RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3458; in Com., 3472 (iv).
 MONTREAL AND SOBREL RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3457 (iv).
 MONTREAL GARRISON ARTILLERY. See "MILITIA."

- MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 567 (i).
- MOODY, JOHN, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 148 (i).
- MOODY. See "PORT MOODY."
- "MORAVIAN." See "ALLAN LINE."
- MORGAN, H. J., PAYMENTS TO: M. for Stmt. (Mr. McCraney) 1443 (ii). See "DOMINION ANNUAL REGISTER."
- MORGAN, J. H., SERVICES AS FORESTRY COMMISSIONER: Ques. (Mr. Cockburn) 77; APPOINTMENT: M. for O. C. (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 147 (i).
- MOULDINGS AND PICTURE FRAMES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (ii).
- MORTON DAIRYING AND FARMING Co. See "SQUATTERS."
- MOUNTED INFANTRY. See "MILITIA."
- Mounted Police Augmentation B. No. 144** (Sir John A. Macdonald). Res. prop., 994 (ii); M. for Com. on Res., 2402; in Com., 2415; M. to receive Rep. of Com., 2421; 1^o* of B., 2430 (iii); 2^o and in Com., 2770; 3^o m., 2820; 3^o on a div., 2822 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 53.)
- MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS, TENDERS FOR: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMMISSIONERS' REP.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2359 (iii).
- MOUNTED POLICE, COMPENSATION FOR INJURIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 505 (i).
- Mounted Police Force B. No. 140** (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1^o*, 1670 (ii); 2^o and in Com., 2772; 3^o m., 2832; 3^o, 2833 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 54.)
- MOUNTED POLICE: in Com. of Sup., 3243, 3392, 3421 (iv).
- MOUNTED POLICE, INCREASE OF FORCE: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2169 (ii).
- MOUNTED POLICE OFFICERS, REPS. FROM, *re* ENGAGEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3435 (iv).
- MOUNTED POLICE RECRUITS: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1566 (ii).
- MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3303, 3307 (iv).
- MURRAY CANAL ROUTE, COR. AND PETS.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Cockburn) 1442 (ii).
- MUSK: in Com on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- MUSKOKA LAKES AND RIVER SEVERN CANAL SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 289 (i).
- MCCARTHY, C. (PUBLIC WORKS DEPT.) SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2530 (iii).
- MCDUGALL, MR. H. F.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- MCISAAC'S POND, INVERNESS, N.S., AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE, (Ques.) 36; ENGINEERS' REPS. RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 60 (i).
- MCLEOD, N., (INDIAN AFFAIRS) SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2530 (iii).
- MCMANUS, GRATUITY TO WIDOW OF: in Com. of Sup., 3350; conc., 3374 (iv).
- NAPANEE, CONSTRUCTION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT: Ques. (Mr. Pruynt) 77 (i).
- NAPANEE, TAMWORTH AND QUEBEC RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458.
- NARROWS, ERECTION OF A LIGHTHOUSE AT: Ques. (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 112 (i).
- "NATIONAL POLICY" PAMPHLET: M. for copy* (Mr. Charlton) 124 (i).
- Navigation of Canadian Waters Act Amt. B. No. 132** (Mr. McLelan). Res. prop. and in Com., 1278; 1^o* of B., 1279 (ii); Order for 2^o dschgd. and B. withdn., 2899 (iv). See B. 159.
- NELSON & SON'S SCHOOL BOOKS. See "CUSTOMS."
- "NEWFIELD." See "ALLAN LINE."
- NEW HARBOR AND INDIAN HARBOR, N.S., BREAKWATERS, ENGINEERS' REPS.: M. for copies, &c.* (Mr. Kirk) 147 (i).
- NEW MEMBERS, RET. OF (ANNOUNCEMENT) 1, 113 (i), 1192, 1385 (ii), 3072 (iv).
- NEW MILITIA PENSIONS: conc., 2765 (iv).
- NEW BRUNSWICK:**
- CARLTON BRANCH RY., PURCHASE OF: in Com. of Sup., 3415 (iv).
- DODGE, BRENTON, DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Moffat) 1442 (ii).
- DORCHESTER PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 989 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
- FISH INSPECTOR IN CITY OF ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 2997 (iv).
- FISH TAKEN IN THE MIRAMICHI: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mitchell) 295 (i).
- FOOT AND CARRIAGE BRIDGE AT ST. JOHN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1443 (ii).
- INTERCOLONIAL RY. See general heading.
- JUDGES, APPOINTMENT FOR YEAR'S CIRCUIT: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 568 (i).
- LIEUT.-GOVERNOR: Ques (Mr. Blake) 362 (i).
- MILITARY PROPERTIES AT ST. JOHN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 606 (i).
- MILL ST., ST. JOHN, RY. CROSSING, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Weldon) 1442 (ii).
- NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. Co.: M. for copies* (Mr. Temple) 533 (i).
- POWDER MAGAZINES AT FORT HOWE, ST. JOHN: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 246 (i).
- RICHIBUCTO AND KINGSTON PORTS, CUSTOMS BUSINESS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1442 (ii).
- SALMON FISHING IN BATHURST HARBOR: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2359 (iii).
- ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RY. EXTENSION Co.: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 569 (i).
- ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTY, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 3127 (iv).
- ST. STEPHEN'S POST OFFICE, RECEIPTS, &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Burpee) 1100 (ii).
- ST. STEPHEN'S PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 1148 (ii).
- SUPREME COURT, CAUSES ENTERED: M. for number (Mr. Foster) 294 (i).
- WOODSTOCK PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Irvine) 606 (i).
- "NEPTUNE," See "HUDSON BAY."
- NEW BRUNSWICK AND P.E.I. RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3457; in Com., 3472 (iv).
- NEWFOUNDLAND AND THE DOM., TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 3042 (iv).
- NICOLET: Return of Member to represent, 1.
- NORTH AMERICAN CONTRACTING Co., POSITION OF DEBT OF \$600,000: M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
- NORTHERLY AND WESTERLY BOUNDARIES OF ONT., PROCEEDINGS, MONEYS PAID, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 210 (i).
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. AND THE C.P.R.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 57 (i).
- NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. LEASE: M. for copy (Mr. Mulock) 56 (i).

- NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY., COR., BETWEEN DOM. AND LOCAL GOVT. OF N.B.:** M. for copies (Mr. Temple) 533 (i).
- NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY. Co.'s SUBSIDY:** prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3457 (iv).
- NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS:** M. for copy of Repts., &c. (Mr. McCallum) 615, 695 (i).
- NORTH SHORE LINE, SUBSIDY TO:** M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
- NORTH SHORE RY., PURCHASE OF, BY GOVT.:** Ques. (Mr. Laurier) 189 (i).
- NORTH SHORE RY., USE OF BY C.P.R.:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1915 (iii).
- NORTHERNBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judgment of Supreme Court, 593 (i); Return of Member, 1192 (ii).
- NORTH-WESTERN COAL AND NAV. Co.** See B. 147.
- NORTH-WEST CENTRAL RY.:** Remarks (Mr. Watson) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3380 (iv).
- N.W. COUNCIL, RES. re HALF-BREED CLAIMS:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- N.W. COUNCIL, SALARIES:** in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).
- N.W.T. Expenses B. No. 149** (Mr. Bowell). Res., 2532, 1°* of B., 2559; 2° and in Com., 2855; 3°*, 2894 (iv). (48-49 *Vic., c. 42.*)
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES:**
- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.** See B. 141.
- BELL AND KAYAMAGH LAND CLAIMS:** M. for copies of O. C. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 479 (i).
- CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE:** Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.** See general heading.
- CENSUS:** Ques. (Mr. Farrow) 149 (i). See B. 21.
- CHANGE OF NAMES OF LOCALITIES:** Ques. (Mr. Tassé) 2359 (ii).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.:** M. for Stmt. * (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
- FEES FROM SETTLERS BY GOVT. AGENTS:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2170 (ii).
- FISHERIES ACT EXTENSION:** Ques. (Mr. Hesson) 51 (i).
- FISHERIES PROTECTION:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Henson) 700 (i).
- FORT MACLEOD BARRACKS:** in Com. of Sup., 3387 (iv).
- FORT MACLEOD RANCH TEL. Co.** See B. 80.
- FUEL FOR SETTLERS:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Blake) 61 (i).
- GOVT. OFFICIALS, NAMES, &c.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. McMullen) 66 (i).
- GRANDIN, BISHOP, COMMUNICATIONS FROM:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3423 (iv).
- HALF-BREED GRIEVANCES:** Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 761; neg. (Y. 57, N. 122) 771 (i); Speech, 2030; Resumé of Events: Res. (Mr. Blake) in Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means, 3075; deb. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 3110; (Mr. Laurier) 3119; (Mr. Girouard) 3128; (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 3154, 3163; (Mr. Mackintosh) 3175; (Mr. Mills) 3190; (Mr. Royal) 3199.
- HOUGHTON, COL., MISSION IN 1884:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- IMMIGRANT SHEDS AT MEDICINE HAT:** Ques. (Mr. Watson) 350 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. Blake) 45 (i).
- INDIANS.** See general heading.
- INDIAN SUPPLIES, TENDERS FOR:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 532 (i).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS AT QU'APPELLE, &c.:** conc., 2922 (iv).
- JUDICIAL REFORM, PETITIONS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1306 (ii).
- LAND GRANTS TO RYS.** See B. 147.
- LANDS.** See "DOMINION LANDS."
- LAURIE, MAJOR GENL., MISSION TO N.W.:** Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 2997 (iv).
- LOSSES AND EXPENSES THROUGH TROUBLES:** in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).
- MAIL ROBBERIES:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Blake) 91 (i).
- MEDICINE HAT AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE:** Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- MILITARY ORGANIZATIONS IN THE N.W.:** Ques. (Mr. Trow) 862 (ii).
- NORTH-WEST TERRITORIES—Continued.**
- MORGAN, J. H., APPOINTMENT AS FORESTRY COMMISSIONER:** M. for O.C., &c.* (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 147 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE BARRACKS:** Ques. (Mr. Watson) 351 (i).
- N.W. COUNCIL, SALARIES:** in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).
- OFFICIALS, COMMUNICATIONS WITH:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- REAL PROPERTY IN THE N.W.T.** See B. 109.
- REBELLION.** See general heading "DISTURBANCE."
- REPRESENTATION IN PARLT.:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 292 (i); Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404.
- ROYAL, HON. MR., VISIT TO N.W.:** attention of Govt. called to (Mr. Blake) 889 (ii).
- RUSSELL, MR., DUTIES OF:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2358 (iv).
- SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS:** M. for Ret. (Mr. McCallum) 615, 695 (i).
- SAUNDERS AND WOOD, TRIAL FOR LIBEL:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
- SETTLERS DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1884:** Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 113 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN QU'APPELLE VALLEY:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 205 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN TP. 3, RANGES 23 AND 24 WEST:** M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 231 (i).
- ST. CLAIR RANCH Co.:** Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2240 (iii).
- SURVEYS AND EXPLORATIONS:** Ques. (Mr. Mills) 2029 (iii).
- SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF QU'APPELLE.** See B. 39.
- VOLUNTEER CORPS, ORGANIZATION:** Remarks (Mr. Watson) 816; Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1474 (ii).
- VOTE FOR RELIEF OF SETTLERS:** Ques. (Mr. Watson) 1744 (iii).
- [See also "DISTURBANCE," "DOMINION LANDS," "HALF-BREEDS, &c."]
- NOVA SCOTIA:**
- ANTIGONISH AND SHERBROOKE MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 568 (i).
- AUTOMATIC BUOYS IN LIVERPOOL HARBOR:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 479 (i), 1914 (iii).
- BAYFIELD HARBOR BREAKWATER, EXTENSION:** Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 77 (i).
- BIRD ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, MANAGEMENT:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Campbell, Victoria) 1443 (ii).
- BROOKLYN BREAKWATER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 473 (i).
- CLAIMS FOR A SUBSIDY:** Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 189 (i).
- COFFIN'S ISLAND LIGHTHOUSE, PROTECTION:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 1915 (iii).
- CUMBERLAND, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1 (i).**
- CUSTOMS DETECTIVES OR POLICE IN N.S.:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 889 (ii).
- DIGBY PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Vail) 532 (i).
- EASTERN EXTENSION RY., EARNINGS, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 148; M. for Stmt.,* 313 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3300, 3384 (iv).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
- FISHERMEN, PAYMENT OF BOUNTY, IN GUYSBOROUGH Co.:** Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 2751 (iv).
- FISH LADDERS IN LA HAVRE RIVER:** Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 2239 (iii).
- GREAT VILLAGE RIVER IMPROVEMENTS:** M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 67 (i).
- HARBORS IN GUYSBOROUGH Co., RE-SURVEY:** Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 51 (i).
- "LION," SCHOONER, SEIZURE OF:** M. for copies of Rep.* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).
- MCSAAC'S POND AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE:** Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 36; Engineers' Repts.: M. for copies, 60 (i).
- METAGHAN RIVER PIER, WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS FOR 1884:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. Vail) 532 (i).
- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., PROJECTED LINE:** M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3413 (iv).
- PARSBOROUGH BREAKWATER, TENDERS:** M. for copies (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 66 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND GUYSBOROUGH, &c., COMMUNICATION:** Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 114 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AS A SUB-PORT:** M. for papers (Mr. Kirk) 445 (i).

NOVA SCOTIA—Continued.

- RYs., CONSOLIDATION AND COMPLETION: Ques. (Mr. *Stairs*) 2530 (iv).
 SAWDUST LAW, BREACH OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147; Ques., 1039, 1211 (ii), 2239 (iii).
 SHINGLE SHAVINGS IN THE MERSEY RIVER: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1039 (ii).
 SOMERVILLE BREAKWATER REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 57 (i).
 STARR, J. E., FISHERY OVERSEER, REMOVAL OF: M. for Ret* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
 SUPPLIES PURCHASED IN HALIFAX: Ms. for Rets.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i), 1442; Ques., 1914, 1915 (iii).
 TRACADIE BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *McIsaac*) 147 (i).
 VACANCY IN A JUDICIAL DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2750 (iv).
 WATER LOTS, APPLICATIONS FOR: Ques. (Mr. *Tupper*) 429 (i).
 WHITE POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).
 WINDSOR BRANCH RY., O.O., AGREEMENTS, &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Kinney*) 533 (i).
- Oaths of Office.** See "ADMINISTRATION."
- OBSTRUCTIONS IN NAVIGABLE WATERS: in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).
 OAK, PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS, EXPORT DUTY: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1442 (ii).
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN RIVERS, COL. BETWEEN CANADA AND U.S.: M. for copies (Mr. *Irvine*) 443; withdn., 445 (i).
 OCEAN AND RIVER SERVICE. See "MARINE" and "SUPPLY."
 OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, ANNUAL COST, &c.: M. for Stmt., (Mr. *Blake*) 204 (i).
- Ocean Mail Service, Renewal of Contract B. No. 151** (Mr. *Carling*). Res. prop., 2440; Res. in Com., 2555 (iii); M. to rec. Rep. of Com., 2751; M. to conc. in Res., 2754; 1° of B., 2757; Order for 2° dschgd. and B. withdn., 3375 (iv).
- O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, SUMS PAID TO, re ONT. BOUNDARY: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Lister*) 210 (i).
- Offences Against the Person.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- OFFICIAL ARBITRATORS, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. *Belleau*) 88 (i).
 OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES UNDER BANKRUPT ACT, 1869: M. for Ret. of Estates, &c.* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 303, 533 (i).
 OFFICIAL DESPATCHES RESPECTING ENGAGEMENTS IN N.W.: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2999 (iv); Ques., 2169 (iii).
 OFFICIALS, GOVT., IN THE N.W., NAMES, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 66 (i).
 OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES, EMPLOYMENT OF, DURING RECESS: Ques. (Mr. *Auger*) 76 (i).
 O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copy of Rep. of Maj.-Genl. (Mr. *Casey*) 45 (i).
 O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST AND SUSPENSION OF: M. for copy (Mr. *Wilson*) 101; (i).
 ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S BONDS: M. for copy of Prospectus, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i); Stockholders: M. for Stmt.,* 1443 (ii).
- Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 72** (Mr. *Bergin*). 1°*, 213; 2°*, 405 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1007 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 19.)
- ONTARIO:**
 BOUNDARIES. See general heading.
 CHARLINGH, POSTMASTER AT: M. for Papers (Mr. *Blake*) 708 (i).

ONTARIO—Continued.

- CORNWALL CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).
 CORNWALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2997 (iv).
 DAMS AT LAKEFIELD AND YOUNG'S POINT: Ques. (Mr. *Dummy*) Lighthouse Fog-horn: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).
 DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD, SALE OF: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 147; prop. Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 451 (i). See B. 120.
 DUNDAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 290 (i).
 EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
 FORT FRANCIS CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3385 (iv).
 GLAMMIS POST OFFICE, ENQUIRY: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1131 (ii).
 GREENVILLE, SOUTH, RETURN OF MEMBER, 3072 (iv).
 HENEY, J., GOVT. PROPERTY OCCUPIED BY: Ques. (Mr. *Holton*) 3426 (iv).
 HUGHES, D. J., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 98; Ques., 77 (i).
 INDIAN TITLES ACQUIRED BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. *Mills*) 632 (i).
 KINGSTON PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 985 (i), 3350 (iv).
 LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1444 (ii); Ques., 3073 (iv).
 LAND IMPROVEMENT FUND SETTLEMENT: Ques. (Mr. *Sproule*) 1039 (ii).
 LENNOX CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S CERTIFICATE, &c., 1 (i).
 LIFE-SAVING SERVICE AT PORT ROWAN: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Jackson*) 142 (i).
 LONG POINT FISHING GROUNDS: Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 289 (i).
 MAIL SERVICE ON CAN. SOUTHERN RY.: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wigle*) 120 (i).
 MAITLAND, POSTMASTER AT: Ques. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1743 (iii).
 MARITIME COURT, EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION. See B. 11.
 MIDDLESEX, WEST, CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S REP., 1 (i).
 MILITIA BARRACKS AT LONDON: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
 MINING AND TIMBER LANDS NORTH OF LAKE SUPERIOR: M. for O.O., &c. (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).
 MURRAY CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3303 (iv).
 MURRAY CANAL ROUTE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1442 (ii).
 MUSKOKA LAKES AND RIVER SEVERN CANAL SYSTEM: Ques. (Mr. *Bain*, *Wentworth*) 289 (i).
 NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Pruyn*) 77 (i).
 NORTHUMBERLAND CONTROVERTED ELECTION, JUDGE'S REP., 593 (i); Ret. of Member, 1192 (ii).
 O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., CHARGES AGAINST: M. for copies (Mr. *Casey*) 45; (Mr. *Wilson*) 101 (i).
 ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RY. CO.'S BONDS: M. for copy of Prospectus (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i); Stockholders: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
 ONTARIO, WEST, VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1 (i).
 OTTAWA, ALLOWANCE TO ASSISTANT POSTMASTER: in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3398 (iv).
 OTTAWA RIVER SHIP CANAL: prop. Res. (Mr. *White*, *Renfrew*) 1211 (ii).
 OTTAWA RIVER SURVEY AND EXPLORATIONS: Ques. (Mr. *White*, *Renfrew*) 131 (i), 1040 (ii).
 PORT ARTHUR HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
 PORT CREDIT HARBOR CO., REPS. MADE TO GOVT.: M. for copies (Mr. *Platt*) 124 (i).
 PORT ROWAN AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 297 (i).
 PORTS STANLEY AND BURWELL, HARBORS OF REFUGE: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 62 (i).
 REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO MUNICIPALITIES, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Cook*) 569 (i).
 RIDEAU CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3312, 3418 (iv).
 RIDGETOWN AS A PORT OF ENTRY, PETS., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. *Casey*) 532 (i).
 RYS. CENTREING IN OTTAWA, BONUSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86 (i).
 RYS. IN CO. OF GREY, REFUND OF BONUSES: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).
 SALMON POINT BREAKWATER: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).

ONTARIO—Continued.

- SHILOH AND FERGUS MAIL SERVICE: Ques. (Mr. Innes) 1211 (ii).
 ST. THOMAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).
 TRENT RIVER NAVIGATION: in Com. of Sup., 3311 (iv).
 TIMBER PERMITS GRANTED IN TERRITORY AWARDED ONT.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 114, 115; M. for Ret., 115; M. for copies,* 124, 210 (i).
 WELLAND AND WILLIAMSBURG CANALS: in Com. of Sup., 3301, 3418 (iv).
 WELLER'S BAY "RANGE LIGHTS": M. for Cor. (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).
 WILKINSON, J. A., SUMS PAID: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 51 (i).
 WOOD AND WILKINSON, SUMS PAID: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 147 (i).
 WOOD SUPPLY TO PUBLIC BUILDINGS, OTTAWA: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1387 (ii).

OPERATIVES IN FACTORIES: M. for Rets, Stmnts. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 37 (i).

ORDER PAPER, OMISSION FROM, OF A QUESTION: Remarks (Mr. Charlton) 2774; explanation, 2854 (iv).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE:

ORDER:

- ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE IN THE N.W. B. 141: Interruption by Members not in Order (Mr. Speaker) 3430 (iv)
 CENSUS OF THE N.W., &c., B. 21: Member called to Order for imputing motives (Mr. Speaker) 213 (i).
 CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMT. B. 31. On Amt. to 3^o: full discussion of principles of B. objected to by Mr. Bowell; Ruling (Mr. Deputy Speaker) competent for members to enter largely into discussion of B, but should confine their remarks to Resolution in Amt., 1300 (ii).
 DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W. Remarks (Mr. Girouard) on newspaper paragraph: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) Ques. of Privilege should conclude with a motion, and member cannot correct a speaker until conclusion of speech, 3161 (iv).
 FRANCHISE B. 103. Calling across floor not in Order (Mr. Chairman) 1432 (ii), 1733.
 — Irrelevancy of deb., 1431, 1494, 1503, 1619, 1793, 2242, 1733 1800, 1923, 1964, 2146 (iii).
 — Member called to Order for drawing a comparison: Ruled in Order (Mr. Chairman) 1867 (iii).
 — Member called to Order for reading extracts: Ruling (Mr. Chairman) reading extracts continuously an abuse of Privilege, 1461, 1465, 1467, 1496 (ii); Remarks (Mr. Orton) 3161 (iv).
 — Members wearying House with repetitions: Authorities quoted (Mr. Chairman) 1804 (iii).
 — Objection (Mr. Davies) to member imputing statements, 1974; (Mr. Foster) 1825 (iii).
 — Objection (Sir Richard Cartwright) to Member calling "Order" from his seat: Ruled (Mr. Chairman) in Order; but if a Member wants to raise a point of Order he must rise and state it, 1975 (iii).
 — On discussion of financial condition of the country: objection (Mr. McCallum) 1919; Ruling (Mr. Chairman) an elaboration of financial condition of the country not in Order, 1922; appeal from decision of Chair to House (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 1923; Ruling sustained (Y. 87, N. 41) 1924 (iii).
 — On enfranchisement of Indians: objection (Mr. Dawson) taken to discussing proprietary rights of Indians: Ruling (Mr. Chairman) objection sustained, 2144 (iii).
 — On Member keeping floor and not speaking, and disorderly interruptions: Remarks (Sir John A. Macdonald and others) 1969 (iii).
 — On M. to adjn.: Member called to order for irrelevancy of remarks, 1509: Ruled out of Order (Mr. Chairman) 1510; appeal from decision of Chair to House (Mr. Edgar) 1510; authorities quoted, 1510, 1511; ruling sustained (Y. 76, N. 46) 1513 (ii).
 — Ruling (Mr. Chairman) deb. must be confined to clause before Com., 1800 (iii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

ORDER—Continued.

- FRANCHISE B. 103. Unparliamentary language, withdrawal requested (Mr. Chairman) 1424; (Mr. Casey) 1435, 1436, 1466, 1680 (ii), 1825 (iii)
 FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS: Genuineness of Signatures questioned by Mr. Woodworth, and "May" quoted, 2024; Remarks (Mr. Speaker) as to duties of Clerk and officers, 2027 (iii).
 INFECTIOUS OR CONTAGIOUS DISEASES AFFECTING ANIMALS B. 44: Full discussion of B. not in Order on an Amt. (Mr. Deputy Speaker) 1330 (ii).
 LAND GRANTS TO RYS. IN THE N. W. B. 147: Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) on article in Toronto Mail re frosts in Manitoba, 2459; discussion on C. P. R. Contract declared not in Order (Mr. Speaker) 2460 (iv).
 MANITOBA CLAIMS SETTLEMENT: on Res, Member called to Order (Mr. Speaker) for referring to what took place in Com., 2783; reference to what took place in Com. of W. not in Order, 2786 (iv).
 TORONTO "NEWS," ARTICLE ON FRENCH AGGRESSION: Objection taken by Mr. Charlton to an hon. Member naming another by some other name than his own or constituency; objection sustained by Mr. Speaker and expression withdrawn, 1680 (ii).
 VOLUNTEERS, RECOGNITION OF SERVICES B. 160: On alteration of Res. without consent of the Crown; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3380 (iv).
 WASHINGTON TREATY, TERMINATION OF FISHERY CLAUSES: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) allusion to previous deb. not in Order, 2899 (iv).
 WAYS AND MEANS: Objection taken by Mr. Bowell to Member entering into full discussion of sugar duties, simply on a change; Ruling (Mr. Chairman) 852 (ii).
 PRIVILEGE:
 BONUSES TO RYS. BY ONT. GOVT.: Personal explanation (Mr. Blake) 3445 (iv).
 CANADA TEMP. ACT: Explanation (Mr. Orton) on article in News Record, re vote, 3,000; explanation (Mr. Kaulbach) 3073 (iv).
 C.P.R. BETWEEN EMERSON AND WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. Lister) on Stmnt. of Minister of Marine, 693 (i).
 — Remarks (Mr. Mitchell) re charge of being the defender of the Co., 2460 (iv).
 — RESOLUTIONS: PUBLICATION IN NEWSPAPERS BEFORE PRESENTATION TO HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 1712 (ii).
 CORRESPONDENCE IN PORT ARTHUR "HERALD": Remarks (Mr. Dawson) and repudiation (Mr. Macmaster) 3162 (iv).
 DEBATES, OFFICIAL REP: Interpolation of remarks in Speech; remarks and repudiation (Mr. Blake) 2541; correction (Mr. Macmaster) 2619 (iv).
 DISTURBANCE IN THE N.W.: Article in the *Electeur*; personal explanation (Mr. Caron) 967 (ii).
 — Denial of Stmnt. in Montreal Post (Mr. Girouard) 3161 (iv).
 — Remarks (Mr. Cook) on newspaper paragraph re Col. Amyot's Battalion, 1336 (ii).
 — Repudiation of charge contained in article in Hamilton Spectator (Mr. Blake) 813 (ii).
 DOMINION AND ONTARIO POLITICS: Personal explanation (Mr. Blake) 1837 (iii)
 FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS AND THE CLERGY: Explanation (Mr. Sproule) re paragraph in Canada Presbyterian and Meaford Monitor 2772 (iv).
 FRANCHISE B. PETITIONS, GENUINENESS OF SIGNATURES: Remarks (Mr. Edgar) on article in Ottawa Citizen, 1955, 2103; (Mr. Allen) 2209 (iii).
 FRANCHISE B.: Report of speech in Globe newspaper: Remarks (Mr. Wallace) 1824 (iii).
 FRENCH AGGRESSION: Article in Toronto News, Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1678 (ii).
 GOVERNMENT PRINTING, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Somerville, Brant) on paragraph in Ottawa Citizen, 3162, 3213; personal allusions (Mr. Mackintosh) 3247 (iv).
 GRAND TRUNK RY. AND CONDUCT OF MR. HICKSON: Remarks (Mr. McMullen) on paragraph in Montreal Herald, 1131 (ii).

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

PRIVILEGE—Continued.

- HALF-BREED GRIEVANCES IN THE N.W.: Explanation (Mr. *Blake*) re J. E. Brown's correspondence, 3246 (iv).
- HYDRAULIC POWER ON CORNWALL CANAL: Explanation (Mr. *Gault*) of paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, 49 (i).
- INTERPOLATION OF WORDS IN A DESPATCH: Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) 3247 (iv).
- LABORERS ON C.P.R.: Explanation (Mr. *Dawson*) of paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, 247 (i).
- LAND GRANTS AND LAND GRANT BONDS, &C., RETURN: Personal explanation (Mr. *Mitchell*) 94 (i).
- MESSAGES FROM HIS EX., MEMBERS RISING AND UNCOVERING ON DELIVERY: Contradiction of Stmt. in *Ottawa Free Press* (Messrs. *Royal* and *Girouard*) 170 (i).
- NOVA SCOTIA VOLUNTEERS: Remarks (Mr. *Kaulbach*) on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, 1094 (i).
- PRINCE ALBERT COLONIZATION CO.: Explanation (Mr. *White, Hastings*) re paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, 3162 (iv).
- TIMBER LIMITS IN THE N.W.: Denial (Mr. *Sproule*) of Statements published in *Ottawa Free Press*, 566 (i).
- TIMBER REGULATIONS IN B. C.: Remarks (Mr. *Ferguson, Welland*) on paragraph in *Ottawa Free Press*, 2240 (iii).
- VERACITY QUESTIONED: Remarks (Mr. *Curran*) 725 (i).
- WATER POWER ON WILLIAMSBURG CANAL: Explanation (Mr. *Benson*) of paragraph in *Globe* newspaper, 43 (i).
- WAYS AND MEANS: Remarks (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) re workmen of Montreal, 521 (i).

PROCEDURE:

- CAN. TEMP. ACT AMT. B. 92: On Amt. (Mr. *White, Cornwall*) to M. for 2°: objection taken by Mr. *Blake* that a motion in amendment to 2° should be made as a substantive motion: Ruling (Mr. *Deputy Speaker*) Amt. in Order, as it contradicts the principle of the B., and "May" quoted in support of same, 952 (ii).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT: On M. to place B. Second Order on Pub. Bills and Orders: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) Order of proceedings regulated by the Rules; items standing on Order Paper taken up according to precedence; Order cannot be changed without notice, 714 (i).
- CAN. TEMP. ACT: On Mr. *Hickey's* Amt. to M. to conc. in Sen. Amts., relevancy of Amt. questioned: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) that Amt. is consequential to or relevant upon the Amt. adopted by the Senate, and *Speaker Brand* quoted, 2556 (iv).
- DIVISIONS IN COMMITTEE, OBJECTION TO CHAIRMAN'S RULING: Practice stated (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 1470 (ii).
- DUNDAS AND WATERLOO ROAD: On M. for Com. on Res. legalising sale; object of Rule stated to be that full time should be given for consideration of all Bills, Motions or Resolutions which may result in a charge on the Treasury, &c. (Mr. *Speaker*) 451 (i).
- FACTORIES, REGULATION OF LABOR B. 85: On M. for rsmng. adjd. deb. for 2°; Objection taken by Mr. *Bergin* to Amt. (Mr. *Jamieson*) substituting Can. Temp. Act, 944; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) that the House may proceed to other Orders of the Day in discussing an Order, or a particular Order may be superseded by the House agreeing to an Amt. and "May" quoted to sustain same, 944 (ii).
- INSOLVENT DEBTORS' ASSETS B. 4: On M. to transfer to Govt. Orders: Votes and Proceeding quoted (Mr. *Speaker*) 1281 (ii).
- INSPECTION OF FACTORIES RES: Suggestion (Mr. *Speaker*) that same stand first on Pub. Bills and Orders, 607 (i).
- MILLIA ACT, 1883, AMT. B. 152: On Res. increasing number of men: Exception taken by Mr. *Blake* as to whether B. ought not to have been initiated by preliminary Res., 3045; Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) not necessary that Amt. should be founded on a Res., and Journals of 1883 quoted, 3046 (iv).
- PETITIONS, PRESENTATION: Signatures signed by proxy: Reception objected to by Mr. *Woodworth* and "May" quoted, 2024; Remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) and practice stated, 2027, 2029; Names

ORDER, PRIVILEGE AND PROCEDURE—Continued.

PROCEDURE—Continued.

- obtained by fraud: discussion to take place on M. to read and receive same (Mr. *Speaker*) 2274; Petition having no signatures not in Order and cannot be received (Mr. *Speaker*) 2319 (iii).
- PETITIONS, READING AND RECEIVING: Objection taken by Mr. *Edgar*: Cushing's practice quoted in support of same, 2319, 2320 (iii).
- PETITIONS, READING: Irregular for Member to read a Petition on presentation, but if required it may be read by the Clerk at the Table: Rule read (Mr. *Speaker*) 1891, and authorities quoted, 1893 (iii).
- PROHIBITION OF SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) in Order to move the Previous Question, &c., 1045 (ii).
- PRIVILEGE, QUES. OF: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) should conclude with a motion, 3161 (iv).
- SCOTT ACT PETITIONS AND FORGED SIGNATURES: On M. (Mr. *Foster*) to erase name: Ruling (Mr. *Speaker*) no practice to warrant such a motion; English practice stated, 2320 (iv).
- SPEAKER, DEPUTY, APPOINTMENT OF MALACHY DALY, ESQ: On Res. objection on consent of Crown not having been signified (Mr. *Blake*) and B.N.A. Act quoted, 73 (i).
- SUPREME COURT APPELLATE JURISDICTION B. 68: On M. to introduce: Right to introduce questioned, because Bill of same nature is before the House (Mr. *Casgrain*), and remarks (Mr. *Speaker*) 240; Ruled (Mr. *Speaker*) in Order to introduce Bill, 270 (i).
- WAYS AND MEANS: Objection taken by Mr. *Blake* to Res. before Com., a Res. on same subject having been already passed upon: Ruled (Mr. *Chairman*) in Order, and authorities quoted to sustain same, 3255 (iv).
- WINNIPEG AND PRINCE ALBERT RY. B. 82: On m. for 2°: suggestion (Mr. *Speaker*) that Order be discharged, 428 (i).
- OSSLER, MR. JUSTICE: Rep. on West Middlesex Controverted Election, 1 (i).
- OTTER'S, COL., MARCH TO BATTLEFORD: Remarks, 1386 (ii).
- OTTAWA, RY. CONNECTION WITH: M. for Rot. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86 (i).
- OTTAWA RIVER SURVEY AND EXPLORATION: Ques. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 131 (i).
- OTTAWA RIVER SHIP CANAL: Res. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 1211; Deb. (Mr. *Bryson*) 1215; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1217; (Mr. *Dawson*) 1218; (Messrs. *Cameron* [Victoria] and *Tassé*) 1219; (Mr. *Hilliard*) 1224; (Sir *Hector Langevin* and Messrs. *Blake* and *White, Renfrew*) 1225 (ii).
- OTTAWA, WADDINGTON AND NEW YORK RY. AND BRIDGE Co.'s SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3457; in Com., 3472 (iv).
- OUIMET'S, COL., ABSENCE FROM DUTY: Remarks (Mr. *Casgrain*) 1167, 1205 (ii).
- OUTBREAK. See "DISTURBANCE."
- OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., N.S., PROJECTED LINE: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3414 (iv).
- PACIFIC RY. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC."
- PAPERS IN RESPECT OF THE N. W.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).
- PARLIAMENT, 5TH, THIRD SESSION, 1885, 48 VICTORIA: Opening, 1; Speech from the Throne, 2 (i); Bills assented to, 1516 (ii), 3475; Prorogation, 3475 (iv). See "HOUSE OF COMMONS."
- PARSBOROUGH BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION OF: M. for copies of Tenders (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 66 (i).

- PARTRIDGE, PRAIRIE FOWLS, &c.:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 858 (ii).
- PASSENGER, FREIGHT AND MIXED TRAINS, C. P. R., RUNNING OF:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 67 (i).
- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. No. 25** (Mr. *White, Renfrew*). 1^o, 67; 2^o m., 266; neg. (Y. 57, N. 70) 269 (i).
- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. No. 64** (Mr. *McCarthy*). 1^o, 234; 2^o m., 622; Order for 2^o dschgd., 629 (i).
- Patent Act, 1872, Amt. B. No. 89** (Mr. *Hay*). 1^o*, 362 (i).
- PATENTS ISSUED TO SETTLERS IN PRINCE ALBERT:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 964 (ii).
- Patents of Invention Act Amt. B. No. 29** (Mr. *Smyth*). 1^o*, 88 (i).
- PAUPER TURKISH IMMIGRANTS:** Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 3475 (iv).
- Pawnbrokers' further Provision B. No. 137** (Mr. *Small*). 1^o*, 1474 (ii).
- PAYNE AND APPEGARTH, MURDER OF, BY INDIANS IN N.W.,** 859 (ii).
- PEACHY, J. W., SUPERANNUATION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 1743 (iii).
- PENITENTIARIES, REP.:** presented (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 28 (i).
- PENITENTIARY RULES, SUSPENSION:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 823 (ii).
- PENITENTIARIES.** See "SUPPLY."
- PENSION, CONTINUATION OF, TO WIDOW OF JOHN MARTIN:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 201 (i).
- Pension Fund of Bank of Montreal B. No. 49** (Mr. *White, Cardwell*). 1^o*, 170; 2^o*, 245; in Com. and 3^o*, 693 (i). (48-49 *Vic., c. 13.*)
- PENSIONS:** in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).
- PETITIONS, FRANCHISE B.:** Remarks (Mr. *Charlton*) on reception, 1856; on genuineness of Signatures (Mr. *Woodworth* and others) 2023; (Mr. *McNeill*) 2171; (Mr. *Allen*) 2209; (Mr. *Rykert*) 2274; (Mr. *Edgar*) 2319; (Mr. *Sproule*) 2392 (iii), 2772 (iv); (Mr. *McNeill*) 2495 (iii).
- PETITIONS, SCOTT ACT:** M. (Mr. *Foster*) to erase name, 2320 (iii).
- PETITIONS, ON PRESENTATION OF:** Remarks, 1891 (iii).
- PETITIONS, RESOLUTIONS, &c., ON BANKRUPTCY:** presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 101 (i).
- PETITIONS, RESOLUTIONS, &c., ON HALF-BREEDS' AND SETTLERS' CLAIMS:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
- PICKLES AND SAUCES:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 843 (ii).
- PICTURE FRAMES, &c.:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 846 (ii).
- PIERS AND WHARVES IN P. E. I., EXPENDITURE ON MAINTENANCE, &c.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies*) 533 (i).
- PIERS.** See "MARINE."
- PILLAGE OF HOUSES AND HALF BREEDS BY VOLUNTEERS:** Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 2169 (iii), 2990 (iv).
- PITCH PINE:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).
- PLANS AND SURVEYS OF ST. LAURENT SETTLEMENT, RECEIPT OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2358 (iii).
- PLATE GLASS:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 856 (ii).
- PLANTE, J. B., OF ST. CHARLES, CLAIM OF:** M. for copies* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 147 (i).
- POINTE AUX TREMBLES, CONSTRUCTION OF WHARF:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 234 (i).
- POLARISCOPIC TEST FOR SUGAR:** Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 479 (i).
- POPOISE FISHING, REP. OF J. U. GREGORY:** M. for copy (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
- Portage la Prairie and Lake of the Woods Ry. Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. 63** (Mr. *Watson*). 1^o*, 210; 2^o*, 289 (i).
- PORT ARTHUR AND WINNIPEG, CONSTRUCTION OF C. P. R. BETWEEN, SUMS PAID:** M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Casey*) 123 (i).
- PORT CREDIT HARBOR Co., REPORTS MADE TO GOVT., &c.:** M. for copies* (Mr. *Platt*) 124; REPAIRS to: Ques. (Mr. *Fleming*) 188 (i).
- PORT MOODY AND SAVONA FERRY, EXTENSION OF TIME:** Ques. (Mr. *Homer*) 146 (i).
- PORT MOODY, B.C., DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Casey*) 816 (ii).
- PORT MOODY WHARF AND FREIGHT SHED:** M. for copies of Reps., Plans, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 295 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND EAST BAY C.B., STEAMSHIP SUBVENTION:** in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
- PORT MULGRAVE AND GUYSBOROUGH, CANSO AND ARCHAT, COMMUNICATION BETWEEN:** Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 114 (i).
- PORT MULGRAVE, N.S., AS A SUB-PORT:** M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Kirk*) 445 (i).
- PORT ROWAN AS A HARBOR OF REFUGE, CONSTRUCTION OF:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Jackson*) 297 (i).
- PORT STANLEY AND BURWELL HARBORS OF REFUGE:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wilson*) 62 (i).
- PORT WILLIAMS FISHERY:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
- POST OFFICE AND FINANCE DEPTS., COMPUTING INTEREST:** in Com. of Sup., 927 (ii).
- POST OFFICE:**
- ANTIGONISH AND SHEBROOKE MAIL SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *McIsaac*) 568 (i).
- ASSISTANT POSTMASTER AT OTTAWA, ALLOWANCE TO:** in Com. of Sup., 3393; conc., 3398 (iv).
- BRANDON, POSTMASTER AT, SALARY, &c.:** Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 2029 (iii).
- CALGARY AND FORT MACLEOD STAGE LINE:** Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 351 (i).
- CHARLINCHE, POSTMASTER AT:** M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 703 (i).
- DEPT. REP.:** presented (Mr. *Carling*) 76; in Com. of Sup., 902 (ii); conc., 2764 (iv).
- DEPOSITS IN P.O. SAVINGS BANKS:** Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 2359, 2465, 2559 (iii).
- DEPOSITORS IN P.O. SAVINGS BANKS:** Ms. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 533; (Mr. *Fairbank*) 819 (i).
- GLAMMIS POST OFFICE ENQUIRY:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1131 (ii).
- LETTER POSTAGE REDUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. *Hesson*) 33; M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Charlton*) 291 (i).
- LE FONDS POST OFFICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 816 (ii).
- MAIL TRAINS BETWEEN BROCKVILLE AND TORONTO:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 816 (ii).
- MAIL BAGS, FURNISHING OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Jackson*) 964 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE ON CAN. SOUTHERN RY.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Wigle*) 120 (i).
- MAIL ROBBERIES IN MAN. AND N.W.T.:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 91 (i).

POST OFFICE—Continued.

- MAIL SUBSIDIES. See "SUPPLY."
- MAITLAND, POSTMASTER AT: QUES. (Mr. *Mulock*) 1743 (iii).
- MEDICINE HAT AND FORT MACLEOD MAIL SERVICE: QUES. (Mr. *Watson*) 351 (i).
- OCEAN MAIL SERVICE, ANNUAL COST, &C.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 204 (i). See B. 151.
- POST OFFICE AT MONTMAGNY: QUES. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
- POSTAL PRIVILEGES, EXTENSION TO LOCAL GOVTS.: QUES. (Mr. *Amyot*) 289 (i).
- POSTAL AND TRANSPORT SERVICE ON C.P.R.: QUES. (Mr. *Blake*) 1744 (iii).
- POSTAL REVENUE AT VICTORIA, B.C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).
- SAVINGS BANKS IN THE MAR. PROVS.: QUES. (Mr. *Stairs*) 148 (i).
- SHILOH AND FERGUS MAIL SERVICE: QUES. (Mr. *Innes*) 1211 (ii).
- SMALL SAVINGS, ENCOURAGEMENT OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).
- SUPERINTENDENTS OF LETTER CARRIERS: prop. Res. (Mr. *Chapleau*) 218 (i).
- U. S. AND VICTORIA, B.C., MAIL SUBSIDY: in Com. of Sup., 2936 (iv).
- POUNDMAKER. See "DISTURBANCE."
- POWDER MAGAZINES AT FORT HOWE, ST. JOHN, N.B.: QUES. (Mr. *Weldon*) 246 (i).
- PRESQU'ISLE AND WELLER'S BAY HARBORS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cockburn*) 1442 (ii).
- PRINCE ALBERT AND ST. LAURENT SETTLEMENTS; REPS. OF MESSRS. RUSSEL AND ALDOUS: QUES. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
- PRINCE ALBERT COLON. CO.'S LAND, SETTLERS' OR SQUATTERS' IMPROVEMENTS: QUES. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
- PRINCE ALBERT COLON. CO.'S TOWNSHIP SURVEYS: QUES. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).
- PRINCE LEOPOLD. See "ALBANY, DUKE OF."
- PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND:
- CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 2917 (iv).
- CAPE TORMENTINE RY. CONNECTION: QUES. (Mr. *Davies*) 2997 (iv).
- CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH RY., PAYMENT OF LABORERS AND CONTRACTORS: M. for copies of Pets., &c. (Mr. *Hackett*) 142; QUES. (Mr. *Yeo*) 694 (i).
- CASCUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: QUES. (Mr. *Yeo*) 479 (i).
- CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC BUILDINGS: QUES. (Mr. *Davies*) 1039 (ii); (Mr. *Burpee*) 2359 (iii).
- CUSTOMS APPRAISER AT SUMMERSIDE: QUES. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &C.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanassa*) 964 (ii).
- FREIGHT AND PASSENGER EARNINGS ON P.E.I. RY.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies*) 1442 (ii).
- INLAND REVENUE COLLECTOR AT SUMMERSIDE: QUES. (Mr. *Yeo*) 350 (i).
- "LANDSDOWN," STEAMER, COMMUNICATION WITH ISLAND: QUES. (Mr. *Jenkins*) 927 (ii).
- PIERS AND WHARVES, EXPENDITURE, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Davies*) 533 (i).
- QUEEN'S CO., VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1 (i).
- RED POINT HARBOR BREAKWATER: QUES. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1039 (ii).
- REFUND TO MERCHANTS AND OTHERS, COMMISSIONER'S REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (ii).
- SEA LOTS, DEPTL. INSTRUCTIONS RESPECTING: M. for copies (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
- WHARVES ON P.E.I. GRANT FOR CONSTRUCTION: QUES. (Mr. *Davies*) 351 (i).
- WINTER CROSSING: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 62 (i).
- PRINGLE, H. H., OF COBOURG, EMPLOYMENT OF, BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Casey*) 743 (i).
- PRINTING AND ADVERTISING, GOVT.: Remarks (Mr. *Somer-ville, Brant*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3033 (iv).

- PRINTING AND ADVERTISING, IMMIGRATION: M. to refer charges to Public Accounts Com. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 202 (i).
- PRINTING AND ADVERTISING, RET. RESPECTING: QUES. (Mr. *McMullen*) 28 (i).
- PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.'S, SUMS PAID TO AND SERVICES RENDERED: M. for Rets.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 147 (i).
- PRINTING COMMISSION: in Com. of Sup., 3392 (iv).
- PRINTING DOMINION NOTES: in Com. of Sup., 898 (ii).
- PRINTING DONE OUTSIDE OF CONTRACT: M. for Ret. (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 860 (ii).
- PRINTING OF PARLT.: M. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) to conc. in Second Rep., 149 (i); Seventh Rep., 1882 (iii); Ninth Rep., 3293; Tenth Rep., 3393 (iv).
- PRINTING, PUBLIC, CHANGES IN CONTRACT: M. for copies of O.C. (Mr. *Rykert*) 246 (i).
- PRISONERS. See "DISTURBANCE IN N.W."
- Prison Labor without the walls of Gaols Act Amt. B. No. 87 (Mr. *Sutherland, Oxford*). 1°*, 362 (i); 2°, in Com., and 3°*, 1658 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 81.)
- PRIVATE BANKS AND BROKERS, LEGISLATION RESPECTING: QUES. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 51 (i).
- PRIVATE BILLS, RECEPTION OF: Ms. to extend time (Mr. *Kranz*) 88; (Mr. *Abbott*) 505, 782 (i); (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 1094 (ii).
- PRIVATE BILLS, PETITIONS FOR: M. to extend time for receiving (Mr. *Beaty*) 40 (i).
- PRIVY COUNCIL OFFICE: in Com. of Sup., 899, 914 (ii).
- PROGRESS ESTIMATES. See "C.P.R."
- Prohibition. See "SPIRITUOUS LIQUORS."
- PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW OF THE N. W. T., RELAXATION OF PROVISIONS: M. for Cor. (Mr. *Foster*) 101 (i). See "CAN. TEMP. ACT."
- Proof of Entries in Books of Account B. No. 113 (Mr. *Chapleau*). 1°*, 964 (ii); 2°, 2397; withdn., 2398; 2°, 2465; in Com., 2466; 3°*, 2497 (iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 48.)
- PROROGATION, LETTER FROM ACTING GOV. GEN.'S SEC., 3473; Moss. from His Ex., 3475 (iv).
- PROSECUTIONS UNDER CAN. TEMP. ACT: QUES. (Mr. *McCraney*) 1306 (ii), 3320 (iv).
- PROSSER, MR., FISHERY WARDEN, LAKE ERIE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Lister*) 964 (ii).
- PROVINCES, ADVANCES TO. See B. 7.
- PROVINCIAL ACTS, DISALLOWANCE OF: M. for copies of O. C., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 52 (i).
- Provincial Courts Judges, Salaries, &c., B. No. 161 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). Res. prop., 3293; M. for Com. on Res., 3375; in Com and 1°* of B., 3395; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3436 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 56.)
- PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION, COMPILATION OF COR., &C.: conc., 3434 (iv).
- PROVINCIAL RYS. TAKEN OVER BY GOVT.: QUES. (Mr. *Sproule*) 188 (i).
- PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES. See "SUBSIDIES."

PRODUCE, EXPORTS OF: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 606 (i).
 PRUSSIAN POTASH: in Com. on Ways and Means 846 (ii).
 PRUYN, MR. M. W.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1.
 PUBLIC ACCOUNTS: presented (Sir Leonard Tilley) 28; M. (Sir Richard Cartwright) to refer to Public Accounts Com., 76 (i).

PUBLIC BUILDINGS. See "PUBLIC WORKS."
 PUBLIC DEBT OF CANADA: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 29, 76 (i), 927 (ii), 2465 (iv).

PUBLIC EXPENDITURE: Res. (Sir Richard Cartwright) in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 2869; (Mr. McLellan) 2878; (Mr. Charlton) 2883; neg. (Y. 42, N. 79) 2889 (iv).

PUBLIC RESERVES IN B.C. AND "FORE-SHORE" RIGHTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 703 (i).

PUBLIC SERVICE, ROOMS, &c., RENTED FOR, IN OTTAWA: M. for Ret. (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 533 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS DEPTL. REP.: presented (Sir Hector Langevin) 28 (i).

Public Works, preservation of Peace in vicinity, Acts Amt. B. No. 131 (Sir John A. Macdonald). 1°*, 1278 (ii); 2° m. and in Com., 2824; 3°*, 2854 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 80.)

PUBLIC WORKS:

AGENT AND CONTINGENCIES, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 3308 (iv).
 BARRACK HUTS IN B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 3412 (iv).
 BARRACKS AT FORT MACLEOD: in Com. of Sup., 3387 (iv).
 BAYFIELD HARBOR BREAKWATER: Ques. (Mr. McIsaac) 77 (i).
 BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2916-2919, 3385, 3452 (iv).
 CAPE TORMENTINE HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 2917 (iv).
 CASUMPEC HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. Feo) 479 (i).
 CHARLOTTETOWN PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 1039 (ii); (Mr. Burpee) 2359 (iii).
 CHURCH POINT AND TROUT COVE PIER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Vail) 54 (i).
 COAL, PURCHASE OF, FOR PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Kirk) 313 (i).
 CORNWALL PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Lister) 2997 (iv).
 DREDGES, TUGS AND SCOWS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Jackson) 53 (i).
 DREDGING: in Com. of Sup., 2921; conc., 2923 (iv).
 DRY DOCKS, ENCOURAGEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION. See B. 108.
 DUNDAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 290 (i).
 ESQUIMAULT GRAVING DOCK: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 743 (i); in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv). See B. 7.
 FOG-HORNS AND LETTER-BOX FRONTS, TENDERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Langelier) 313 (i).
 GOVT. YARDS IN MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Gault) 57 (i).
 HARBORS AND RIVERS: in Com. of Sup., 2920-2923, 3385, 3386, 3409, 3419, 3420, 3433 (iv).
 HARBORS IN GUYSBOROUGH CO., RE-SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. Kirk) 51 (i).
 HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, COST OF: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Blake) 90 (i).
 HIGH COMMISSIONER: in Com. of Sup., 3386 (iv).
 IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS AT LÉVIS: Ques. (Mr. Belleau) 89 (i).
 IMMIGRANT SHEDS AT MEDICINE HAT: Ques. (Mr. Watson) 350 (i).
 INSPECTORS OR CLERKS OF WORKS: M. for Stmnt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 139; Ques. (Mr. Mackenzie) 606 (i).
 INSPECTORS, RET. RESPECTING: Ques. (Mr. Mackenzie) 606 (i).
 MATTAWA, MOUNTAIN RAPIDS, &c., IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. White, Renfrew) 1040 (ii).
 NAPANEE PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Pruyn) 77 (i).
 NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS: M. for Ret. (Mr. McCallum) 615, 695 (i).
 OTTAWA, ADDITIONAL BUILDINGS: in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
 OTTAWA RIVER SHIP CANAL: prop. Res. (Mr. White, Renfrew) 1211 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—Continued.

OTTAWA RIVER SURVEYS AND IMPROVEMENTS: Ques. (Mr. White, Renfrew) 131 (i), 1040 (ii).
 PORT ARTHUR HARBOR: in Com. of Sup., 2916 (iv).
 PORT CREDIT HARBOR, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Fleming) 188 (i).
 PORT MOODY DOCK, TENDERS FOR REPAIR: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 816 (ii).
 ROADS AND BRIDGES: in Com. of Sup., 3420.
 SABLE ISLAND TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION: Ques. (Mr. Daly) 57 (i).
 SALMON POINT BREAKWATER: M. for Cot. (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).
 SOMERVILLE BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 57 (i).
 STOREHOUSES IN QUEBEC, LEASE OF: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1039 (ii).
 ST. STEPHEN'S PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 1148 (ii).
 ST. THOMAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).
 TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE, B. C.: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 743 (i); in Com. of Sup., 3307 (iv).
 TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WEST OF WINNIPEG: Remarks, 839 (ii).
 TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 2922, 3307, 3386, 3420 (iv).
 TELEGRAPH SYSTEM IN CAPE BRETON: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 78 (i).
 THREE RIVERS HARBOR COMMISSIONERS. See B. 150.
 TRACADIE BREAKWATER, EXPENDITURE: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. McIsaac) 147 (i).
 TUG-BARGES, DREDGE, &c., ON RED RIVER: M. for Ret. (Mr. Watson) 964 (ii).
 VENTILATION OF HOUSE OF COMMONS: Remarks, 2676 (iv).
 WATER LOTS, APPLICATIONS FOR: Ques. (Mr. Tupper) 429 (i).
 WATER LOTS ON RIVERS, GOVT. RIGHTS: Ques. (Mr. Vanasse) 2138 (iii).
 WHARVES ON P. E. I.: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 351 (i).
 WHITE POINT BREAKWATER, REPAIRS: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 52 (i).
 WOODSTOCK, N.B., PUBLIC BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. Irvine) 606 (i).
 WOOD SUPPLY: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 429 (i); (Mr. Bain, Wentworth) 1387 (ii).
 [See different PROVINCES; also "MARINE."]
 PULLMAN PALACE CAR CO. See "I.C.R."
 PUMICE AND PUMICE STONE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).
 PURCELL & RYAN, PAYMENT TO, FOR SUPPLIES FURNISHED LORD LORNE AND PARTY: in Com. of Sup., 3452 (iv).
 QU'APPELLE HALF-BREEDS, REP. OF MR. WALSH: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3426 (iv).
 QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILROAD AND STMBT. CO. See B. 147.
 QU'APPELLE VALLEY FARMING CO.'S AGREEMENT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 816 (ii).
 QUACO LIGHTHOUSE, MEMORIALS, &c., RESPECTING: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 1442 (ii).
 QUARANTINE, APPOINTMENT OF PHYSICIANS TO ACCOMPANY STEAMSHIPS: Ques. (Mr. Taschereau) 2169 (iii).
 QUARANTINE. See "INSTRUCTIONS" and "SUPPLY."
 QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. Pope) 3457; in Com., 3472 (iv).
 QUEBEC:
 BEAUCE: Vacancy in the representation, 1 (i).
 BOLDU, CAPT., RESIGNATION OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 29 (i).
 BRAS ST. NICHOLAS, DEEPENING OF: M. for copies of Pets.* (Mr. Langelier) 312 (i).
 BROUSSEAU & LISABELLE, FRAUDS BY: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1387 (ii).
 CAPE ST. IGNACE STATION: Ques. (Mr. Casgrain) 246 (i).
 CARON AND GAUVREAU, FISHERY OVERSEERS, SALARY, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondeau) 290; M. for copies of Rep.,* 532 (i).
 CATHOLIC POPULATION OF PROVINCE: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 363 (i).
 CHEVRIER, G. E., DISMISSAL OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Holton) 1443 (ii).
 CHIEF JUSTICE MEREDITH, RESIGNATION OF: M. for Ret. (Mr. Laurier) 43 (i).

QUEBEC—Continued.

- CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 1387 (ii).
 DUCHENE, CAPT., COMPLAINTS AGAINST: M. for copies* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
 DRILL SHED AT QUEBEC, TENDERS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).
 ELGIN STATION, L'ISLET: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 148 (i).
 ETCHEMIN RIVER LINE SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Lesage*) 350 (i).
 EXPENDITURE FOR RYS., &c.: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
 GOSSELIN, E., RECORD IN THE MATTER OF: M. for copy (Mr. *Amyot*) 703 (i).
 GREGORY, J. N., REP. OF ENQUIRY: M. for copies* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
 GRENVILLE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3418 (iv).
 IMMIGRATION OFFICE, EMPLOYÉS: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 30 (i).
 LACHINE CANAL: in Com. of Sup., 3301 (iv).
 LE FONDS POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Rinfret*) 816 (ii).
 LÉVIS, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS AT: Ques. (Mr. *Belleau*) 89 (i).
 LÉVIS, ISSUE OF WRIT: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 633 (i).
 LIEUT. GOV.'S OATH OF OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 479 (i).
 LONGUEUIL AND LÉVIS RY. SURVEY: Ques. (Mr. *Vanasse*) 429 (i).
 LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTHOUSE WOOD SUPPLIES: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
 MASHKINONGÁ: Vacancy in the Representation, 1 (i).
 MEDICINE HAT, IMMIGRANT BUILDINGS: Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 350 (i).
 MEGANTIC: Ret. of Member, 1 (i).
 MONTMAGNY VILLAGE POST OFFICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 246 (i).
 MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST DEBENTURES: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 567 (i).
 NICOLET: Ret. of Member, 1 (i).
 NORTH SHORE RY., SUBSIDY TO: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 41; Purchase of: Ques., 189 (i).
 PLANTE, J. B., CLAIM OF: M. for copies* (Mr. *Amyot*) 147 (i).
 POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 231 (i).
 REBELLION IN THE N.W. See general heading "DISTURBANCE."
 RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS, MEMORIALS, &c.: Ques. (Mr. *Becharé*) 606 (i).
 SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC: M. for Papers, (Mr. *Langelier*) 88 (i).
 SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 743 (i).
 SHORT LINE RY. See general heading; also "SUBSIDIES."
 SIMARD, J., REP. OF: M. for copies* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1443 (ii).
 SOULANGES CONTROVERTED ELECTION: Judge's Rep. 1; Ret. of Member, 113 (i).
 ST. ROMUALD D'ETCHEMIN STATION: Ques. (Mr. *Guay*) 1567 (ii).
 ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 986 (i), 3350 (iv).
 SUPERIOR COURT, CHIEF JUSTICE: Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 429 (i).
 SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES. See B. 161.
 SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, ACCOUNTS DUE: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1413 (ii).
 THREE RIVERS, HARBOR COMMISSIONERS OF. See B. 150.
 VICTORIA RIFLES, MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. *Curran*) 1983 (iii).
 "QUEEN OF THE ISLES," STEAMER, EMPLOYMENT OF: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1131 (ii).
 QUEEN'S BIRTHDAY, ADJMT. FOR: M. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 2030 (iii).
 QUEEN'S COUNTY, P. E. I., VACANCY IN THE REPRESENTATION: Warrant issued and return of Member, 1 (i).
 QUEEN vs. ROBINSON. See "INLAND FISHERIES."
 QUERCITRON OR OAK BARK: in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).
 RAILS FOR GOVT. SECTION IN B. C.: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1914 (iii).
 RY. ACCIDENTS. See "CASUALTIES."
 Ry. Act. See "CONSOLIDATED."
 RYS. AND CANALS, DEPTL. REP.: presented (Mr. *Pope*) 76 (i); in Com. of Sup., 914 (ii); Remarks (Mr. *Mills*) on M. for Com. of Sup., 3436 (iv).

- RY. BONUSES. See "REFUND."
 RY. BELT ON VANCOUVER ISLAND: Ques. (Mr. *Gordon*) 290 (i).
 RY. COMMISSIONERS. See "COURT."
 RY. COMMISSIONERS AND DOMINION ARBITRATORS: Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 114 (i).
 RYS. CENTREING IN OTTAWA, BONUSES GRANTED TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86 (i).
 RY. FROM MONTREAL TO THE SEA BOARD: Res. (Mr. *Laurier*) 189 (i).
 RYS., REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO COUNTY COUNCIL OF GREY: M. for copy of Memorial (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).
 RY. LANDS IN B. C., CLAIMS OF CANADA UPON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
 RYS. OUTSIDE OF MAN. AND N. W. T., AID TO: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i).
 RAILWAYS. See respective headings.
 RY. SUPPLIES, PURCHASE OF, IN HALIFAX: M. for Ret. Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 1915 (iii).
 RY. TICKETS. See "SALE."
 RANGE LIGHTS. See "WELLER'S BAY."
 RAND'S MICMAC INDIAN DICTIONARY: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).
 Real Property in the N. W. T. B. 109 (Sir *Hector Langevin*). 1^o*, 742 (i).
 REBELLION. See "DISTURBANCE IN THE N. W."
 RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES, CONSOLIDATED FUND: Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 1677 (ii).
 RECEIPTS OF DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Blake*) 54 (i).
 RECIPROCITY WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 78; with JAMAICA: Ques. (Mr. *Burpee*) 429 (i); (Mr. *Laurier*) 2354 (iv); with MEXICO: Ques. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 632 (i); with the U. S.: Deb. on Res. (Mr. *Davies*) in Amt to Com. of Sup., 995; (Mr. *Hackett*) 1001; (Mr. *Yeo*) 1004; (Mr. *Burpee*) 1004, 1008; (Mr. *Woodworth*) 1010; (Mr. *Kirk*) 1011; (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 1015; (Mr. *Weldon*) 1016; (Mr. *Jenkins*) 1019; (Mr. *Fisher*) 1021; Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1387; M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Charlton*) 1444 (ii); Ques. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3163 (iv). See "TREATIES."
 RUBBER, RE-COVERED: in Com. on Ways and Means, 807 (ii).
 RED LIQUOR: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).
 RED POINT HARBOR, P. E. I., BREAKWATER AT: Ques. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 1039 (ii).
 REFUND OF BANK IMPOSTS: in Com. of Sup., 3387; conc., 3396 (iv).
 REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO Co. COUNCIL OF GREY, MEMORIALS, &c.: M. for copies (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58; Co. of Elgin (Mr. *Wilson*) 356 (i).
 REFUND OF RY. BONUSES TO ONT. MUNICIPALITIES: M. for copies of Memorials, &c. (Mr. *Cook*) 569; Deb. (Messrs. *McCallum* and *Mills*) 570; Messrs. *O'Brien* and *Fleming*) 571; (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 573; (Mr. *Casey*) 576 (Messrs. *Wallace* and *McMullen*) 578; (Mr. *White, Renfrew*) 581, 588; (Mr. *Sproule*) 583; (Mr. *Lister*) 585; (Messrs. *Dawson* and *Desjardins*) 587; (Mr.

- Armstrong*) 588; (Mr. *Wilson*) 589; (Mr. *Allen*) 590; (Mr. *Fairbank*) 591; (Messrs. *Trow and Cook*) 592; (Mr. *Pope*) 593 (i).
- REFUND OF DUTIES TO MERCHANTS AND FISHERMEN IN P.E.I., COMMISSIONERS' REP.: M. for copy (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (ii); in Com. of Sup., 3455; conc., 3470 (iv).
- RELIEF OF DISTRESSED IN N.W.T.: Ques. (Mr. *Ross*) 3321; in Com. of Sup., 3454 (iv).
- REMOVAL OF PRISONERS: in Com. of Sup., 3411 (iv).
- RENTAL OF OFFICES FOR USE OF GOVT. IN OTTAWA: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 533 (i).
- REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS, COR., REPS., O.C., &C., RELATING TO: M. for copies* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- REPORTS PRESENTED:
- AUDITOR GENERAL (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 28 (i).
 - CHINESE COMMISSION (by Mess. from His Ex.) 234 (i).
 - INDIAN AFFAIRS (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i).
 - INLAND REVENUE (Mr. *Costigan*) 28 (i).
 - INTERIOR (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 28 (i).
 - MARINE AND FISHERIES (Mr. *McLellan*) 113 (i).
 - MILITIA AND DEFENCE (Mr. *Caron*) 40 (i).
 - PENITENTIARIES (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 28 (i).
 - POSTMASTER GENERAL (Mr. *Carling*) 76 (i).
 - PUBLIC ACCOUNTS (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 28 (i).
 - PUBLIC WORKS (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 28 (i).
 - RAILWAYS AND CANALS (Mr. *Pope*) 76 (i).
 - SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. *Chapleau*) 127 (i).
 - STATUTES, CONSOLIDATION, COMMISSIONERS' REP. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 32 (i).
 - TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETURNS (Mr. *Bowell*) 28 (i).
- REPRESENTATION OF N.W.T. IN PARLT.: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 292 (i); Res. in Amt. to Com. of Sup., 3404; neg. (Y. 35, N. 77) 3408 (iv).
- Representation of the N.W.T. in Parliament
B. No. 45 (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*). 1°*, 147; 2° m., 362, 490; debt. adjd., 495 (i).
- RETURNS, ENQUIRIES FOR: 183, 211, 239, 363, 427, 455, 490, 504, 534, 566, 662, 715, 746 (i), 782, 895, 966, 1038, 1063, 1132, 1167, 1206 (ii), 1608, 1913, 2392 (iii), 2854, 2936, 3000, 3395 (iv).
- RETURNS, INCOMPLETE: Remarks, 67, 101, 534 (i), 860, 1064, 1209, 1278 (ii).
- RETURNS, C.P.R., ORDERED BY HOUSE SINCE DATE OF CONTRACT: M. for Stmt. (Mr. *Hesson*) 481 (i).
- RETURNS, PREPARATION OF: in Com. of Sup., 3245 (iv).
- RETURN TICKETS ON GOVT. RYS: M. for Ret. (Mr. *Weldon*) 706 (i).
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C., MOTIONS FOR:
- A, BAND O BATTERIES, Officers, &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 313 (i).
 - ABOLITION OF DUTY ON Grain, &c. (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
 - ACTIVE MILITIA, Number and Annual Drill, &c.* (Mr. *Mulock*) 533 (i).
 - ADVANCES TO GOVERNMENT BY BANKS (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
 - ADVANCES TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
 - ADVERTISEMENTS FOR LOAN (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
 - AID TO RYS. OUTSIDE MAR. and N.W. (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i).
 - ALASKA AND B.C. BOUNDARY LINE (Mr. *Gordon*) 705 (i).
 - ALGOMA, CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS IN (Mr. *Dawson*) 39 (i).
 - ALLAN STEAMSHIP Co., Claim of Govt. against* (Mr. *Forbes*) 312 (i).
See "ASSISTED PASSAGES."
 - ANIMAL CHARCOAL Imported and Duties collected* (Mr. *Stairs*) 533 (i).
 - "ANNUAL REGISTER." See "DOMINION."
- RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &C.—Continued.
- ANTWERP INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
 - ARGYLE HIGHLANDERS, Payment of Arrears due* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).
 - ASSISTED PASSAGES, &C., Sums paid Allan Line* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
 - "A TRIP TO THE DOM. OF CAN." Pamphlet* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 - AUDITOR GENERAL and Dept. of Marine and Fisheries re Rental of Rivers and Streams* (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i).
 - AUSTRALIAN COLONIES, Trade with (Mr. *Mitchell*) 36 (i).
 - BANK ADVANCES TO GOVT. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
 - BANKRUPT ESTATES and Official Assignees* (Mr. *Mitchell*) 303, 533 (i).
 - BAY OF FUNDY FOG-WHISTLES, Coal Supply, Tenders* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 - BEAVER LINE OF STEAMERS, Intercol. Ry. Freight Rates (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).
 - BELL & KAVANAGH, Land Claims of (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 479 (i).
 - BILL, S.J.R., and Breach of Sawdust Law in N.S.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
 - BINGHAM, LT. COL., deprivation of Command while on Duty* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).
 - BIRD ISLAND LIGHT, N. S., Management of* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
 - BOLDUC, CAPT., Resignation (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 29 (i).
 - BOLTON, STAFF COMMANDER, Dept. of Marine and Fisheries in account with (Mr. *McMullen*) 135 (i).
 - BOLTON, STAFF COMMANDER, vs. Mr. Tilton* (Mr. *McMullen*) 312 (i).
 - BONUSES GRANTED TO RYS., Memorials, &c.* (Mr. *Fleming*) 1443 (ii).
 - BONUSES, RY., REFUND to County Council of Grey (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).
 - BONUSES TO RYS. in Ont., Refund (Mr. *Wilson*) 356, 616 (i); (Mr. *Cook*) 569.
 - BOUNDARIES. See general heading.
 - BOUNTIES TO FISHERMEN, Sums paid under (Mr. *Fortin*) 56 (i).
 - BOUNTY TO FISHING VESSELS (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 98 (i).
 - BOUNTIES TO MANUFACTURERS OF IRON (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
 - BRADLEY, W. INGLES, Clerk, Ry. Dept. (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 479 (i).
 - BRAS D'OR LAKES, Bounty paid on Fish caught* (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 1443 (ii).
 - BRAS ST. NICHOLAS, Deepening of* (Mr. *Langelier*) 312 (i).
 - BRITISH MEDICAL ACT and Amt.* (Mr. *Bergin*) 33 (i).
 - BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, Soundings, &c. (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 533 (i).
 - BYE-ELECTIONS SINCE 1878 (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
 - CANADA AGRICULTURAL INSURANCE Co. (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
 - CANADA AND JAMAICA, Confederation (Mr. *Burpee*) 505 (i).
 - CANADA CENTRAL RY., BONUSES to (Mr. *Landerkin*) 86, 89 (i).
 - CANADA SHIPPING Co. and Intercol. Ry. Freight Rates (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).
 - CANADA SOUTHERN RY. Mail Service (Mr. *Wigle*) 120 (i).
 - CANADA TEMP. ACT, Constitutionality of. See "LUGRIM, O. H."
 - CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, Memorials, &c., respecting* (Mr. *Kranz*) 448 (i).
 - CANADA TEMPERANCE ACT, 1878, Voting on (Mr. *Fisher*) 121 (i).
 - CANADIAN AGENT AT PARIS (Mr. *Bergeron*) 928 (ii).
 - CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY. See general heading.
 - CANADIAN VOYAGERS, NAMES, &c.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 210 (i).
 - CAPE TRAVERSE BRANCH, P.E.I. Ry., Payment of laborers (Mr. *Hackett*) 142 (i).
 - CAPITAL ACCOUNT, Expenditure on (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 45 (i).
 - CARON, CLOVIS, Fishery Overseer, Rep. of, &c.* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
 - CAUGHNAWAGA INDIAN AGENCY INVESTIGATION* (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).
 - CAVALRY AND INFANTRY SCHOOLS* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 313 (i).
 - CAVALRY, SCHOOL OF, at Quebec* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 88 (i).
 - CERTIFICATES TO SELL LIQUOR granted in County of Halton* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67; (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
 - CHARCOAL, ANIMAL, imported and Duties collected* (Mr. *Stairs*) 533 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- CHARLINGH POST OFFICE CHANGES (Mr. *Blake*) 708 (i).
 CHERRIER, G. E., INDIAN AGENT at Caughnawaga, Dismissal of* (Mr. *Holton*) 1443 (ii).
 CHINESE COMMISSION, Date of Appointment, &c.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i).
 CHURCH POINT and Trout Cove Piers, N.S. (Mr. *Vail*) 54 (i).
 CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYÉS IN B.O.* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).
 CLAIMS OF CANADA TO RY. LANDS IN B.C.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
 CLARK, G. M. K., Sums paid to (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 697 (i).
 CLERKS OF WORKS or Inspectors (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 139 (i).
 COAL, CARRIAGE by I.C.R. from Spring Hill Mines* (Mr. *McMullen*) 533 (i).
 COAL ENTERED Ex-warehouse, &c. (Mr. *Burpee*) 100 (i).
 COAL LANDS, Sales and Leases* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).
 COAL, PURCHASE OF, for Public Buildings, Ottawa* (Mr. *Kirk*) 213 (i).
 COAL SUPPLY to Fog-whistles, &c., Tenders* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 COLLINS, J. E., Employment of (Mr. *McMullen*) 699 (i).
 COLONIZATION COMPANIES and modified Agreements (Mr. *Blake*) 92 (i).
 COMPTON, MR., Evidence taken re J. D. Robertsons's claim* (Mr. *Mills*) 1443 (ii).
 CONSOLIDATED FIVE PER CENT. LOAN (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
 CONSOLIDATED FUND, Receipts and Expenditure* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
 CONTRACTS FOR PRINTING since 1867* (Mr. *Rykert*) 246 (i).
 CULLERS, SUPERVISOR OF, Amounts due* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).
 CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS in Algoma (Mr. *Dawson*) 39 (i).
 CUSTOMS LAWS, Violation of by John Leander McKelzie* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).
 CUSTOMS SEIZURE OF SCHOOL-BOOKS AT TORONTO* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT WINNIPEG* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1443 (ii).
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES IN N.S.* (Mr. *Stairs*) 532 (i).
 CUSTOMS SEIZURES made at different Ports* (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
 DE CHENE, CAPT. A. M., Enquiry respecting* (Mr. *Cusgrain*) 30 (i).
 DEPOSITS, GOVERNMENT, in Banks (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 29 (i).
 DIGBY PIER, Wharfage Collections at* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).
 DISALLOWANCE of Provincial Acts (Mr. *Blake*) 52 (i).
 DODGE, B., Dismissal from office of Collector* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).
 DOMINION "Annual Register," Payments on account of* (Mr. *McCraney*) 1443 (ii).
 DOMINION LANDS. See general heading.
 DOMINION LICENSE COMMISSIONERS (Mr. *Bergeron*) 307 (i).
 DOMINION SUBSIDIES to Provinces (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
 "DOM. OF CAN., A TRIP TO THE," Pamphlet* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 DRAWBACKS on Manufactured Exports (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
 DRAWBACKS on Shipbuilding Materials (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 100 (i).
 DREDGES, TUGS and SCOWS Built (Mr. *Jackson*) 53 (i).
 DREDGING ON RED RIVER* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).
 DRILL SHED AT QUEBEC, Tenderers and Securities* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).
 DUMMY LIGHTHOUSE Fog Horn (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).
 DUNDAS AND WATERLOO Macadamized Road, Sale of* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).
 DUTIES imposed under Old Prov. of Can., &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 1443 (ii).
 DUTIES ON HAY exported to the U.S. (Mr. *Irvine*) 443 (i).
 DUTIES ON FISH exported to the U.S. (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (ii).
 DUTIES ON WHEAT AND FLOUR, Memorials, &c.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
 EASTERN EXTENSION RY., Earnings* (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 313 (i).
 EDMONTON AND SASKATCHEWAN Land Co.'s Agent* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
 EDUCATION OF INDIANS and Half-breeds in Man. and N.W.T.* (Mr. *Kirk*) 1443 (ii).
 ELECTIONS, BYE, since 1878* (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
 ELGIN, County Judge, Case of (Mr. *Wilson*) 98 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- EMERSON, Claim of Town on Govt.* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 448 (i).
 EXHIBITION AT ANTWERP (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
 EXPENDITURE on Capital Account (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 45 (i).
 EXPENDITURE ON PUB. WORKS in the different Provs.* (Mr. *Vanasse*) 964 (ii).
 EXPENSES OF GOVT. OFFICIALS in England* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 124 (i).
 EXPORT DUTY, ON OAK, PINE, &c., Receipts* (Mr. *Edgar*) 1442 (ii).
 EXPORTS AND IMPORTS, distinguishing Products of Canada from other countries* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
 EXTRADITION, Demands for, &c.* (Mr. *Blake*) 87 (i).
 EXTRADITION* (Mr. *Blake*) 147 (i).
 FABRE, MR., Appointment as Canadian Agent at Paris (Mr. *Bergeron*) 928 (ii).
 FACTORY OPERATIVES, number employed (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
 FISH CAUGHT IN BRAS D'OR LAKES, Bounty paid* (Mr. *McDougall, Cape Breton*) 1443 (ii).
 FISH, EXPORT OF, FROM P.E.I., Refund of Duties (Mr. *Davies*) 831 (ii).
 FISH TAKEN in the Miramichi (Mr. *Mitchell*) 295 (i).
 FISH WEIRS in Co. of CHARLOTTE, Licenses, &c.* (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1444 (ii).
 FISHERIES OF ONT., Inland (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).
 FISHERIES, CANADIAN (Mr. *Mulock*) 55 (i).
 FISHERY BOUNTIES, Sums paid (Mr. *Fortin*) 56 (i).
 FISHERY PROTECTION in the N. W. (Mr. *Hesson*) 700 (i).
 FISHERY OVERSEERS in N.S. and breach of Sawdust Law* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
 FISHING LEASES, &c., in non-tidal Waters in N.B.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 533 (i).
 FISHING LICENSES granted for Lake Erie* (Mr. *Lister*) 964 (ii).
 FISHING VESSELS, Bounty to (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 98 (i).
 FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLIDATED LOAN (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
 FLAG TREATY between U. S. and Spain (Mr. *Vail*) 219.
 FLOUR AND WHEAT DUTIES, Memorials, &c.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
 FLOUR, CORN AND CORNMEAL, Imports and Exports from Provinces* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 56 (i).
 FOG-HORN on Dummy Lighthouse (Mr. *Jackson*) 293 (i).
 FOG-HORNS and Letter-Box Fronts* (Mr. *Langelier*) 312 (i).
 FOOT AND CARRIAGE BRIDGE on St. John River* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1443 (ii).
 FORESTRY COMMISSIONER, Appointment of (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i); (Mr. *Rykert*) 187 (i).
 FORESTS, PROTECTION OF, Rep. of Commissioner (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).
 FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, Road on* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
 FORT WILLIAM INDIAN RESERVE, Timber Licenses* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (ii).
 FRANCE AND CANADA, Commercial Relations (Mr. *Amyot*) 825 (ii).
 FRASER, D. M. AND HUGH, payments to* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 FREEMAN, J. N., and breach of Sawdust Law in N.S.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
 FRENCH CANADIANS, Repatriation of, Scheme of Immigration* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
 FUEL OF NORTH-WEST SETTLERS (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
 GAUVREAU, J., Fishery Overseer, Rep. of* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
 GOLD RESERVE, GOVT. (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 351 (i).
 GOODS IMPORTED FOR CONSUMPTION (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
 GOODWIN, GEO., Contract, Trent Valley Canal (Mr. *Blake*) 823 (i).
 GOSSELIN, EUGÈNE, vs. THE QUEEN, RECORD OF (Mr. *Amyot*) 703 (i).
 GOVERNMENT DEPOSITS IN BANKS (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 29 (i).
 GOVERNMENT EXPENSES OF VISITS TO ENGLAND* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 124 (i).
 GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN THE N. W. (Mr. *McMullen*) 66 (i).
 GOVERNMENT EMPLOYÉS IN B. C. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).
 GOVERNMENT RYB., Return Tickets on (Mr. *Weldon*) 706 (i).
 GRADUATES OF ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 313 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- GRAND TRUNK RY. See general heading.
- GRAIN, &c., Abolition of Duty on (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 54 (i).
- GREAT AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN SHORT LINE RY. (Mr. *Paint*) 78 (i).
- GREAT VILLAGE RIVER, N. S., IMPROVEMENTS* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 67 (i).
- GREGORY, J. U., Rep. of Enquiry, &c.* (Mr. *Blondeau*) 532 (i).
- GREY, COUNTY OF, RYS. in, Refund of BONUSES (Mr. *Landerkin*) 58 (i).
- HALIFAX STEAM NAVIGATION CO., Moneys paid to by Govt.* (Mr. *Blake*) 210 (i).
- HALTON, COUNTY OF, Liquor Certificates granted* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67; (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
- HARBORS OF REFUGE, Ports Burwell and Stanley (Mr. *Wilson*) 62 (i).
- HARDWARE AND RY. Supplies purchased in Halifax* (Mr. *Forbes*) 1442 (ii).
- HARDWARE SUPPLIES purchased by Marine Dept. at Halifax* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i).
- HEALTH OFFICERS in N. B., Instructions to* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1443 (ii).
- HEATING PUBLIC BUILDINGS, Cost (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).
- HIGH COMMISSIONER. See general heading.
- HOLLAND, G. & A., Payments to for Short-hand work* (Mr. *Auger*) 147 (i).
- HUDSON BAY STEAMER *Neptune*, Supplies for (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).
- HUGHES, D. J. (County Judge of Elgin) Case of (Mr. *Wilson*) 98 (i).
- IMMIGRANTS into the N. W. (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- IMMIGRATION OFFICE, Quebec, Employés* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 30 (i).
- IMMIGRATION, SCHEME FOR, mentioned by Sir Hector Langevin in a speech at Montreal* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS, distinguishing products of Canada from other Countries* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- IMPORTS AND EXPORTS of Wheat, Flour, &c. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 138 (i).
- IMPORTS FOR CONSUMPTION (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 30 (i).
- IMPORTS OF SUGAR at Halifax from Jamaica* (Mr. *Vail*) 40 (i).
- IMPROVEMENTS OF NAVIGATION in the North Saskatchewan (Mr. *McCallum*) 615, 695 (i).
- INDIAN AFFAIRS IN B. C. (Mr. *Mills*) 863 (ii).
- INDIAN AGENCY, Man. (Mr. *Charlton*) 61 (i).
- INDIAN HARBOR, N. S., Rep. of Engineer* (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
- INDIAN LANDS in Township of Toronto unsold (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147 (i).
- INDIAN LANDS sold in the Viger Agency* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).
- INDIAN LANDS unsold in Tp. of Trafalgar* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).
- INDIAN RESERVE, Fort William, Road on* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- INDIAN RESERVE LANDS in B. C., Purchase of* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- INDIAN SCHOOLS IN B. C., Establishment* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- INDIANS of Fort William Reserve* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (ii).
- INDIAN SUPPLIES for the N. W.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
- INDIAN TROUBLES at Metlakatla (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).
- INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS for Indians and Half-breeds in Man. and N. W. T.* (Mr. *Kirk*) 1443 (ii).
- INDUSTRIES OF CANADA, Commission respecting* (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
- INLAND FISHERIES of Ont. (Mr. *O'Brien*) 223 (i).
- INTERCOLONIAL RY. See general heading.
- INTERIOR DEPT., Receipts, &c., (Mr. *Blake*) 55 (i).
- INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION at Antwerp (Mr. *Bergeron*) 305 (i).
- INSPECTORS OR CLERKS OF WORKS (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 139 (i).
- IRON, BOUNTIES to Manufacturers* (Mr. *Blake*) 100 (i).
- ISLANDS LEASED in River St. Lawrence* (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 147 (i).
- JONES, L. K., Appointment of, as Secretary to Intercolonial Ry. Commission* (Mr. *Rykert*) 187 (i).
- JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS, Tel. Cable across, Cost* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- KAVANAGH & BELL, Land Claims by (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 479 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- KENTVILLE, N. S., Dismissal of Collector* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).
- KINGSTON HARBOR Preventive Officers Claims* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1442 (ii).
- LAKE SIMCOE FISHERIES, Applications and Permits granted* (Mr. *Mulock*) 1444 (ii).
- LAND RESERVES OF B. C. (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 703 (i).
- LANDS NORTH AND WEST of Lake Superior (Mr. *Mills*) 66 (i).
- LEASES OR LICENSES to Fish in non-tidal Waters of N. B. (Mr. *Weldon*) 533 (i).
- LETTER POSTAGE, Reduction on (Mr. *Charlton*) 291 (i).
- LICENSE ACT and decision of Supreme Court* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
- LICENSE ACT, Dom., Commissioners under (Mr. *Bergin*) 307 (i).
- LICENSE COMMISSIONERS, Board of, under Act of 1883* (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 46 (i).
- LICENSES OR PERMITS to cut Timber (Mr. *Charlton*) 30 (i).
- LIFE-SAVING SERVICE at Port Rowan (Mr. *Jackson*) 142 (i).
- LINGAN, Cape Breton, Services of Argyle Highlanders* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1444 (ii).
- "LION" SCHOONER, Seizure of, at Barrington, N. S. (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
- LIQUOR CERTIFICATES in County of Halton granted under Canada Temperance Act, 1878* (Mr. *McCraney*) 67 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, Factum, Arguments and Short-hand Writers' Notes (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 45 (i).
- LIQUOR LICENSE ACT, 1883, Licenses granted under* (Mr. *Landerkin*) 46 (i).
- LIQUORS, REVENUE derived from Importation and Manufacture* (Mr. *Rykert*) 313 (i).
- LOAN, FIVE PER CENT. CONSOLIDATED (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 484 (i).
- LOAN ISSUED IN LONDON (1884) Amounts subscribed and Advertisements for same (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 37 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS., Advances to (Mr. *Blake*) 45 (i).
- LOCAL GOVTS. in N. W. T. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 292 (i).
- LOWER TRAVERSE LIGHTSHIP, Supplying of Wood to* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
- LUGRIN, C. H., and Sec. of State, Cor. re Can. Temp. Act* (Mr. *Burpee*) 1443 (ii).
- MACKINLEY, A. & W., Entry by of School Books at undervaluation* (Mr. *Rykert*) 1443 (ii).
- MCISAAC'S POND, Inverness, N. S., Improvements (Mr. *Cameron, Inverness*) 60 (i).
- McKENZIE, J. L., Violation of Customs Laws* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).
- MAIL ROBBERIES in Man. and N. W. (Mr. *Blake*) 91 (i).
- MAIL SERVICE on the Canada Southern Ry. (Mr. *Wigle*) 120 (i).
- MANUFACTURED EXPORTS, Drawbacks (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 139 (i).
- MARINE AND FISHERIES and Quaco Lighthouse Site* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
- MARINE STORES, Purchase of, at Halifax* (Mr. *Forbes*) 533 (i).
- MARINE. See general heading.
- MARKET BATTERY, Kingston, Lease of* (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).
- MARTIN, JOHN, Widow of, continuation of Pension to (Mr. *Curran*) 201 (i).
- MEREDITH, CHIEF JUSTICE, Resignation of (Mr. *Laurier*) 43 (i).
- METLAGAN PIER, Wharfage Collections* (Mr. *Vail*) 532 (i).
- METLAKATLA INDIAN TROUBLES (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 304 (i).
- MILITIAMEN, Names and Places of Residence* (Mr. *Bourassa*) 101 (i).
- MILITIA RESERVE, Enrolments in Military Dis. No. 9* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
- MILITIA. See general heading.
- MILLARD, JOHN, and breach of Sawdust Laws in N. S.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
- MILL ST. RY. CROSSING, St. John* (Mr. *Weldon*) 1442 (ii).
- MIRAMICHI RIVER, Fish taken in (Mr. *Mitchell*) 295 (i).
- MORGAN, H. J., Payments to (Mr. *McCraney*) 120 (i).
- MORGAN, J. H., Forestry Commissioner* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 147; (Mr. *Rykert*) 187; Report of (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).
- MOUNTED POLICE, Amounts paid for Injuries* (Mr. *Somerville, Brant*) 505 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

MURRAY CANAL, Moneys paid for Valuation* (Mr. McMullen) 147 (i).
 MURRAY CANAL, Selection of Route, &c.* (Mr. Cockburn) 1442 (ii).
 NATIONAL POLICY PAMPHLET* (Mr. Charlton) 124 (i).
 NELSON & SON'S, Consignments of School Books* (Mr. Wallace, York) 1443 (ii).
 "NEPTUNE," STEAMER, Supplies for (Mr. Vail) 229 (i).
 NEW HARBOR, Rep. of Engineer (Mr. Kirk) 147 (i).
 NORTHERN AND PACIFIC JUNCTION RY. Co., Lease of* (Mr. Mulock) 56 (i).
 NORTHERN AND WESTERN RY., N.B.* (Mr. Temple) 533 (i).
 NORTH SASKATCHEWAN RIVER Navigation, Improvements (Mr. McCallum) 615, 695 (i).
 NORTH SHORE LINE, SUBSIDY (Mr. Laurier) 41 (i).
 OAK, PINE AND SPRUCE LOGS, Export Duty* (Mr. Edgar) 1442 (ii).
 OBSTRUCTIONS IN RIVERS IN N.B. (Mr. Irvine) 443 (i).
 OCEAN MAIL SERVICE (Mr. Blake) 204 (i).
 O'CONNOR, HON. JOHN, Sums paid to, in connection with Ontario Boundary* (Mr. Lister) 210 (i).
 OFFICIAL ASSIGNEES under Bankrupt Act* (Mr. Mitchell) 533 (i).
 OFFICIALS IN THE N.W. (Mr. McMullen) 66 (i).
 O'MALLEY, LIEUT.-COL., Charges against (Mr. Casey) 45; (Mr. Wilson) 101 (i).
 ONT. AND QUE. RY., Original Stockholders* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
 ONTARIO BOUNDARIES. See general heading.
 OPERATIVES IN FACTORIES, Number employed (Sir Richard Cartwright) 37 (i).
 OTTAWA, Premises leased or rented for the Public Service* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 503 (i).
 OTTAWA, RY. COMMUNICATION WITH (Mr. Landerkin) 88, 89 (i).
 OXFORD AND NEW GLASGOW RY., N.S. (Mr. Blake) 145 (i).
 PARRSBORO' BREAKWATER (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 63 (i).
 PAYMENTS, CLAIMS, &c, to High Commissioner (Mr. Blake) 44 (i).
 PENITENTIARY RULES, Suspension of, in B. C. (Mr. Shakespeare) 823 (ii).
 PENSION, Continuation of, to widow of John Martin (Mr. Curran) 201 (i).
 PIERES AND WHARVES IN P. E. I., Construction and Maintenance* (Mr. Davies) 533 (i).
 PLANTE, J. B., CLAIM OF* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 147 (i).
 POINTE AUX TREMBLES WHARF* (Mr. De St. Georges) 231 (i).
 PORPOISE FISHERY OF St. Anne la Pocatière* (Mr. Blondeau) 532 (i).
 PORT CREDIT HARBOR COMPANY* (Mr. Platt) 124 (i).
 PORT MOODY Wharf and Freight Shed (Mr. Blake) 295 (i).
 PORT MULGRAVE, N.S., as a Sub-port (Mr. Kirk) 445 (i).
 PORT ROWAN Harbor of Refuge (Mr. Jackson) 297 (i).
 PORT ROWAN LIFE-SAVING STATION (Mr. Jackson) 142 (i).
 PORT STANLEY and Port Barwell Harbors of Refuge (Mr. Wilson) 62 (i).
 PORT WILLIAMS, N.S., Fishery Overseer* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
 POSTAGE ON LETTERS, Reduction of (Mr. Charlton) 291 (i).
 POSTAL REVENUE AT VIC., B.O., for eight months* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1442 (ii).
 POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANKS and small Savings (Mr. Blake) 90 (i).
 ——— Receipts at Stephen's, N.B. (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 100 (i).
 ——— SAVINGS BANKS DEPOSITORS* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533 (i).
 ——— SAVINGS BANKS (Mr. Fairbank) 819 (ii).
 PRESQ' ISLE and Weller's Bay Harbors* (Mr. Cockburn) 1442 (ii).
 PRINTING AND PUBLISHING Co.'s, Sums paid to* (Mr. McMullen) 147 (i).
 PRINTING CONTRACTS since 1867* (Mr. Rykert) 246 (i).
 PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW of the N.W.T.* (Mr. Foster) 101 (i).
 PROHIBITORY LIQUOR LAW, Petitions praying for* (Mr. Foster) 533 (i).
 PROSSER, Mr., Fishery Warden, Lake Erie* (Mr. Lister) 964 (ii).
 PROTECTION to the Fisheries in the N.W. (Mr. Hesson) 700 (i).
 PROVINCIAL ACTS, Disallowance of (Mr. Blake) 52 (i).
 PUBLIC BUILDINGS at St. Thomas (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).
 ——— Cost of heating (Mr. Blake) 90 (i).
 PUBLIC RESERVES OF B.O. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 703 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

PUBLIC WORKS in different Provs., Expenditure on (Mr. Vanasse) 964 (ii).
 PUBLIC WORKS. See general heading.
 QUACO LIGHTHOUSE SITE, Purchase, &c.* (Mr. Weldon) 1442 (ii).
 QU'APPELLE VALLEY, Squatters in (Mr. Lister) 205 (i).
 QUARANTINE REGULATIONS issued to Ports in N.B.* (Mr. Weldon) 1443 (ii).
 QUEBEC DRILL SHED, Tenderers and Securities* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 533 (ii).
 "RANGE LIGHTS" at Weller's Bay* (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).
 RECEIPTS, &c, of Interior Department (Mr. Blake) 55 (i).
 RECIPROCAL TRADE RELATIONS with the U. S.* (Mr. Charlton) 1444 (ii).
 REFUND OF DUTIES to P. E. I. Fishermen (Mr. Davies) 831 (ii).
 REFUND OF HAY DUTIES (Mr. Irvine) 443 (i).
 RENTAL OR LEASE OF ROOMS, &c., in Ottawa for the Public Service* (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 503 (i).
 REPATRIATION OF FRENCH CANADIANS, Scheme of Immigration* (Mr. Blake) 533 (ii).
 REPRESENTATION OF N.W.T. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 292 (i).
 RESERVES, PUBLIC, OF B.C. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 703 (i).
 RESIGNATION of Capt. Bolduc (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 29 (i).
 RESIGNATION of Chief Justice Meredith (Mr. Laurier) 43 (i).
 RETURN TICKETS on Govt. Rys. (Mr. Weldon) 706 (i).
 REVENUE from Imported and Manufactured Liquors* (Mr. Rykert) 313 (i).
 RICHELIEU COUNTY, Dom. Lands in* (Mr. Massue) 147 (i).
 RICHIBUCTO HARBOR, Customs business* (Mr. Landry, Kent) 1442 (ii).
 RIDGETOWN as a Port of Entry* (Mr. Casey) 532 (ii).
 RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, Number, Annual Grant and Names of Members* (Mr. Bergin) 46 (i).
 RIVERS AND STREAMS, Rental of* (Mr. McMullen) 448 (i).
 ROBBING MAILS in Man. and N.W. (Mr. Blake) 91 (i).
 ROBERTSON, J. D., Claim re Intercol. Ry.* (Mr. Mills) 1443 (ii).
 ROGERS' FISH-LADDER (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 870 (ii).
 ROGERS, W. H., and Sawdust Law in N. S.* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).
 ROOTS, WEIGHT AND MEASUREMENT OF* (Mr. McDonald, King's) 20 (i).
 ROYAL MILITARY COL. GRADUATES* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 313 (i).
 RY. BONUSES IN ONT., Refund (Mr. Wilson) 356, 616; (Mr. Cook) 569; (Mr. Landerkin) 58 (i); (Mr. Fleming) 1443 (ii).
 RY. COMMUNICATION with Ottawa (Mr. Landerkin) 86, 89 (i).
 RY. COMPANIES OF CANADA* (Mr. Cameron, Middlesex) 312 (i).
 RY. LANDS IN B. C., Claims of Can.* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
 RYS., Aid to, outside Man. and N.W. (Mr. Blake) 92 (i).
 RY. SUBSIDIES in N. S. and Cape Breton (Mr. McDougall) 140 (i).
 RY. SUPPLIES purchased in Halifax* (Mr. Forbes) 1442 (ii).
 ST. JOHN, N.B., Military Properties (Mr. Weldon) 606 (i).
 ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, Islands leased in* (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 147 (i).
 ST. LAWRENCE RY., BONUSES to (Mr. Landerkin) 86, 89 (i).
 ST. ROCH DES AULNETS, ENQUIRY RESPECTING CAPT. A. M. DECHENE* (Mr. Casgrain) 30 (i).
 ST. STEPHENS, N. B., Post Office Receipts* (Mr. Burpee, Sunbury) 100 (i).
 ST. THOMAS PUBLIC BUILDINGS (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).
 SALMON POINT (Ont.) Breakwater at* (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).
 SAVINGS BANKS, DEPOSITORS* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533 (i).
 SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE (Mr. Fairbank) 819 (ii).
 SAUNDERS & WOOD, Criminal Libel against* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
 SAWDUST LAW, Breach of, in N.S.* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).
 SCHOOL BOOKS, Consignment by Nelson & Sons* (Mr. Wallace, York) 1443 (ii).
 SCHOOL BOOKS, Seizure of, at Toronto* (Mr. Rykert) 1443 (ii).
 SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC* (Mr. Landerkin) 88 (i).
 SEA LOTS OF PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND (Mr. Blake) 62 (i).
 SECTION B. See "CANADIAN PACIFIC RY."
 SEIZURE OF SCHOONER Lion* (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 533 (i).
 SEIZURES AT DIFFERENT PORTS* (Mr. Blake) 56 (i).
 SEIZURES, CUSTOMS, at Winnipeg (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 293 (i); 1443 (ii).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- SEIZURES, CUSTOMS, in N.S.* (Mr. *Stairs*) 532. (i)
 SELLON, MR., and breach of Sawdust Law in N. S.* (Mr. *Forbes*) 147 (i).
 SETTLERS, FUEL FOR, in the N.W. (Mr. *Blake*) 61 (i).
 SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, Drawbacks on (Mr. *Burpee, Sunbury*) 100 (i).
 SHORTHAND WRITING, payment to G. and A. Holland* (Mr. *Auger*) 147 (i).
 SHORT LINE ROUTE TO MARITIME PROVINCES (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 33 (i).
 SIMARD, M. J., Rep. recommending payment to G. Lavoie* (Mr. *Langelier*) 1443 (ii).
 "SIR HECTOR," Tug, Depth of water drawn* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).
 "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," Repairs, &c., to Steamer (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 831 (ii).
 SMALL SAVINGS AND P.O. SAVINGS BANKS (Mr. *Blake*) 90 (i).
 SQUATTERS in the Qu'Appelle Valley (Mr. *Lister*) 205 (i).
 SQUATTERS in TOWNSHIP 3, Ranges 23 and 24 west (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 231 (i).
 STARR, J. E., Removal of, as Fishery Overseer* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
 SOUNDINGS, &c., Burlington Bay Canal* (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 533 (i).
 SUBSIDIES, DOMINION, TO PROVINCES (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
 SUBSIDIES TO RAILWAYS AND PAYMENTS* (Mr. *Blake*) 56 (i).
 SUBSIDIES TO RYS. in N.S. and Cape Breton (Mr. *McDougall*) 140 (i).
 SUBSIDY TO THE NORTH SHORE LINE (Mr. *Laurier*) 41 (i).
 SUGARS IMPORTED AT HALIFAX FROM JAMAICA* (Mr. *Vail*) 40 (i).
 SUPERANNUATION FUND* (Mr. *Blake*) 56; (Mr. *McMullen*) 58 (i).
 SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, Amounts due* (Mr. *De St. George*) 1443 (ii).
 SUPREME COURT, Contested Cases, &c.* (Mr. *Curran*) 210 (i).
 SUPREME COURT Decision re License Act* (Mr. *Blake*) 533 (i).
 SUPREME COURT JUDGMENTS and Queen's Bench, Quebec* (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 533 (i).
 SUPREME COURT OF NEW BRUNSWICK (Mr. *Foster*) 294 (i).
 TARIFF under Old Prov. of Can., &c.* (Mr. *Watson*) 1443 (ii).
 TELEGRAPH CABLE ACROSS Juan de Fuca Straits, Cost* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
 TEMP. ACT, 1878, PETITIONS, Number presented* (Mr. *Foster*) 533 (i).
 TENDERS FOR COAL SUPPLY to Fog-whistles, &c.* (Mr. *Robertson, Shelburne*) 533 (i).
 TENDERS FOR INDIAN SUPPLIES for the N. W.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
 TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, Lease of* (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).
 TILTON, Mr., vs. Staff Commander Bolton* (Mr. *McMullen*) 312 (i).
 TIMBER LANDS sold or leased in Ont.* (Mr. *Mackenzie*) 40 (i).
 TIMBER LICENSES, Fort William Reserve* (Mr. *Blake*) 1442 (ii).
 TIMBER LICENSES GRANTED in disputed Territory and applications not granted* (Mr. *Charlton*) 209 (i).
 TIMBER LICENSES in B. C., Applications for* (Mr. *Charlton*) 210 (i).
 TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS in N.W. (Mr. *Charlton*) 121 (i).
 TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS (Mr. *Charlton*) 30 (i).
 TIMBER LICENSES OR PERMITS to cut in new Territory of Ont.* (Mr. *Mills*) 124 (i).
 TIMBER PERMITS to cut in disputed Territory* (Mr. *Mills*) 210 (i).
 TOLLS ON CERTAIN RAILWAY COMPANIES (Mr. *Mulock*) 54 (i).
 TRACADIE BREAKWATER, Expenditure for Repairs* (Mr. *McIsaac*) 147 (i).
 TRADE WITH THE AUSTRALIAN COLONIES (Mr. *Mitchell*) 36.
 TRAFALGAR, TOWNSHIP, Indian Lands in* (Mr. *McCraney*) 533 (i).
 TREATY BETWEEN U. S. AND SPAIN (Mr. *Vail*) 219 (i).
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, Goodwin's Contract (Mr. *Blake*) 823 (ii).
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL (Mr. *Cockburn*) 202 (i).
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, Rent, &c., of building occupied by Engineer* (Mr. *Cockburn*) 56 (i).
 TRENT VALLEY CANAL, Reps. to Council, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i).
 TUG-BARGES, Dredge, &c., on Red River* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).
 U.S. AND CAN., Reciprocal Trade Relations* (Mr. *Charlton*) 1444 (ii).
 VERNON SMITH'S REP. OF SURVEY (Mr. *Lesage*) 294 (i).

RETURNS, STATEMENTS, &c.—Continued.

- VICTORIA, B.C., Postal Revenue for eight months* (Mr. *Baker, Victoria*) 1442 (ii).
 VIGER INDIAN AGENCY, Lands sold* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).
 VOLUNTEER COMPANIES DISBANDED in Mil. Dist No. 9* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).
 VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38 (Mr. *Hickey*) 37 (i).
 VOYAGERS TO EGYPT, Names, &c.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 210 (i).
 WEIGHT AND MEASUREMENT OF ROOTS (Mr. *McDonald, King's*) 201 (i).
 WEIRS IN THE CO. OF CHARLOTTA* (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1444 (ii).
 WELLER'S BAY, Ont., "Range Lights"* (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).
 WHEAT AND FLOUR DUTIES, Memorials, &c.* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
 WHEAT AND FLOUR, Imports and Exports (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 138 (i).
 WHEAT, FLOUR, CORNMEAL AND CORN, Duties collected* (Mr. *Vail*) 533 (i).
 WHITE HAVEN BOAT CANAL, Rep. of Engineer* (Mr. *Kirk*) 147 (i).
 WILKINSON, J. A., Moneys paid to* (Mr. *McMullen*) 147 (i).
 WINDSOR BRANCH RY., Pleadings and Verdicts* (Mr. *Kinney*) 532 (i).
 WINNIPEG, CUSTOMS SEIZURES AT* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 1443 (ii).
 WINTER CROSSING FROM P.E. I. (Mr. *McDonald, King's*) 62 (i).
 WIRE FENCES, I. C. R., Contracts made by Govt.* (Mr. *Weldon*) 532 (i).
 WOOD, A. F., Moneys paid to* (Mr. *McMullen*) 147 (i).
 WOOD, SUPPLYING OF, to Lower Traverse Lightship* (Mr. *Casgrain*) 30 (i).
 RICE, INCREASED DUTY ON : Quos. (Mr. *Shakespeare*) 695 (i).
 Richelieu and Ont. Nav. Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. *Desjardins*). 1°*, 188; 2°*, 246 (i); Notice of an Amt., 1210; in Com., 1347; 3°, 1352 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 91.)
 RICHELIEU CO. LANDS. See "DOMINION LANDS."
 RICHELIEU RIVER FLOODS, MEMORIAL FROM RIPARIAN OWNERS : Quos. (Mr. *Bechard*) 606 (i).
 RICHIBUCTO AND KINGSTON PORTS, CUSTOMS BUSINESS : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Landry, Kent*) 1412 (ii).
 RICHIBUCTO HARBOR. See "CUSTOMS."
 RIDEAU CANAL, INCREASE OF WATER SUPPLY : in Com. of Sup, 3313 (iv).
 RIDGETOWN AS A PORT OF ENTRY, PETS., &c. : M. for copies* (Mr. *Casey*) 532 (i).
 RIEL, CAPTURE OF, TEL. FROM GENL. MIDDLETON, 1895 (iii).
 RIEL, EMPLOYMENT OF, BY GOVT. : Quos. (Mr. *Casey*) 743 (i).
 RIEL'S PROPOSAL TO ACCEPT MONEY : Quos. (Mr. *Blake*) 3426 (iv).
 RIEL, TREATMENT OF IN PRISON : Remarks (Mr. *Laurier*) 2357 (iii).
 RIEL, TRIAL OF : Quos. (Mr. *Lister*) 2358 (iii).
 RIFLE ASSOCIATIONS, HEADQUARTERS, ANNUAL GRANT, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Bergin*) 46 (i).
 "RIMOUSKI" STEAMER, SUBSIDY TO : Quos. (Mr. *Kirk*) 114 (i).
 RITES OF RELIGION REFUSED PRISONERS IN THE N.W. : Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 2998 (iv).
 RIVER LOTS, N.W., SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS, MR. PEARSON'S LETTER RESPECTING : Quos. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).
 RIVERS AND STREAMS, RENTAL OF, SUMS RECEIVED BY DEPT. OF FISHERIES : M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 448 (i); Quos., 2359 (iii).
 RIVIÈRE DU LOUP BRANCH, SALE OF : Quos. (Mr. *McMullen*) 1039 (ii).

- River St. Clair Ry.** See "ST. CLAIR."
ROACHE, MATTHEW, AND PILOTAGE COMMISSION: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3427 (iv).
ROBERTSON, JOHN D., COMPENSATION TO, FOR PREMISES AND LAND TAKEN FOR I.C.R.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Mills) 1443 (ii).
ROBINSON AND QUEEN. See "INLAND FISHERIES."
Rock Lake, Brandon and Souris Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 100 (Mr. McDougald, Pictou). 1°*, 742 (i); 2°*, 873 (ii).
ROGERS, W. H., FISHERY INSPECTOR FOR N.S., BREACH OF SAWDUST LAW: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Forbes) 147 (i).
ROGERS' FISH LADDERS, PURCHASE AND USE OF: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 3073 (iv).
ROGERS' PATENT FISH LADDER, COR. AND REPS.: M. for copies (Mr. Robertson, Shelburne) 870 (ii).
ROLLING STOCK ON EASTERN SECTION, C.P.R.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Edgar) 302 (i).
ROLLING STOCK ON C.P.R., PAYMENT OF DUTIES ON, BY CO.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 888 (ii).
ROSS, N. N., OF QUEBEC, NAME AND SALARY OF SUCCESSOR TO: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 862 (ii).
ROUNDHOUSE AND BUILDINGS IN MAN. ON PRIVATE PROPERTY: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2030, 2171 (iii).
ROYAL ASSENT TO BILLS, 1516 (ii), 3475 (iv).
Royal Canadian Insurance Co's B. No. 43 (Mr. Curran). 1°*, 125; 2°*, 188 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 791 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 28.)
ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE. See "MILITIA."
Rush Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and Nav. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 79 (Mr. Tupper). 1°*, 313; 2°*, 490 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 1180 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 90.)
RUSSELL, A. (DEPT. OF INTERIOR) SUPERANNUATION OF: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 2530; RUSSELL, L., 2531 (iii).
SABLE ISLAND, TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WITH: Ques. (Mr. Daly) 57 (i).
ST. ANNE LA POCATIÈRE PORPOISE FISHERY. See "PORPOISE."
ST. CROIX COTTON MILLS, PAYMENT OF DUTIES: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 632 (i).
ST. CLAIR RANCHE CO., RENT PAID, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2240 (iii).
St. Clair Riv. Ry. Bridge and Tunnel Co.'s B. No. 8 (Mr. Bergin). 1°*, 40; 2°*, 57; in Com. and 3°*, 245 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 25.)
ST. GEORGE'S DAY, ADJT. FOR: M. (Mr. Shakespeare) 1305 (ii).
ST. JOHN AND PORTLAND, MILL ST. RY. CROSSING. See "I. C. R."
ST. JOHN BRIDGE AND RY. EXTENSION CO.: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 569 (i).
ST. JOHN, N.B., CITY AND COUNTY, ISSUE OF WRIT FOR ELECTION: Ques. (Mr. Weldon) 3427 (iv).
ST. JOHN, N. B., MILITARY PROPERTIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Weldon) 606 (i).
ST. LAURENT, LAND AND SURVEYS OF: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
ST. LAWRENCE CANALS. See "SUPPLY," &c.
St. Lawrence River Nav. B. No. 159 (Mr. McLelan). 1°*, 3293; Order for 2° read, 3436; 2° m., Amt. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 6 m. h., neg., 3470; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 Vic., c. 77.)
ST. LAWRENCE RY., BONUSES TO: M. for Ret. (Mr. Landerkin) 86 (i).
ST. LOUIS DE LANGEVIN, PETITION FROM SETTLERS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424 (iv).
ST. LAWRENCE RIVER, ISLANDS LEASED IN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wood, Brockville) 147 (i).
ST. MARTIN'S JUNCTION TO QUEBEC: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Laurier) 533 (i).
ST. PATRICK'S DAY: M. for adjmt. (Mr. Curran) 593 (i).
ST. PETER AND ST. PAUL: M. for adjmt. (Sir Hector Langevin) 2889 (iv).
ST. ROCH DES AULNETS, ENQUIRY re CAPT. DE CHENE: M. for copy (Mr. Casgrain) 30 (i).
ST. ROMUALD D'ETCHEMIN, STATION AT: Ques. (Mr. Guay) 1567 (ii).
ST. STEPHEN'S, N. B., POST OFFICE, RECEIPTS, &C.: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Burpee) 100 (i).
ST. STEPHEN'S, N. B., PUBLIC BUILDINGS, CONSTRUCTION OF: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 148 (i).
ST. THOMAS, PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT, AMOUNT EXPENDED ON: M. for Ret. (Mr. Wilson) 79 (i).
ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY: in Com. of Sup., 986 (ii).
SALARIES OF MINISTERS: Ques. (Mr. Somerville, Brant) 3073 (iv).
Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets Act Amt. B. No. 86 (Mr. McCarthy). 1°, 362 (i).
Sale of Ry. Passenger Tickets. Acts Amt. B. No. 121 (Mr. Patterson, Essex). 1°*, 927 (ii).
SALES AND RECEIPTS ON ACCOUNT OF DOMINION LANDS: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2854; Sales for 1884-85, 2997 (iv).
SALMON FISHING IN BATHURST HARBOR, REGULATIONS, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2359 (iii).
SALMON POINT BREAKWATER, CONSTRUCTION OF: M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).
SALT CAKE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
SASKATCHEWAN RIVER IMPROVEMENTS. See "N.W.T."
SATUMA ISLAND, B.C., LIGHTHOUSE: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 479 (i).
Sault St. Marie Bridge Co.'s B. No. 52 (Mr. Dawson). 1°*, 170; 2°*, 245; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 24.)
SAUNDERS AND WOOD, TRIAL OF, FOR CRIMINAL LIBEL IN N. W.T.: M. for copies* (Mr. Blake) 1443 (ii).
SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE, IN THE MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. Stairs) 148 (i); in Com. of Sup., 896 (ii).
SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE, DEPOSITORS IN: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fairbank) 819, 823 (ii).

- SAVINGS BANKS, POST OFFICE, DEPOSITS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 2359, 2465, 2559 (iii).
- SAVINGS BANKS (POST OFFICE OR OTHERWISE) DEPOSITORS IN: M. for Ret.* (Sir Richard Cartwright) 533 (i).
- SAWDUST IN LA HAVE RIVER, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 2239 (iii).
- SCHMIDT, LOUIS, AND OTHERS, OF PRINCE ALBERT DISTRICT, EMPLOYMENT OF BY GOVT.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1915 (iii); ANSWER TO LETTER OF, 3424 (iv).
- SCHOOL BOOKS, CONSIGNMENT OF BY NELSON & SONS: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wallace, York) 1443 (ii). See "CUSTOMS."
- SCHOOL OF CAVALRY AT QUEBEC: M. for copies of papers, &c. (Mr. Langelier) 88 (i).
- SCHOOL OF NAVIGATION AT QUEBEC: Ques. (Mr. Amyot) 743 (i).
- SCOTT ACT PETS.: M. to Erase name (Mr. Foster) 2320 (iii).
- SCOTT ACT, PROSECUTIONS UNDER: Ques. (Mr. Tupper) 41 (i).
- SEA LOTS OF P.E.I., DEPTL. INSTRUCTIONS, &C.: M. for copies (Mr. Blake) 61 (i).
- Secretary of State, Dept. of, Acts Amt. B. No. 102** (Mr. Chapleau). 1°, 629 (i); 2° and in Com., 891; 3°, 895 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 2.)
- SEC. OF STATE'S REPORT: presented (Mr. Chapleau) 127 (i).
- SECTION B. See "C. P. R."
- Seduction, &c., Punishment B. No. 27** (Mr. Charlton). 1°, 76; 2°, 619 (i). See B. 123.
- SEIZURES. See "CUSTOMS."
- SEIZURES BY CUSTOMS DEPT. AT MONTREAL: Ques. (Mr. Langelier) 1387 (ii).
- SESSIONAL CLERKS, EXTRA: in Com. of Sup., 2796, 3448 (iv).
- SETTLEMENT OF SETTLERS' CLAIMS AT PRINCE ALBERT, &C.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2358 (iii).
- SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS OF MAN. HALF-BREED MINORS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1743 (iii). See "HALF BREEDS."
- SETTLERS' CLAIMS, PRINCE ALBERT DISTRICT: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 1567 (ii).
- SETTLERS IN MAN. AND N. W. T.: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 113 (i).
- SETTLERS IN THE DOM. DURING CALENDAR YEAR 1884: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 113 (i).
- SETTLERS IN THE MAR. PROVS.: Ques. (Mr. Gillmor) 148 (i).
- SHAREHOLDERS. See "C. P. R." and "G. T. R."
- SHEET IRON HOLLOWWARE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- SHINGLE SHAVINGS IN THE MERSEY RIV.: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 1039 (ii).
- SHIPBUILDING MATERIALS, DRAWBACK ON: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Burpee) 100 (i).
- SHORT LINE RY.: Deb. on Res. (Mr. Laurier) 189; (Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Langelier) 193; (Mr. De St. Georges) 195; (Messrs. Casgrain and Blake) 198; (Sir John A. Macdonald) 199; (Mr. Mills) 200 (i).
- SHORT LINE RY.: prop. Res. (Sir Hector Langevin) 2531; M. for Com., 2971; in Com., 2975; Deb. on 2nd Res. (Sir John A. Macdonald and Messrs. Dodd, Vail and Blake) 2977; (Messrs. Gillmor and Landry) 2978; (Mr. Hall) 2979; (Mr. Langelier) 2982; (Mr. Colby) 2982, 2987; (Mr. Burpee) 2986; (Mr. Laurier) 2987; (Mr. Blake) 2988; (Sir Hector Langevin) 2989, 3250; (Mr. Stairs) 2990; (Mr. Lesage) 2992; (Mr. Desaulniers, Maskinongé) 2995; on M. to conc. in Res. (Mr. Laurier) 3250; Amt., 3257; (Sir Hector Langevin) 3257; (Mr. Langelier) 3259; Amt. to Amt., 3265; (Mr. Shanly) 3266; (Mr. Weldon) 3266; (Mr. Girouard) 3267; (Mr. Taschereau) 3268; (Mr. Wood, Westmoreland) 3269; (Mr. Temple) 3271; (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 3273; (Messrs. Hall and Foster) 3274; (Mr. Landry, Kent) 3276; (Mr. Colby) 3277; (Mr. Gillmor) 3281; (Mr. Bossé) 3282; (Mr. Fisher) 3284; (Mr. Mitchell) 3287; Amt. to Amt. neg. (Y. 39, N. 107) 3289; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Lesage) 3289; neg. (Y. 36, N. 101) 3292; Amt. neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 3292 (iv).
- SHORT LINE RY.: M. for copies of O. C., instructions given, Reports, &c., of Engineers (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 33 (i); SURVEY FROM ST. CHARLES: Ques, 350; SECOND REP. OF MR. LIGHT: Ques., 1744 (iii).
- SHORT LINE RY. FROM MONTREAL TO THE ATLANTIC: M. for copies of Reps. of Govt. Engineers, &c. (Mr. Lesage) 38 (i); REPORT OF MR. WICKSTEED: Ques., 1744 (iii).
- SHORT LINE RY., PLANS AND REPS.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 567 (i).
- SHORT LINE RY. TO THE MAR. PROVS: Ques. (Mr. Edgar) 2239 (iii).
- SILVER AND GERMAN SILVER: in Com. on Ways and Means, 808 (ii).
- SIMARD, JOSEPH, REP. RECOMMENDING PAYMENT TO GEORGE LAVOIE: M. for copies* (Mr. Langelier) 1443 (ii).
- SIMPSON, G. A., GOVT. LAND AGENT: Ques (Mr. Blake) 57 (i).
- SINKING FUND, FIVE PER CENT. LOAN: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 2465 (iii).
- "SIR JAMES DOUGLAS," STEAMER, REPAIRS TO, &C.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 831 (ii).
- Sisters of Charity of the N.W. incorp. Act Amt. B. No. 115** (Mr. Desjardins). 1°, 832; 2°, 873; in Com. and 3°, 1007 (iii). (48-49 Vic., c. 35.)
- SKIRMISH WITH POUNDMAKER: Ques. (Mr. Mitchell) 1646 (ii).
- SMALL SAVINGS. See "POST OFFICE."
- SMITH, VERNON. See "SHORT LINE RY."
- SOMERVILLE, N.S., BREAKWATER, REPAIR OF: Ques. (Mr. Forbes) 57 (i).
- SOULANGES ELECTION, JUDGMENT OF SUPREME COURT, 1 (i).
- SOUNDINGS TAKEN IN BURLINGTON BAY CANAL, REP. OF SUPT.: M. for copies* (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton) 533 (i).
- SOUTH GRENVILLE ELECTION: Return of Mr. Shanly, 3072 (iv).
- South Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. B. No. 37** (Mr. Robertson, Hamilton). 1°, 125; 2°, 179; in Com. and 3°, 672 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 17.)
- Speaker, Deputy, and Chairman of Committees B. No. 26** (Sir John A. Macdonald). Res. prop., 67; Amt. (Mr. Blake) to refer to Sel. Com., 70; neg. (Y. 59, N. 121) 72; 1° of B., 74; 2° and in Com., 175; M. for 3° agreed to on a div. and 3°, 212 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 1.)

- SPEECHES FROM THE THRONE:** Opening of Parlt., 2 (i);
Prorogation, 3476 (iv).
- SPIRITS AND TOBACCO:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 3212 (iv).
- SPIRITS TAKEN OUT OF BOND:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3371;
Stmnt. (Mr. *Costigan*) 3395 (iv).
- Spiruous Liquors Prohibition B. No. 125** (Mr. *Beaty*). Res. prop., 1040; 1°* of B., 1063 (ii).
- SPRING HILL MINES.** See "COAL."
- SQUATTERS OR OCCUPANTS, &C.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 231 (i).
- SQUATTERS, QU'APPELLE VALLEY, ARBITRATION:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Lister*) 205 (i).
- STAFF OF THE HOUSE, RES. AND SCHEDULES ADOPTED BY COMMISSIONERS,** 2497 (iii).
- STAMP DUTY, COMMUTATION OF:** in Com. of Sup., 897 (ii).
- STANDING COMMITTEES, NON MEETING OF, FOR ORGANIZATION:** Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) 57, 67 (i).
- STANDING COM. ON COLONIZATION AND IMMIGRATION:** M. to add Messrs. Baker, Vic., and Jackson, to Com. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 299 (i).
- STANDING COM. ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES:** M. to add name of Mr. Bain (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 125 (i).
- STARR, J. E., FISHERY OVERSEER OF PORT WILLIAMS, N.S., REMOVAL OF:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Blake*) 1443 (ii).
- STATIONERY USED IN H. OF C., EXPENSE OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 290 (i).
- STATISTICS RELATING TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE:** Ques. (Mr. *Tassé*) 2531 (iii), 2854 (iv).
- STATUTES, DISTRIBUTION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Trow*) 568 (i).
- Statutes of Canada Consolidation B. No. 96** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). Not introduced. See B. 130.
- Statutes of Canada, Revised, B. No. 130** (Sir *John A. Macdonald*). 1°, 1226 (ii); Order for 2° deshd. and B. withdn., 2402 (iii).
- Steamboat Inspection Act, 1882, Amt. B. No. 133** (Mr. *McLelan*). Res. prop., 1279; in Com. and 1°* of B., 1280 (ii); 2° and in Com., 2399; 3°*, 2421 (iii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 75.)
- STEAM COMMUNICATION WITH FRANCE:** Ques. (Mr. *Amyot*) 567 (i).
- STEAMSHIP SUBVENTIONS:**
- CAMPBELLTON AND GASPÉ: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
 - CANADA AND ANTWERP: in Com. of Sup., 2942; conc., 2596 (iv).
 - CANADA AND GERMANY: in Com. of Sup., 2945 (iv).
 - FRANCE AND QUEBEC: in Com. of Sup., 2936, 3041 (iv).
 - LIVERPOOL OR LONDON AND ST. JOHN, N.B., OR HALIFAX: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
 - N.B. AND P.E.I. TO GREAT BRITAIN: in Com. of Sup., 3457 (iv).
 - P.E.I. AND GREAT BRITAIN: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
 - PORT MULGRAVE AND EAST BAY, C.B.: in Com. of Sup., 2942 (iv).
 - U. S. AND VICTORIA, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 2936; conc., 2958 (iv).
- STEEL:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 805 (ii).
- STIPENDIARY MAGISTRATE IN N.W.T.:** in Com. of Sup., 3448 (iv).
- STONEY INDIAN RISING, FURTHER INFORMATION ASKED,** 863; Stmnt. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 886 (ii).
- Subsidies, Further, to Rys. B. 158** (Sir *Hector L. Langevin*). Res. prop., 2531 (iii); M. for Com. on Res., 2971; in Com., 2974; M. to conc. in Res., 3250; 1°* of B., 3293; 2° m., 3380; in Com., 3380; on M. to conc. in Amts., Amt. (Mr. *Kirk*) 3401; neg. (Y. 40, N. 83) 3403; Amt. (Mr. *Blake*) neg. (Y. 43, N. 79) 3404; 3°*, 3404; Amt. (Mr. *Laurier*) 3057; Amts. to Amt. (Mr. *Langelier*) 3266; neg. (Y. 39, N. 101) 3292; (Mr. *Lesage*) 3292; neg. (Y. 36, N. 101) 3292; Amt. (Mr. *Langelier*) neg. (Y. 35, N. 101) 3292 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 58.)
- Subsidies to Rys. B. No. 164** (Mr. *Pope*). Res. prop., 3457; M. for Com., 3470; in Com., 3472; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 3473 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 59.)
- Subsidies to Rys.** See "LAND GRANTS."
- SUBSIDIES:**
- CANADIAN PACIFIC RY.: Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1677 (ii); in Com. of Sup 3295.
 - FURTHER, TO RYS. See B. 158.
 - LAND GRANTS TO RYS. See B. 147.
 - MANITOBA: prop. Res. (Mr. *Bowell*) 2889 (iv).
 - NEW BRUNSWICK AND P.E.I. RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop. Res. (Mr. *Pope*) 3457; in Com., 3472 (iv).
 - NORTH SHORE RY.: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Laurier*) 41 (i).
 - N.S. INCREASED: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 189, 567 (i).
 - PROVINCIAL: M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Amyot*) 303 (i).
 - QUEBEC, ADVANCES TO, ON ACCOUNT: Ques. (Mr. *Langelier*) 235 (i).
 - RYS.: Remarks (Mr. *Blake*) and others, on M. for Com. of Sup., 3442 (iv). See Bs. 147, 158 and 164.
 - Rimouski, STEAMER: Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 114 (i).
 - RYS. IN N.S. AND CAPE BRETON: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. *McDougall*) 140 (i).
 - RY. CO.'S, NAMES OF OFFICERS, &C.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Cameron, Middlesex*) 312 (i).
- SUGARS, IMPORTATION OF, AT HALIFAX, FROM JAMAICA:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Vail*) 40 (i).
- SUGAR:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 3219 (iv).
- SUGAR: POLARISCOPIC TEST:** Ques. (Mr. *Vail*) 479 (i).
- Summary Convictions.** See "CRIMINAL LAW."
- SUMS PAID OR ADVANCED TO C. P. R. AS INTEREST OR SUBSIDY:** Ques. (Mr. *Charlton*) 1677 (ii).
- Sunday Excursions Prohibition B. No. 19** (Mr. *Charlton*). 1°*, 46; 2° m., 256; neg. on a div., 266 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT OF QUEBEC, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE:** Ques. (Mr. *Casgrain*) 429 (i).
- SUPERIOR COURT OF QUEBEC:** prop. Res. (Sir *Hector Langevin*) 3293 (iv).
- SUPERANNUATION FUND, NUMBER ON LIST, &C.:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *McMullen*) 56 (i).
- SUPERVISOR OF CULLERS, AMOUNTS DUE TO:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *De St. Georges*) 1443 (ii).
- SUPPLIES FOR THE HUDSON'S BAY STR. "NEPTUNE":** M. for copies of Accts., &c. (Mr. *Vail*) 229 (i).
- Supply B. No. 163** (Mr. *Bowell*). 1°*, 2°, 3°*, 3470 (iv). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 41.)
- SUPPLY:**
- [Only subjects which caused remark or discussion noted under this head.]
- Amts. to Ms. for Com.: Washington Treaty and Reciprocity (Mr. *Davies*) 995; Public Expenditure (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 2868; Representation of the N. W. Territories (Mr. *Cameron, Huron*) 3404.

SUPPLY—Continued.

Mess. from His Ex., transmitting Estimates for 1885-86, 289; Mess. from His Ex., transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1884-85, 2820; Mess. from His Ex., transmitting Suppl. Estimates for 1885-86, 3359; Mess. from His Ex., transmitting further Suppl. Estimates for 1885-86, 3415.

Res. (Sir Leonard Tilley) for Com., 27; in Com., 895, 968, 1023, 1304, 2795, 2830, 2889, 2903, 2936, 3041, 3232, 3295, 3339, 3383, 3408.

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice:

General Vote, 985.

N. W. T. (*re* Trials in connection with Rebellion) 3411; conc., 3433; (Fourth Stipendiary Magistrate) 3448.

*Adulteration of Food. See "Collection of Revenues."**Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:*

Archives, Care of, 1023.

Antwerp and Colonial Exhibition, 1032; conc., 2766.

Agricultural, Industrial, and other Statistics in Man. and N. W. T., 1035.

Criminal Statistics, Preparation of, 1026.

Dominion Exhibition, 1026.

Health Statistics: conc., 2766.

Indian and Colonial Exhibition, 3452.

Mortuary Statistics, 2027.

*Canals. See "Railways and Canals."**Charges of Management:*

Assistant Receivers General's Offices, Montreal, St. John, Winnipeg, 895.

Brokerage, Commission, &c., on Loans, 1874 to 1879, inclusive, 896.

Brokerage, Commission, &c., on Loan of 1884, 896.

Co.nty Savings Banks, N.B., N.S., and B.C., 896.

Country Savings Banks: printing, &c., 897.

Dominion Notes: issue and redemption, 897.

Dominion Notes, printing, &c., 897.

Financial Inspector, 895.

Financial Commissioner in England, 896; conc., 2763.

Civil Government:

Agriculture, Dept. of, 904; contingencies, 921.

Auditor General's Office, 901.

Civil Service Board of Examiners, 973.

Contingencies, Departmental:

High Commissioner, 925.

Post Office and Finance Depts., 927.

Travelling Expenses, 923.

Customs, Dept. of, 901; contingencies, 916.

Finance, Dept. of, and Treasury Board, 891; suppl., 3411; contingencies, 915.

Fisheries, Dept. of, 910.

Governor General's Secretary's Office, 832, 898.

Indian Affairs, Dept. of, 901; suppl. (increase and arrears of salaries) 3410, 3411.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Civil Government—Continued.

Inland Revenue, Dept. of, 901; contingencies, 916.

Interior, Dept. of, 968, contingencies, 915; suppl. (Geological Survey Branch) 3408; conc., 2764, 3433 (iv).

Justice, Dept. of, 898.

Penitentiaries Branch, 914.

Marine, Dept. of, 906; contingencies, 922; suppl. 3411.

Militia and Defence, Dept. of, 898; contingencies, 914.

Postmaster-General's Dept., 902; suppl., 3411; conc., 2764.

Privy Council Office, 899; contingencies, 914.

Public Works, Dept. of, 911; suppl., 3448; contingencies, 921.

Railways and Canals, Dept. of, 973; contingencies, 923.

Secretary of State, Dept. of, 900; suppl., 3350, 3411.

Stationery Office: contingencies, 914.

Collection of Revenues:

Adulteration of Food, 3242.

Culling Timber, 3241.

Customs, 3232; suppl. (Extra for miscellaneous Services), 3393.

Excise, 3241.

Inspection of Staples, 3241.

Liquor License Act, conc., 3398; suppl., 3421.

Post Office, 3308; suppl. (Assistant Postmaster, Ottawa) 3393; conc., 3397.

Public Works—Repairs and Working Expenses:

Agent and Contingencies, B.C., 3308.

Harbors and Slides, Repairs, 3307.

Telegraph and Signal Service generally, 3307.

Telegraph Lines, P.E.I., and Mainland, 3307.

Railways—Repairs and Working Expenses:

Eastern Extension Railway, 3300.

Intercolonial, 3299.

Prince Edward Island Railway, 3301.

Windsor Branch Railway, 3301.

Weights and Measures and Gas, 3241.

Kinnee, Daniel (increase of Salary) 3457.

*Culling Timber. See "Collection of Revenues."**Customs. See "Collection of Revenues."**Dominion Lands—Capital:*

Surveys, Examination of Survey Returns, &c., 3344.

Dominion Lands—Income:

Agencies, 3346.

Land Board at Winnipeg, 3344.

Dominion Police:

General Vote, 985; suppl., 3350.

*Dominion Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."**Excise. See "Collection of Revenues."*

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Fisheries :

- Canadian Fisheries Exhibit, 2956.
- Fishing Bounty, expenses in connection with distribution, 2956; suppl., 3387.
- Protection Steamers and Vessels, maintenance and repairs, 2955; conc., 2958.

Geological Survey :

- General Vote, 3346; suppl., 3408; conc., 3433.

*Government Steamers. See "Ocean and River Service."**Immigration :*

- General Vote, 2809, 2830.

Indians :

- Assistance to Institutions, 3392.
- Grant to supplement Indian Fund, 3242.
- British Columbia generally, 3313.
- Manitoba and N. W. T., 3314, 3339; suppl., 3393; conc., 3373.
- New Brunswick, 3243.
- Nova Scotia generally, 3243.

Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River :
conc., 2922.

Oka Indians, Removal of, 3457.

*Inspection of Staples. See "Collection of Revenues."**Insurance, Superintendence of :*

- Expenses in connection with service, 2957; conc., 2958.

*Justice, Administration of, 985.**Legislation :*

House of Commons :

- Contingencies, 2796.
- Debates, publishing of, 991; conc., 2765, 3371.
- Expenses of Committees, Extra Sessional Clerks, &c., 2795.
- Haché, Jacques, Gratuity to, 3450.
- Internal Economy, Commissioners' Report, increased expenditure under, 3449; conc., 3470.
- Printing, paper and bookbinding, 992, 2798.
- Salaries, &c., 991.

Miscellaneous :

- Deputy Speaker's Salary, 3351.
- Election expenses, Returning Officers, Montreal, 3451.
- Library—Salaries, &c., 2796.
- Morgan's "Annual Register," 3351.
- Sessional Indemnity, Increased, 3450.

Senate :

- Extra Expenses, including Debates and Short-hand Writers, 3448.
- Salaries and Contingent Expenses, 990; conc., 2765.

Lighthouse and Coast Service :

- Agencies, rents and contingencies, 2951.
- Cape Race Light, 2952.
- Fog-Whistles, Buoys and Beacons, maintenance and repairs, 2951.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Lighthouse and Coast Service—Continued.

- Lighthouse and Fog-Alarms, 2952.
- Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., 2950.

*Liquor License Act. See "Collection of Revenues."**Mail Subsidies and Steamship Subventions :*

- Campbellton and Gaspé, 2942.
- Canada and Antwerp, 2942; conc., 2958.
- Canada and Germany, 2945.
- France and Quebec, 2936, 3041.
- Liverpool or London and St. John, N. B., or Halifax, N.S., 2942.
- N.B. and P.E.I. to Great Britain and continental ports, 3457.
- Port Mulgrave and East Bay, C.B., 2942.
- Prince Edward Island and Great Britain, 2942.
- United States and Victoria, B.C., 2936; conc., 2958.

Marine Hospitals :

- General Vote, 2957.

Militia :

- A, B and C Batteries, Pay and maintenance, 2914.
- Ammunition, 2903.
- Barrack Huts, B.C., 3412.
- Barracks at London, 3412.
- Brigade Majors' Salaries, transport, &c., 2903.
- Cavalry and Infantry Schools, Pay and maintenance, 2915.
- Clothing and Great Coats, 2906.
- Contingencies, 2913.
- Dominion Artillery Association, 2913.
- Dominion Rifle Association, 2913.
- Drill Pay, &c., 2910.
- Drill Sheds and Rifle Ranges, 2915.
- Middleton, General, Grant to, 3470.
- Military Branch and District Staff, Salaries, 2889, 2903.
- Military Properties, Care and maintenance, 2916.
- Mounted Infantry at Winnipeg, 3411.
- New Militia Pensions, conc., 2765.
- Ordnance, Improved Rifled, 2915.
- Pay and transport, &c., of Force aiding civil power at Langan Mines, C.B., 3452.
- Public Armories, Care of Arms, &c., 2910.
- Royal Military College, 2913; conc., 2922.
- Veterans of War of 1812, Pensions, conc., 2765.

Miscellaneous :

- American Institute of Mining Engineers' visit to N.S., 3456.
- Bank Imposts, Refund of, 3387; conc., 3396.
- Canada Temperance Act, Expenses of Elections under, 3387.
- Chinese Commission, Expenses, &c., 3387; conc., 3396.
- Chinese Commissioners' Report, Printing, &c., 3421.
- Commercial Agencies, 3245.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Miscellaneous—Continued.

- District of Keewatin, Expenses of Govt., 3244.
 Doutre, J., Settlement of Claim against Govt. re Fishery Commission, 3392.
 Fabre, Mr., Salary and contingencies of office, 4244.
 Halifax Fishery Commission, Settlement of Legal Claims, 3388, 3392; conc., 3396.
 "Histoire Généalogique des Familles Françaises," 3455.
 Hudson Bay Expedition Expenses, 3245.
 Intoxicating Liquors, Putting in force Act respecting, 3244.
 Lynch's Treatise on Butter-making, 3456.
 Middleton, General, Grant to, 3470.
 Model Farm, Establishment of, 3453.
 Mounted Police Barracks, Erection of, 3244; suppl. 3387.
 North-West Council, Salaries of Members for 1881 and 1883, 3392; conc., 3397.
 North-West Disturbance, Expenses and losses, arising out of, 3454.
 North-West Territories, Expenses of Govt., &c., 3243.
 Printing Commission, Expenses, 3392.
 Provincial Legislation, Compilation, &c., correspondence, petitions, reports and O.C.'s respecting, 3421; conc., 3434.
 Purcell & Ryan, claim for transportation of supplies, &c., furnished Marquis of Lorne, 3452.
 Rand's Micmac Indian Dictionary, 3420.
 Refund of Duties to Merchants in P.E.I., 3455; conc., 3470.
 Returns, Preparation of, Payment of Extra Clerks, 3245; suppl., 3388.
 Surveys, Lakes Superior and Huron, 3244.

North-West Mounted Police:

- Equipment, pay and maintenance of additional men, 3421
 General Vote, 3243; suppl., 3392.

Ocean and River Service:

- Canadian Registration of Shipping, 2950.
 Government Steamers, maintenance, &c., 2945; conc., 3396.
 Life-boats, Stations and Life-preservers, &c., 2946.
 Obstruction in Navigable Waters, Removal of 2950.
 Water and River Police, Montreal and Quebec, 2950.
 Wrecks and Casualties, investigation of, &c., 2950.

Penitentiaries:

- British Columbia, 990.
 Dorchester, 989.
 Kingston, 985; suppl. (McManus' gratuity) 3350; conc., 3374.
 Manitoba, 989; suppl. (Sutherland, services) 3350.
 Removal of Prisoners, 3411.

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Penitentiaries—Continued.

- St. Vincent de Paul, 986; suppl. (Baillairgé, services) 3350.

Pensions:

- New Militia, conc., 2765.
 Veterans of War of 1812, 992; conc., 2765.
 Post Office. See "Collection of Revenues."

Public Works—Capital:*

- Public Buildings:
 Additional Public Buildings, Ottawa, 2916.

- Public Works:
 Cape Tormentine Harbor, 2917.
 Esquimalt Graving Dock, 2916.
 Port Arthur and Kaministiquia River, 2916.

Public Works—Consolidated Fund:

- Harbors and Rivers:
 Manitoba (River Saskatchewan) 3420.
 Nova Scotia, 3419.
 Ontario, 3386.
 Quebec (River Yamaska) 3419.

Miscellaneous:

- House and Furniture for High Commissioner, balance, 3386.
 Roads and Bridges (iron bridge across Rideau River) 3420.

Public Buildings:

- Armories, Montreal, 3385; suppl., 3419.
 British Columbia, 3386.
 Examining Warehouse, Toronto, 3385.
 Newcastle, N.B., Post Office, 3385.

Telegraphs:

- Amherst Island and Mainland, 3420.
 Sub-marine Cable between B.C. and Washington Territory, 3386.

Public Works—Income:

- Dredging, 2921; conc., 2923.

Harbors and Rivers:

- Manitoba, 2921.
 Maritime Provinces—Repairs and Improvements generally, 2920; conc., 2922.
 New Brunswick, 2920.
 Ontario, 2920.
 Prince Edward Island, 2919.

Public Buildings:

- Manitoba, 2919.
 New Brunswick, 2918.
 North-West Territories, 2919.
 N. W. T. (Prince Albert Court House and Gaol) 3452.
 Ontario, 2918.
 Prince Edward Island, 2918.
 Quebec, 2918.
 Repairs, Furniture, Heating, &c., 2919.
 Telegraphs, 2922.

*For Repairs and Working Expenses, see "Collection of Revenues."

SUPPLY—Continued.

COMMITTEE—Continued.

Quarantine :

- General Vote, 2853.
- Immigrant Patients, Winnipeg and St. Boniface Hospitals, 3358.
- Sheep Scab in Quebec, extirpating disease, 3358 ; suppl., 3411.

Railways* and Canals—Capital :

Canals :

- Cornwall, 3301.
- Fort Francis, Hugh Sutherland's Claim, 3385.
- Lachine, 3301.
- Murray 3303.
- St. Peter's, 3312.
- Trent River Nav. and Locks, 3311.
- Welland, 3301, 3311.
- Williamsburg, 3301.

Railways :

- Canadian Pacific Railway—
 - Inspecting Engineers' Expenses, 3417.
 - Pembina Branch (Award of Arbitrators) 3417.
 - Section B., 3383.
 - Subsidy, 3295 :
- Carleton Branch Railway :
 - To purchase, with harbor frontage, town lots, &c., 3415.
- Eastern Extension Railway :
 - Steamer *Norwegian*, Repairs, 3384.
- Intercolonial Railway :
 - Air Brakes to 100 engines, 3299.
 - Miscellaneous Works, 3296 ; suppl., 3383 ; conc., 3395.
 - Sleeping Cars, Purchase of, 3417.
- Short Line Railway, N.S. :
 - Settling unpaid Claims, &c., 3413.

Railways and Canals—Income :

Canals :

- Grenville (J. Simard, for services) 3418.
- Miscellaneous (Repairs to Road Dyke, Lake St. Francis) 3418.
- Rideau, 3312 ; (Land Damages, Township of Pittsburg) 3418.
- Welland (Land and Damages, Grand River, &c.) 3418 ; conc., 3433.

Railways :

- Surveys and Inspections, 3313.
- Surveys of Cape Breton and other Railways, 3418.

Scientific Institutions :

- Meteorological Observations, instruments &c., 2956.

Steamship Subventions. See "Mail Subsidies."

Weights and Measures and Gas. See "Collection of Revenues."

CONCURRENCE :

- Administration of Justice in the N.W.T. (Trials in connection with Rebellion) 3433.

SUPPLY—Continued.

CONCURRENCE—Continued.

- Antwerp and Colonial Exhibition, Expenses, 2766.
- Assistant Postmaster, Ottawa, Allowance to, 3397.
- Bank Imposts, Refund of, 3396.
- Canada and Antwerp, Steam communication, 2958.
- Charges of Management, 2763.
- Chinese Commission, Expenses, 3396.
- Debates, House of Commons, 2765, 3371.
- Dominion Steamers, 3396.
- Dredging, 2923.
- Fishery Protection Steamers and Vessels, 2958.
- Halifax Fishery Commission, Legal Claims, 3396.
- Harbors and Rivers, Maritime Provinces, Repairs, &c., 2922.
- Health Statistics, Expenses in connection with, 2766.
- Indian Industrial Schools at Qu'Appelle and High River, 2922.
- Indians of Manitoba and the N. W. T., 3373.
- Insurance, Superintendence of, 2958.
- Intercolonial Railway (Capital) 3395.
- Interior, Dept. of, 2764.
- Internal Economy Commissioners' Report, Increased Expenditure under, 3470.
- Liquor License Act, Commissioners, Inspectors, &c., 3398.
- McManus, C., Gratuity to Widow of, 3374.
- Mining Geologists, 3433.
- North-West Council, Salaries of Members, &c., 3396.
- Pensions, New Militia, 2765.
- Postmaster General's Office, 2764.
- Provincial Legislation, Compilation, &c., of Documents respecting, 3434.
- Refund of Duties to Merchants in P. E. I., 3470.
- Royal Military College of Canada, 2922.
- Senate, Salaries and Contingencies, 2765.
- U.S. and Victoria, B.C., Steam communication, 2958.
- Veterans of War of 1812, Pensions, 2765.
- Welland Canal (Land Damages, &c.) 3433.

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction Limitation B. No. 3 (Mr. Landry, *Montmagny*). 1°, 28 ; Order for 2° read, 102 ; 2° m., 151 ; Amt. (Mr. *Ouimet*) 165 ; neg., 167 ; 2° neg. (Y. 34, N. 125) 169 (i). See B. 68.

Supreme Court Appellate Jurisdiction Limitation B. No. 68 (Mr. Landry, *Montmagny*). 1°, 270 (i). See B. 3.

SUPREME COURT, CONTESTED CASES BEFORE, AND JUDGMENTS :
M. for Ret. (Mr. *Curran*) 210 (i).

SUPREME COURT : Deb. on M. for 2° of B. 3 (Mr. *Landry, Montmagny*) 151, 167 ; (Mr. *Tupper*) 156 ; (Messrs. *Girouard, Beaty and Blake*) 157 ; (Mr. *Macmaster*) 160 ; (Mr. *Curran*) 161 ; (Mr. *Davies*) 162 ; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 163 ; (Mr. *Ouimet*) 164 ; on Amt. (Mr. *Foster*) 165 ; (Mr. *Amyot*) 166 ; (Mr. *Laurier*) 167 ; (Messrs. *Royal and Belleau*) 168 ; (Mr. *Coursol*) 169 (i).

*For Repairs and Working Expenses, see "Collection of Revenues."

- SUPREME COURT: Judgments on Controverted Elections, 1, 593 (i).
- SUPREME COURT, JUDGMENTS RENDERED SINCE ESTABLISHMENT: M. for copies* (Mr. Landry, Montmagny) 533 (i).
- SUPREME COURT OF N.B., CAUSES ENTERED FOR ARGUMENT: M. for Number, &c. (Mr. Foster) 294 (i).
- SURVEYS AND EXAMINATIONS OF SURVEY RETS.: in Com. of Sup, 3344 (iv).
- SURVEYS AND PLANS OF BATTLEFORD AND EDMONTON: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 2357 (iii).
- SURVEYS OF RIVER LOTS AT ST. ALBERT, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3424; Mode of: Ques., 3424 (iv).
- SUTHERLAND, DR., PAYMENT TO: in Com. of Sup., 3351 (iv).
- SMALL SAVINGS, ENCOURAGEMENT OF: M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. Blake) 90 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN THE QU'APPELLE VALLEY: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lister) 205 (i).
- SQUATTERS IN TOWNSHIP 3, RANGES 23 AND 24, WEST: M. for Ret. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 231 (i).
- Synod of the Diocese of Qu'Appelle incorp. B. No. 39 (Mr. Mulock). 1°*, 125; 2°*, 180; in Com. and 3°*, 490 (i). (48-49 Vic., c. 33.)
- Synod of Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada incorp. B. No. 60 (Mr. McCarthy). 1°*, 180; 2°*, 246; in Com., 693 (i); 3°*, 791 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 32.)
- TRACADIE BREAKWATER, N.S., EXPENDITURE ON: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. McIsaac) 147 (i).
- TACHÉ, ARCHBISHOP, COMMUNICATION FROM, *re* HALF-BREEDS: Ques. (Mr. Blake) 3425 (iv).
- TAGGING METAL: in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- TANGENTS AND CURVES ON C.P.R., NUMBER AND AGGREGATE LENGTH: Ques.: (Mr. Blake) 744 (i). See "C.P.R."
- TARIFF, NOTICE OF CHANGES: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 714 (i).
- TARIFF, THE. See "WAYS AND MEANS."
- TAR, PINE: in Com. on Ways and Means, 810 (ii).
- TASCHEREAU, MR. T. L.: Certificate of Election and Return of, 1 (i).
- TELEGRAPH AND SIGNAL SERVICE IN B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 743 (i).
- TELEGRAPH CABLE ACROSS JUAN DE FUCA STRAITS, COST OF: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Baker, Victoria) 1443 (ii).
- TELEGRAPHIC COMMUNICATION WEST OF WINNIPEG: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 839 (ii).
- TELEGRAPHS: in Com. of Sup., 3420 (iv).
- TELEGRAPH SYSTEM IN CAPE BRETON, EXTENSION OF: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Inverness) 78 (i).
- TEMPORARY LOANS TO GOVERNMENT BY BANKS: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 350 (i), 2530 (iii).
- TERRY, CHARLES HUNTER, GRATUITY TO: Ques. (Mr. McMullen) 632 (i).
- Terry, Fairy Emily Jane, Relief of, B. No. 97 (Mr. Taylor). 1° on a div., 605; 2° on a div., 672 (i); in Com. and 3° on a div., 873 (ii). (48-49 Vic., c. 36.)
- TÊTE DU PONT BARRACKS, LEASE OF: M. for copies of O.C., &c. (Mr. Platt) 210 (i).
- THANKS OF QUEEN FOR CONDOLENCE ON DEATH OF DUKE OF ALBANY: Mess. from His Ex. (Sir John A. Macdonald) 32 (i).
- THANKS OF PARLT. TO VOLUNTEERS. See "VOTE."
- Three Rivers. See "HARBOR COMMISSIONERS."
- THUNDER BAY COLONISATION RY. CO.'S SUBSIDY: prop Res. (Mr. Pope) 3458; in Com., 3473 (iv).
- TILTON, MR., AND STAFF COMMANDER BOLTON, DISPUTE BETWEEN: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McMullen) 312 (i).
- TIMBER DUES TO GOVT. BY C.P.R. CO.: Ques. (Mr. Casey) 479 (i).
- TIMBER LICENSES AND PERMITS GRANTED ON LANDS OUTSIDE OF DISPUTED TERRITORY: M. for Rets.* (Mr. Charlton) 209 (i).
- TIMBER LICENSES AND PERMITS IN THE N.W.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Charlton) 121 (i).
- TIMBER LICENSES ISSUED SINCE JAN., 1882, IN N.W.T., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Charlton) 863 (ii).
- TIMBER LICENSES OR BERTHS IN B.C., TOTAL APPLICATIONS, DATE, NAMES AND ADDRESSES, &c., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Charlton) 210 (i).
- TIMBER ON INDIAN LANDS, NON-PRINTING OF RETS., AS ORDERED BY HOUSE: Remarks (Mr. Blake) 56 (i).
- TIMBER PERMITS GRANTED IN TERRITORY AWARDED ONT.: Ques. (Mr. Mills) 114, 115; M. for Ret., 115; M. for copies, &c.,* 124, 210 (i).
- TISSUE PAPER: in Com. on Ways and Means, 849 (ii).
- TOLLS ON CERTAIN RAILWAY COMPANIES: M. for Stmt., &c. (Mr. Mulock) 54 (i).
- BOOTS FOR THE TORONTO MILITIA CORPS: Ques. (Mr. Cameron, Huron) 1744 (iii).
- TOWELS: in Com. on Ways and Means, 857 (ii).
- TOWNSHEND, MR. C. J.: Certificate of Election and Ret. of, 1.
- C. P. R. TOWN SITES, SALES OF, TRANSACTION ON JOINT ACCOUNT: M. for Stmt.* (Mr. Blake) 67 (i).
- TRADE AND NAVIGATION RETS: presented (Mr. Bowell) 28 (i).
- TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND THE U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Davies) 1387 (ii); (Sir Richard Cartwright) 3163 (iv).
- TRADE RELATIONS WITH AUSTRALIAN COLONIES: M. for Ret. (Mr. Mitchell) 36; WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES: Ques. (Mr. Burpee) 78; WITH JAMAICA, 429; WITH MEXICO: Ques. (Mr. Paterson, Brant) 632 (i).
- Trading Corporations. See "INSOLVENT BANKS."
- TRANSFER OF BATTERIES: Ques. (Sir Richard Cartwright) 235 (i).
- TRANSLATION OF *Hansard* AND VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS: Remarks (Mr. Casgrain) 594 (i).
- TRANSPORTATION CHARGES: in Com. on Ways and Means, 3224 (iv).
- Treasury Board, Constitution of, Act Amt B. No. 104 (Sir Leonard Tilley). 1°, 630 (i); 2°, in Com. and 3°*, 1670 (ii). (48-49 Vic. c. 47.)

TREATIES :

FLAG TREATY BETWEEN U. S. AND SPAIN : M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Vail*) 219 (i).

NEGOTIATIONS BY SIR AMBROSE SHEA : Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 1887 (ii).

COMMERCIAL TREATY WITH JAMAICA : Ques. (Mr. *Lawrie*) 2854 (iv).

WASHINGTON TREATY, TERMINATION OF FISHERY CLAUSES : Remarks (Mr. *Mitchell*) 2559, 2773, 2890 ; on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Davies*) 2897 ; Remarks (Mr. *Vail*) 3074 ; Cor. and Papers : presented (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3232 ; Ques. (Mr. *Weidon*) 3249 ; Transport Regulations : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3249 ; Deb. on M. for Com. of Sup. (Mr. *Weidon*) 3322 ; (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3330 ; (Mr. *Mills*) 3333 ; (Messrs. *McLelan* and *Mitchell*) 3336 ; (Mr. *Vail*) 3338 (iv).

TRENT VALLEY CANAL, PLANS AND ESTIMATES OF COST, &C. : M. for copies of Cor., &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 144 (i) ; CONTRACTS : M. for copies, 823 (ii).

TRENT RIVER NAV. : in Com. of Sup., 3311 (iv).

TRESTLES AND BRIDGES, C.P.R., NUMBER OF : M. for Stmtnt. (Mr. *Edgar*) 100 (i).

TROOPS, TRANSPORT OF : Remarks (Mr. *Dawson*) 887 (ii).

TROUBLES AT PRINCE ALBERT : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 693 (i).

Truro Bank incorp. B. No. 78 (Mr. *Tupper*). 1°*, 313 ; 2°*, 405 (i).

TRUTH, J. W., EMPLOYMENT OF, BY GOVT. : Ques. (Mr. *Lan-derkin*) 744 (i).

TUG-BARGES, DREDGE AND MACHINERY ON RED RIVER : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Watson*) 964 (ii).

TURKISH PAUPER IMMIGRANTS : Remarks (Mr. *Trow*) 3475 (iv).

UMBRELLA OR PARASOL RIBS, &C. : in Com. on Ways and Means, 847 (ii).

U. S. AND VICTORIA, B.C., MAIL SUBSIDY : in Com. of Sup., 2936 (iv).

VACANCIES IN THE REPRESENTATION, 1, 593 (i).

VACANCY IN A JUDICIAL DISTRICT, N.S. : Ques. (Mr. *Kirk*) 2750 (iv).

VEGREVILLE, FATHER, COR. WITH MR. DEVILLE : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 3424 (iv).

VETERANS OF 1812, WIDOWS OF, EXTENSION OF PENSIONS : Ques. (Mr. *Robertson, Hastings*) 36 (i).

VETERANS OF WAR OF 1812 : in Com. of Sup., 992 (ii).

VICTORIA RIFLES. See "MILITIA."

VIOLATION OF CUSTOMS LAW IN N.S., BY JOHN LEANDER MACKENZIE : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Moffat*) 1442 (ii).

VOLUNTEER CORPS ORGANIZED IN THE N.W. IN 1879 : Remarks (Mr. *Watson*) 816 ; Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1474 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS DISBANDED IN MILITARY DISTRICT No. 9 : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Campbell, Victoria*) 1443 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS IN THE N.W., AND INTOXICATING LIQUORS : Ques. (Mr. *Foster*) 1131 (ii).

VOLUNTEERS IN THE N.W., RECOGNITION OF SERVICES : Ques. (Mr. *Small*) 1566 (ii) ; (Mr. *Blake*) 2029 (iii) ; prop. Res. (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3321 ; in Com. on Res., 3370. See B. 160.

VOLUNTEERS OF 1837-38 : Res. recognising services (Mr. *Hickey*) 37 (i).

VOLUNTEERS ON ACTIVE SERVICE, INCREASE OF PAY : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 2170 (iii).

VOTE FOR RELIEF OF SETTLERS IN THE N.W. : Ques. (Mr. *Watson*) 1744 (iii).

VOTE OF \$1,000,000 FOR THE N.W. TROUBLES : in Com. of Sup., 2234 (iii).

VOTE OF THANKS OF PARLT. TO GENL. MIDDLETON AND VOLUNTEERS : prop. Res. (Mr. *Caron*) 3459 ; (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 3463 ; (Mr. *Tassé*) 3465 ; (Mr. *Wright*) 3466 ; (Mr. *Woodworth*) 3467 ; (Mr. *Macmillan*) 3468 (iv).

VOTE TO GENL. MIDDLETON : notice (Sir *John A. Macdonald*) 3457 ; Mess. from His Ex., 3470 (iv).

VOYAGEURS TO EGYPT, NUMBER, NAMES, RESIDENCE, &C., OF OFFICERS AND MEN : M. for Ret.* (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 210 (i).

WARRANTS ISSUED FOR NEW ELECTIONS, 1, 593 (i).

WAR SUPPLIES, CARRIAGE OF, BY AMERICAN RYS. : Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 838 (ii).

WASHINGTON TREATY. See "TREATIES."

WATER AND RIVER POLICE : in Com. of Sup., 2950 (iv).

WATER LOTS IN N.S., APPLICATION FOR : Ques. (Mr. *Tupper*) 429 (i).

WATER LOTS ON RIVERS, GOVT. RIGHTS : Ques. (Mr. *Van-asse*) 2238 (iii).

WATERPROOF BLANKETS FOR VOLUNTEERS, PURCHASE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Catudal*) 2171 (iii).

WATSON, EBENEZER, OF SARNIA, OFFICE OF : Ques. (Mr. *Lister*) 188 (i).

WAYS AND MEANS : Res. for Com. (Sir *Leonard Tilley*) 27 ; on M. for Com., the Budget Speech, 313 ; reply (Sir *Richard Cartwright*) 333 ; Deb. adjd., 348 ; resmd. (Mr. *White, Cardwell*) 394 ; (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 412 ; (Mr. *Tupper*) 455 ; (Mr. *Charlton*) 463 ; (Mr. *McLelan*) 505 ; (Mr. *Mills*) 512 ; (Mr. *Curran*) 521 ; (Mr. *Rinfret*) 527 ; (Mr. *Foster*) 535 ; (Mr. *Davies*) 545 ; (Mr. *Woodworth*) 555 ; (Mr. *King*) 561 ; (Mr. *Burns*) 595 ; (Mr. *Casey*) 599, 633 ; (Mr. *Stairs*) 641 ; (Mr. *Gillmor*) 648 ; (Mr. *Wood, Brockville*) 656 ; (Mr. *Jackson*) 662 ; (Mr. *Vail*) 666 ; (Mr. *Allison*) 676 ; (Mr. *Tassé*) 677 ; (Mr. *Hackett*) 687 ; (Mr. *Cockburn*) 715 ; (Mr. *Robertson, Hamilton*) 719 ; (Mr. *McMullen*) 722 ; (Mr. *Dickinson*) 729 ; (Mr. *Sproule*) 733 ; (Mr. *Bécharé*) 739 ; (Mr. *Hesson*) 747 ; Res. (Mr. *Blake*) re Disturbance in the N.W., 756 ; neg. (Y. 57, N. 129), and in Com., 771 (i) ; in Com., 783, 791, 840 (ii) ; Res. (Mr. *Blake*) re Disturbance in the N. W. (*Resumé* of Events) 3075 ; neg. (Y. 49, N. 105) 3213 ; in Com., 3214, 3294 ; Res. conc. in, 3322 (iv).

WEIGHT AND MEASUREMENT OF ROOTS : M. for copies of Cor.* (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 201 (i).

Weights and Measures Act Amt. B. No. 118 (Mr. *Costigan*). Res. prop., 832 ; in Com. and 1°* of B. 837 ; 2° and in Com., 1672 ; 3°*, 1680 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 64.)

WEIRS IN THE COUNTY OF CHARLOTTE, N. B., LICENSES, &C. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Gillmor*) 1444 (ii).

WELLER'S BAY, "RANGE LIGHTS" AT : M. for Cor., &c. (Mr. *Platt*) 210 (i).

Western Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 94 (Mr. *McCallum*). 1°*, 534 ; 2°*, 616 (i) ; in Com. and 3°*, 1288 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 87.)

- WESTERN TERMINUS C.P.R., ROUTE OR ROUTES FROM PORT MOODY TO ENGLISH BAY:** M. for Plan, &c. (Mr. *Blake*) 145 (i).
- WEST MIDDLESEX CONTROVERTED ELECTION:** Judge's Rep., 1.
- WEST ONTARIO ELECTION:** Return of Member to represent, 1 (i).
- WHARFAGE COLLECTIONS.** See "MARINE."
- Wharves, Docks and Piers in Nav. Waters B. No. 18** (Mr. *Tupper*). 1^o, 46; 2^o m., 215; 2^o* and ref. to Sel. Com., 218 (i).
- WHARVES ON P.E.I., GRANT FOR CONSTRUCTION:** Ques. (Mr. *Davies*) 351 (i).
- WHEAT, FLOUR, CORNMEAL AND CORN, DUTY COLLECTED ON, IN N. S.:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *Vail*) 533 (i).
- WHEAT AND FLOUR DUTIES, ALTERATION OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Bergeron*) 148 (i).
- WHEAT AND FLOUR, DUTIES ON, MEMORIALS, &c.:** M. for copies* (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 532 (i).
- WHEAT AND FLOUR IMPORTS AND EXPORTS:** M. for Ret. (Mr. *Paterson, Brant*) 138 (i).
- WHISKEY:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 3225 (iv).
- WHITE POINT, N. S., BREAKWATER, REPAIR OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Forbes*) 52 (i).
- WHITE SHELLAC:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 806 (ii).
- WILKINSON, J. A., SUMS PAID TO, AND FOR WHAT SERVICES:** Ques. (Mr. *McMullen*) 51 (i).
- WINDSOR BRANCH RY., O.C., AGREEMENTS, &c., RESPECTING:** M. for copies* (Mr. *Kinney*) 533 (i).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 82** (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*). 1^o*, 349; 2^o m., 428; Order dschgd and B. wthdn, 428 (i).
- Winnipeg and Prince Albert Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 91** (Mr. *Cameron, Victoria*). 1^o*, 428; 2^o, 567 (i); in Com. and 3^o*, 1180 (ii). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 89.)
- WINTER CROSSING FROM P. E. I.:** M. for copies of Cor. (Mr. *Macdonald, King's*) 62 (i).
- WOOD AND WILKINSON, SUMS PAID TO, AND SERVICES RENDERED:** M. for Ret.* (Mr. *McMullen*) 147 (i).
- Wood Mountain and Qu'Appelle Ry. Co.'s Acts Amt. B. No. 23** (Mr. *Williams*). 1^o*, 67; 2^o*, 113; in Com. and 3^o*, 490 (i). (48-49 *Vic.*, c. 16.)
- WOODSTOCK, N. B., PUBLIC BUILDINGS, INSPECTOR OF:** Ques. (Mr. *Irvine*) 606 (i).
- WOOD SUPPLIES FOR GOVT BUILDINGS, OTTAWA:** Ques. (Mr. *McCraney*) 429 (i); (Mr. *Bain, Wentworth*) 1387 (ii).
- WOOLLEN FABRICS:** in Com. on Ways and Means, 800, 840 (ii).
- WOOLLEN RAGS:** in Com. of Ways and Means, 783; legislation respecting: Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 1567 (ii).
- WRIT FOR LÉVIS COUNTY:** Ques. (Mr. *Blake*) 633; Remarks 661 (i).